PINDAR AND THE POETICS OF AUTONOMY:
AUTHORIAL AGENCY IN PINDAR'S FOURTH *PYTHIAN* ODE

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Dennis Robert Alley

May 2019

©2019 Dennis Robert Alley

PINDAR AND THE POETICS OF AUTONOMY: AUTHORIAL AGENCY IN PINDAR'S FOURTH *PYTHIAN* ODE

Dennis Robert Alley
Cornell University 2019

Over the last decade a growing number of scholars have questioned the veracity of the longstanding commission-fee model which placed the Greek lyric poet Pindar in the thrall of various aristocratic patrons to secure his pay. This seismic shift in our view on Pindar's composition reveals manifold new questions to explore in its wake. What happens to our understanding of the 45 extant odes and extensive fragments, when, for example, angling for commission no longer mandates procrustean generic strictures? How do we understand praise poetry if not as exclusively solicited and sold? Where do we even begin examining the odes under this new model?

Pindar and the Poetics of Autonomy suggests one ode in particular has suffered from the rigidity of scholarly expectations on commission and genre. In the corpus of Pindaric epinicia, *Pythian* Four, written around 462 for Arcesilaus the fourth of Cyrene, is conspicuously anomalous. At 299 exceptionally long lines, the poem is over twice as long as the next longest ode. While most epinicia devote considerable space in their opening and closing sections to celebrating the present victory, *Pythian* Four makes only one clear mention of it. Unlike other Pindaric epinicia which develop myths focusing on a critical crisis which reveals a hero's

exceptional character, *Pythian* Four features a continuous narrative which lingers on emotional moments of loss, recognition, deceit, success, and return. Finally, the ode concludes with a request for the repatriation of a Cyrenean exile—a feature not only unattested in other Pindaric poems, but which lacks clear precedent in extant Greek poetry. While any one of these features might easily be placed in an epinician to achieve, for example, variation or vividness, the accretion of so many irregular features in a single ode should at least encourage us to consider other generic options, or, alternatively, freer constraints on its composition.

This dissertation does just that. It suggests that our understanding of Pindaric lyric, and *Pythian* four especially, has been problematically skewed by long assumed—but poorly documented—compositional and generic constraints. Finally, it offers a different way of understanding Pindar and Greek Lyric generally.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dennis R. Alley was born in Syracuse, New York and raised on a small farm in Verona, New York. The son of Gary and Catherine Alley, Dennis' intellectual curiosity was piqued at a very young age by multiple discoveries of centuries-old artifacts on his family's farm. A first-generation university student, Dennis was attracted to the study of Classics during his time at Syracuse University, where he completed an honors thesis on Herodotus' characterization of the Spartans in the *Histories* under the supervision of Craige Champion and Jeffrey Carnes. Dennis completed his B.A. from Syracuse, *Summa Cum Laude*, in 2011 and began graduate studies at Cornell University in the Fall of 2012. At Cornell, under the direction of Jeffrey Rusten and Hayden Pelliccia, Dennis has worked on Greek Historiography, Attic Comedy, and specialized in Archaic Greek Lyric. The seeds of his dissertation were planted in part during his work on a topic exam in 2015 on Pindar under the direction of Hayden Pelliccia, and a seminar the same year on the Platonic Letters taught by Hayden Pelliccia and Charles Brittain.

DEDICATION

For my parents, Gary and Catherine Alley, whose endless love, support, generosity, and encouragement made this unlikely path a reality.

For my grandmother, Vera B. Alley, whose indelible spirit has inspired and encouraged me since she departed this world in 2005.

Acknowledgments

As is to be expected with any project of this magnitude, I have incurred a tremendous number of personal and professional debts. The oldest and longest standing of which stretches back long before this project was conceived. My parents, Gary and Catherine Alley, cultivated in me a curiosity and fascination with the world that ultimately made this project a possibility. They taught me how to think for myself and ceaselessly inquire about the world—for that I will always be grateful to them.

Next, I must thank my wife, Leita Powers, whose love, support, patience, and willingness to listen to an endless number of practice conference papers or to help proof-read (though I have no doubt she would rather not have) far exceeded what could fairly be asked of a spouse. Moreover, Leita provided the emotional support necessary to reach the end.

Intellectually, this project has benefited from the input of a wide range of scholars in the field. I would especially like to thank Kathryn Morgan of UCLA who took the time to read and suggest various revisions at early phases. My graduate colleagues in Cornell’s Classics department have all contributed valuable input along the way and are due my gratitude. I would especially like to thank Hannah Karmin of the Comp. Lit. department, whose interests in poetic authority in English literature offered me a tremendous wealth of historical parallels for the notion of poetic autonomy, and my dear friend Natasha Binek of Classics, with whom I had the opportunity to discuss this project over coffee on a weekly basis. Her critical eye and impeccable judgement helped me expand my thinking as the project grew and spared me from numerous embarrassing errors.

Two scholars from my past have exerted a tremendous influence in the development of this project. Craige Champion of Syracuse University was kind enough to read many drafts of each chapter and suggest numerous revisions. It is highly unlikely that this project would have ever taken form had it not been for Jeffrey Carnes also of Syracuse. Jeff, ever the enthusiastic Pindarist, introduced me to Pindar in my senior year at Syracuse. In our time together, he presented Pindar as an author who composed in a genre of which we are largely ignorant: his illumination of that that genre throughout my final semester at Syracuse allowed me to both appreciate and sincerely enjoy the Theban poet.

My greatest debts lie with the faculty and staff of Cornell's Classics department. The superb support and organization afforded us by the secretarial staff has been inspirational. Linda Brown, Philip Rusher, and Jessica Smith always helped me in any capacity they could. A particularly large debt is due to Eric Rebillard, who in his capacity as DGS has ensured the timeliness of this project and guaranteed that I had the opportunity to present versions of each chapter at numerous conferences in North America and Europe. Manifold faculty members have provided exceptional support, guidance, and suggestions at numerous points in this project's devlopement, of whom I would especially like to thank Fredrick Ahl, Charles Brittain, Todd Clary, and Piero Pucci.

My advising committee has been incomparable in the development of this project. The endless enthusiasm, generosity, support, and insight of Athena Kirk and Courtney Roby helped me improve my methodological and theoretical views—considerably sharpening my critical focus. Next, Jeffrey Rusten's knowledge of Greek language and literature was invaluable in the more philological sections of the project. Moreover, during my time at Cornell, Jeff's kindness, warmth, and welcoming personality made meeting the challenges of graduate study possible.

Aditionally, his generous gift of an edition of the scholia to Pindar made working on the ancient reception of the odes substantially easier. Finally, in his capacity as my advisor, Hayden Pelliccia's endless patience, insight, critical eye, and unwavering commitment to my intellectual development ensured my success. Ever ready with words of encouragement, a useful article he had just encountered, a willingness to listen to my newest thoughts on Pindar or *P*.4—even in their most inchoate state—or in his capacity to gently dissuade me from topics that might become "quicksand," Hayden has helped me at every stage of my graduate career. I cannot express the depth of my gratitude to him.

Finally, I would be remiss to neglect a final member of our staff, who was tragically unable to see the completion of this project. Katrina Neff, an administrative assistant in the Classics department, passed away in the Fall of 2016. Katrina's kindness, warmth, generosity, and humor made her a bright spot in the lives of all graduate students in the department and, indeed, everyone who knew her. Many of us often lovingly referred to her as the "Classics den mother." I am sincerely grateful to have known Katrina and deeply saddened that future members of the Cornell Classics community will not have that opportunity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Pindarus Lyricus **1**

Chapter I: **7**
An Autonomous Praise Poet?
Poetic Autonomy and the The Epinician Poet.

Chapter II: A Poetic Nostos? **49**
Rethinking *P*.4

Chapter III: Speaking to the Powerful: **87**
The Poet's Voice

Chapter IV: Jason at the Symposium: **137**
The Exile and the King

Chapter V: Demophilus at the Symposium: **176**
The Plea for Return

Conclusion: **200**
Resetting the Boundaries of Pindaric Poetry

Bibliography **229**

INTRODUCTION:

PINDARUS LYRICUS

ἐπέγνω μὲν Κυράνα
καὶ τὸ κλεεννότατον μέγαρον Βάττου δικαιᾶν
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,
οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ και-
ρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.
εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν· θεράπων δέ οἱ, οὐ δρά-
στας ὀπαδεῖ. φαντὶ δ' ἔμμεν
τοῦτ' ἀνιαρότατον, καλὰ γινώσκοντ' ἀνάγκᾳ
ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα. καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ
προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρῴ-
ας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπό τε κτεάνων·
λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας. ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ
μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου
ἱστίων. ἀλλ' εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦ-
σον διαντλήσαις ποτέ
οἶκον ἰδεῖν, ἐπ' Ἀπόλλω-
νός τε κράνᾳ συμποσίας ἐφέπων
θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, ἔν τε σοφοῖς
δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων πολί-
ταις ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν,
μήτ' ὦν τινι πῆμα πορών, ἀπαθὴς δ' αὐτὸς πρὸς ἀστῶν·
καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων,
πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς.

Cyrene and the most celebrated house of Battus have learned to know the just mind of Damophilus. For that man, a youth among boys, but in counsels an elder who has attained a life of one hundred years, deprives a malicious tongue of its shining voice and has learned to hate the person who is violent, not striving against the noble nor delaying any accomplishment, since opportunity in men’s affairs has a brief span. He has come to know it well; he serves it as an attendant, not as a hireling. They say that the most distressing thing is to know the good but be forced to stand away. Yes, that Atlas is wrestling even now with the sky away from his possessions; yet immortal Zeus released the Titans. In the course of time sails are chained when the wind dies down. But he prays that having drained his accursed disease to the end, he may someday see his home; that he may join the symposium

> at Apollo's fountain, often giving his heart over to the ornate lyre among his cultured citizens, may attain peace, neither doing harm to anyone nor suffering it from his townsmen. And he would tell, Arcesilaus, what a spring of ambrosial verses he found, when he was recently a guest at Thebes.[1]
>
> (*P*.4.279-99)

Does the Theban poet Pindar request the repatriation of an exile from the king of Cyrene in these lines? While the notion that a poet might compose a poem for a friend's benefit is hardly revolutionary[2], the affirmative answer has faced considerable resistance for its apparent challenge to longstanding views on Pindar and his methods of composition. For to answer this question, we must first confront foundational challenges to the study of Pindar's poetry.

In many respects, the Fourth *Pythian*[3] is an ideal candidate to engage deeply entrenched views on Pindaric poetry head-on. Not only does the passage we began with lack any clear parallel in extant Greek poetry, but the poem itself is nearly three times as long as the next longest surviving Pindaric ode.[4] Moreover, unlike any of the other epinicia with which the poem is classed, *P*.4 features a continuous mythic narrative, an extended 1st person prophecy, presents no obvious choice for commissioner, and engages minimally with the king's victory—the ostensible reason for an epinician's composition. By themselves, any one of these may be explained away as an irregular feature of an epinician, yet in the aggregate they point to the poem being something else entirely.

Generic irregularities aside, the question of whether Pindar is requesting repatriation for Damophilos also runs against views on the poet's social position. In contrast to other poets of the archaic period who are universally understood to have written their poetry for manifold reasons, Pindar's motivation to compose—pay—has remained largely monolithic in the scholarly imagination.[5] Where competition and glory in the great civic festivals of Athens are understood to have incited the tragedians, Pindar, who contributed dithyrambs to at least some of the same festivals,[6] was driven by money and commission.[7] Had *P*.4 been written by, e.g. Alceaus or Solon, scholars would likely have few qualms with the notion that, for example, they were engaging in some form of international diplomacy for their respective *polies*, yet this option has not even been considered for Pindar. But how likely is it that a poet whose work looks so similar in many respects to his poetic predecessors and contemporaries functioned so differently from them? How reasonable is it for scholars to impose such rigid expectations on a poet composing in lyric—one of the most intrinsically flexible poetic art forms and consistently resistant to comfortable classifications?[8] Must we ascribe all of Pindar's poems to a commission model or are we distorting our reading of the poems to preserve a model given to us by the scholia transmitted with the poems?

---

[1] Trans. Race. Used henceforth unless otherwise stated.

[2] Allen Ginsberg's *Howl*, composed in part for Carl Solomon and dedicated to him, is a famous example.

[3] Referred to as *P*.4 henceforth.

[4] *P*.9—125 lines. Looking to the poems of Bacchylides, poems 1, 5 and 13 all run close to, or over, 200 lines; yet, despite their length, the size of the constituent lines is generally substantially shorter.

Recent scholars have suggested as much.[9] Yet, new problems arise. If the poet composed at least partially free from the constraints of commission, we must ask how he might have written poetry for victorious athletes or communities in a way that was simultaneously free from the restraints of a commercial frame-work but also without the protections it confers?

---

[5] In its most extreme form, the restraints of commissioned imagined for Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides have effectively made them paid propagandists for Hieron of Syracuse and others, so Finley 1968, ch.3, and Podlecki 1980.

[6] frg.75, see van der Weiden, 1991, 27, for the context of performance and 186-7 for an analysis of the text, its contents, and possible dates of production.

[7] Especially Gentili 1988, 115-55.

[8] The position of lyric in the scheme of Western poetics has been famously problematic since antiquity. For lyric's resistance to classification, see Culler 1985, and Culler 2015, 1-9, and in the classical period 48-69.

[9] Pelliccia 2009; Bowie 2012; Morgan 2015.

To a great extent, this is the central question of this project. What does Pindar look like when viewed not as a hireling, but as a lyric poet writing in a received poetic tradition? What protections does that inherited framework offer? What hazards must the poet navigate? As such, this project finds its expression in two parts. The first section, chapters 1 and 2, offer a framework for understanding how the poet might operate without commission.

As we will see in Chapter 1, the notion of poetic autonomy offers important possibilities. In particular, Luke Roman's successful application of the concept to Roman poets working under the principate has illustrated how a symbiotic relationship between a poet and the powerful figures he encountered protected the poet as long as operated within the boundaries of decorum.[10] This observation is especially important, as the figures Roman explores were subjects of the rulers they sometimes polemically engaged—which is to say, they operated under greater social constraints than Pindar who was not a political subject of autocrats. Moreover, the literary traditions from the 5th and early 4th centuries involving Greek poets depict important parallels to the autonomic rhetoric of the Augustan poets Roman identifies.

Secondly, the traditionally rigid generic expectations of epinician may exaggerate the degree of control over the poems patrons exerted.[11] On this view, Andrea Rotstein's *The Idea of Iambus* affords us valuable methodological innovations.[12] Working with lyric's badly mutilated sister iambus, Rotstein has demonstrated how within cognitive models of genre reception the range of possibilities for what can be meant by the term “iambic” is substantially greater than the traditional Alexandrian markers of meter and insult. Instead of excising outliers from the iambic corpus on the grounds of misclassifications, Rotstein has shown how the boundaries of iambus are remarkably elastic and porous, since: “at any given time there was more than one system of genres at work in the minds of ancient performers and audiences, and, with time shifts of terminology occurred.”[13] To a great extent, Rotstein’s findings on Iambus mirror what has been observed of lyric for centuries—as an art form, it is astonishingly well suited to absorb, re-work, and expand existing poetic conventions.

---

[10] Roman 2012, 5-21.

[11] For the freedoms engendered by lyric's resistance to classification and identification of speaking voices, see De Mann 1985.

[12] Rotstein 2010.

In the case of Pindar, not only does the thought complicate what can be meant by terms like “lyric” or “epinician”, but when they possessed a specific meaning, to whom they held that meaning, and whether or not there were competing meanings an audience or performer perceived at the time of a poem’s performance. Seeing Pindar not chiefly as an epinician poet, but instead as a lyric poet who sometimes composed poems that would come to be known as epinicia in later centuries renders a clearer view on the interplay of Pindar’s poetry with other poetic genres and linguistic registers. These contexts and observations will be central to our discussion of the history of scholarship on *P*.4 featured in Chapter 2.

The second section, Chapters 3-5, seeks to advance section one’s view of “Pindar the lyric poet” through a close examination of *P*.4. By exploring *P*.4 as a poem by a lyric poet first and foremost, I have attempted a new reading which takes into account the rhetorical elements of the poem, its inherited myths and revisions of them, and the historical situations it foregrounds to offer an interpretation that both improves our understanding of *P*.4 and affords scholars a different way of exploring the surviving corpus of epinician poets. Yet, if this reading offers new views on the composition and context of the poem, it inevitably demands certain concessions. Namely, whereas on traditional views the positive outcome of the request for Demophilus' repatriation was taken for granted—and possible insights of the historical situation assumed—on our new reading—like many forensic speeches from the classical period—the efficacy of the plea must remain obscure.

---

[13] Rotstein 2010, 6.

I

AN AUTONOMOUS PRAISE POET?
POETIC AUTONOMY AND THE EPINICIAN POET

In his recent book on medieval encomiastic poetry, J.A. Burrows notes the propensity of modern readers to reject the sincerity of praise: “I shall draw attention to occasions where, in my opinion, modern critics can be found reading their own ironies and reservations into the text—as if, finding pure praise unpalatable, they add their own salt. At its worst, critics as well as students fall victim to a taste for debunking, and display what Northrop Frye called an ‘ironic provincialism.’”[14] It is reasonable to expect, as Burrows encourages us to, that encomiastic poets compose for manifold reasons—not exclusively irony or personal gain.[15] Still, like the Medieval poetry Burrows explores, Classical Greek praise poets have faced a similar prejudice.

For the Theban poet Pindar, whose epinician praise poems are the only corpus of his work to survive through continuous transmission from antiquity, Burrows’ insights are especially illuminating. Though Pindar’s work has traditionally been interpreted through the lens of a commission model,[16] recent scholarship has highlighted the problematic nature of the sources which evince this framework as well as its economic inconsistencies.[17] Divested of the commission model, the surviving corpus emerges as a substantially more complex assortment of poems than traditionally understood. The removal of the model, however, raises important questions about the poet's relationship to his compositions. Why did Pindar write if not for money? How does independence from the demands of a commissioner modify our view on the extant poems? Where, if at all, do we see Pindar's own interests assert themselves in these works? What restrained the poet from expressing his own views in his poetry?

---

[14] Burrows 2008, 5, quoting Frye 1962, 62.

[15] For the reception of encomiastic literature from the Roman to Medieval periods, see Curtius 1953 [1990], 176-8, who also provides context for the conditions of later encomiastic court poets and the expectations on them.

[16] The assumption of commission is pervasive in Pindaric scholarship, but Gentili 1988; Kurke 1991; Mann 2000 pose specific economic frameworks for understand the model.

[17] Pelliccia 2009; Bowie 2012; Morgan 2015; Stewart 2016.

The literary concept of functional autonomy is a valuable starting point. As with Burrows' Medieval praise poets, the idea of Pindar willingly conferring praise on individuals—particularly tyrants—has remained unpalatable to many scholars. Yet praise does not imply complete assent. Indeed, Pindaric poetry utilizes considerable warning and admonishment, suggesting that the praise was not so untrammeled that the poet failed to recognize the possibility that the victor could fall victim to any number of vices. This is important when we consider what functional autonomy meant in a Greek context.

Exploring exertions of poetic autonomy in early imperial Roman literature, Luke Roman has observed how: "a writer or artist may have the purpose of establishing art's radical separateness from the rest of human affairs, yet, viewed in terms of function, the project of aesthetic autonomy may nonetheless produce concrete social outcomes, both positive and negative."[18] Roman highlights the concept's divergence from strict poetic autonomy advanced by the New Critics. Instead of an art that is absolute from the historical, cultural, or social context of its composition, on this view, art's cultural status carries with it the power to confirm or deny messages in other spheres.[19] To this end, the poet enjoys a degree of protection through their work's privileged position, while for the politically or socially powerful, the exigent need for cultural legitimacy demands concessions to the cultural elite. As Jusdanis argues, “the capacity of intellectuals to elevate reigning social, cultural, and political norms was ensured by the sovereign enclave originally declared for art.”[20] On this view, the project of conferring power, prestige, or praise demands the poet at least nominally remain independent of those structures. Casey Haskens has termed this “instrumental autonomy.” Arguing that a misreading of Kant inspired the strict autonomist readings of the Romantic period and early twentieth century criticism, Haskens roots the distinction of his revised autonomist concept in how: “instrumental autonomy” emphasizes “the work of art’s distinctive capacity, as an object of value, to do something not done, or not done in the same way, by other kinds of objects. A significant difference between the two views is that while strict autonomism presupposes that artistic value is necessarily a form of intrinsic, as opposed to instrumental value, instrumental autonomism permits works of art to be valued as works of art, both intrinsically and instrumentally. Thus, while on a strict autonomist view the only standpoint which is relevant or internal to the evaluation of works of art as works art is that of the spectator contemplating their “artistic” or “aesthetic” properties, an instrumental autonomist view, by contrast admits other standpoints into such an assessment as well; e.g. standpoints which view works as instrumental to knowledge or edification.”[21] While the autonomy propounded by Haskens and Roman has traditionally been denied to Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides, it is not unknown in the Greek poetic tradition.[22]

---

[18] Roman 2014, 11.

[19] For applications of autonomy in literary aesthetics, see Haskins 1990, and Haskins 1998.

---

[20] Jusdanis 2005, 39.

[21] Haskins 1989, 43.

[22] Roman 2014, 13, is surprisingly dismissive of the concept being applied to Ancient Greek texts, despite observing potentially fruitful avenues to exploring it: “Greek poetry does not usually manifest the explicit insistence on demarcated realms of endeavor and axiological self-differentiation that we see in overtly autonomist rhetoric of the Roman poets. Certainly, Greek lyric poets such as Archilochus and Sappho define their own values and preferences in ways that also give shape to their individual profiles as poets. Pindar conveys pride in his endeavor and the distinct value of poetry, while balancing encomiastic aims with insistence on poetic integrity. Yet, as D. Feeney has noted, poetry enjoyed an established place in the Greek *Mousike*, and accepted role in cultural education and Greek

Indeed, powerful assertions of authorial autonomy—especially those clustering around edification and admonishment—are common to the Greek literary tradition.

Speaking to the King: Solon and Croesus

Emphasizing the proclivity of power and culture to seek each other out, the author of the Second Platonic Epistle highlights some famous parings (310.E.5- 311.B.7):

πέφυκε συνιέναι εἰς ταὐτὸν φρόνησίς τε καὶ δύναμις μεγάλη, καὶ ταῦτ' ἄλληλα ἀεὶ διώκει καὶ ζητεῖ καὶ συγγίγνεται· ἔπειτα καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι χαίρουσιν περὶ τούτων αὐτοί τε διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ἄλλων ἀκούοντες ἔν τε ἰδίαις συνουσίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ποιήσεσιν. οἶον καὶ περὶ Ἱέρωνος ὅταν διαλέγωνται ἄνθρωποι καὶ Παυσανίου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου, χαίρουσι τὴν Σιμωνίδου συνουσίαν παραφέροντες, ἅ τε ἔπραξεν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· καὶ Περίανδρον τὸν Κορίνθιον καὶ Θαλῆν τὸν Μιλήσιον ὑμνεῖν εἰώθασιν ἅμα, καὶ Περικλέα καὶ Ἀναξαγόραν, καὶ Κροῖσον αὖ καὶ Σόλωνα ὡς σοφοὺς καὶ Κῦρον ὡς δυνάστην. καὶ δὴ ταῦτα μιμούμενοι οἱ ποιηταὶ Κρέοντα μὲν καὶ Τειρεσίαν συνάγουσιν, Πολύειδον δὲ καὶ Μίνω, Ἀγαμέμνονα δὲ καὶ Νέστορα καὶ Ὀδυσσέα καὶ Παλαμήδη – ὡς δ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, καὶ Προμηθέα Διὶ ταύτῃ πῃ συνῆγον οἱ πρῶτοι ἄνθρωποι – τούτων δὲ τοὺς μὲν εἰς διαφοράν, τοὺς δ' εἰς φιλίαν ἀλλήλοις ἰόντας, τοὺς δὲ τοτὲ μὲν εἰς φιλίαν, τοτὲ δ' εἰς διαφοράν, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὁμονοοῦντας, τὰ δὲ διαφερομένους ᾄδουσι.

> It is natural that great wisdom and power come in contact with one another; these always pursue, chase after, and engage with one another. Then afterwards men love conversing about these things and hearing others do so in both private intercourse and poems. So it is, when men discuss Hieron or Pausanias the Lakedaimonian, they love bringing up their engagement with Simonides—what he said and what he did toward them. Just the same, they are accustomed to chat about Periander the Corinthian and Thales the Milesian, Pericles and Anaxagoras, Croesus or, indeed, Solon, how they were wise men, and Cyrus how he was potentate. And, indeed, imitating these, the poets bring together Creon and Tiresias, Polyeidos and Minos, Agamemnon and Nestor, or Odysseus and Palamedes—and, it seems to me, the very first men, in the same way, brought Prometheus together with Zeus—and they sing of how some of these men came to quarrel, some to friendship with one another, while others still first came to friendship and then came to odds, agreeing on some things and arguing on others.[23]

---

life." I generally agree with both Feeney 2002, 187 and Roman 2014, 12-14 that the social position carved out for poets working within the polis was such that poetic autonomy was assumed and not as necessary to overtly appeal to, but would contend that it is essential for international poets like Pindar to accomplish the balancing act Roman perceives in an environment where a powerful figure may attempt to coerce the cooperation of the poet. Moreover, even in the well-documented context of Athenian drama, poets were liable to run afoul of opposing political messages in ways that could make them a target, so the *parabasis* to Aristophanes, *Ach*. 480-555 feels compelled to emphasize the poet's role as an educator against the political attacks of Cleon. Note especially 498-500: "I am ready to address the Athenians about the city while making comedy. For even Comedy knows what's right; and what I say will be shocking, but right." (Trans. Henderson.)

[23] Trans. Bury with modification.

By placing Plato’s engagements with the Dionysii in the continuing struggle of the intellectual to impart wisdom on the powerful, the author of the Second Letter affords us a view on the dynamics of the literary trope. In basic outline, the intellectual offers an unfavorable view to the ruler. The ruler, after ignoring the value of the contribution, is doomed to pay for his failure to comprehend the wise man’s message. We may detect a degree of innovation at work in the Second Letter’s shifting the tradition of interviews between poets and kings to philosophers and rulers. Nevertheless, the list is instructive for us to observe how certain engagements had become canonical at the time of the letter’s composition. The most famous case cited in the Second Epistle, Herodotus’ interview of Solon and Croesus, is valuable to flesh out the intricacies of the dynamic:

ἀπικνέονται ἐς Σάρδις ἀκμαζούσας πλούτῳ ἄλλοι τε οἱ πάντες ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος σοφισταί, οἳ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἐτύγχανον ἐόντες, ὡς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἀπικνέοιτο, καὶ δὴ καὶ Σόλων ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος…Ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐξεινίζετο ἐν τοῖσι βασιληίοισι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κροίσου· μετὰ δέ, ἡμέρῃ τρίτῃ ἢ τετάρτῃ, κελεύσαντος Κροίσου τὸν Σόλωνα θεράποντες περιῆγον κατὰ τοὺς θησαυροὺς καὶ ἐπεδείκνυσαν πάντα ἐόντα μεγάλα τε καὶ ὄλβια. Θεησάμενον δέ μιν τὰ πάντα καὶ σκεψάμενον, ὥς οἱ κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν, εἴρετο ὁ Κροῖσος τάδε· “Ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, παρ' ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπῖκται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης [εἵνεκεν] τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης, ὡς φιλοσοφέων γῆν πολλὴν θεωρίης εἵνεκεν ἐπελήλυθας· νῦν ὦν ἐπειρέσθαι σε ἵμερος ἐπῆλθέ μοι εἴ τινα ἤδη πάντων εἶδες ὀλβιώτατον.” Ὁ μὲν ἐλπίζων εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ὀλβιώτατος ταῦτα ἐπειρώτα, Σόλων δὲ οὐδὲν ὑποθωπεύσας, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐόντι χρησάμενος, λέγει…

> All the other wise-men of Greece came to Sardis while it was flowering with wealth, those who happened to live at the time, so each of them came, and in particular Solon the Athenian… At his arrival, he was welcomed as a guest friend at the palace of Croesus, and, afterwards, on the third or fourth day, at Croesus’ command, his servants lead Solon through his treasury and pointed out all things great and valuable. So, then, Croesus asked him these things, having browsed and seen everything—as much as there was opportunity for him to—“My Athenian friend, considerable report has come to me about you, on account of your wisdom and wandering, how for the sake of philosophizing you have visited many lands for sightseeing. Now the desire has come to me to ask you if you have seen any of all mankind that is wealthier” he asked these things, expecting that he himself was the wealthiest of men, Solon, however, offering no flattery but using the truth, said…

Composed in the second half of the 5th century, Herodotus' *Histories* offer a valuable early reception of the dynamic between wise poet and king.[24] The text respesents an idealized view of the exchange. Conforming to Jusdanis and Haskins' views, in Herodotus' presentation the potentate's need for external validation is a central feature. Solon's itineracy offers the king a valuable opportunity: παρ' ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπῖκται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης [εἵνεκεν] τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης, ὡς φιλοσοφέων γῆν πολλὴν θεωρίης εἵνεκεν ἐπελήλυθας. On Croesus' view, the Athenian's itineracy confers greater weight on his knowledge. Though it is tempting to associate this representation of itineracy and knowledge with the Halicarnassian historian's personal agenda,[25] as Richard Hunter and Ian Rutherford have observed, the pairing dates back at least as far as the *Odyssey*.[26] Itineracy bestowing knowledge on the traveler has important ramifications for what a traveling intellectual may say. Despite the warm reception and courtesy Croesus grants him, the historian shows how the Athenian is not obligated to flatter the king. Indeed, not only does he not bow to his pressure, but he offers him no further blandishment than the truth: Σόλων δὲ οὐδὲν ὑποθωπεύσας, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐόντι χρησάμενος.

Solon's status as a poet is significant. Aside from the political elegies composed for his own city, we know, for example, that Solon composed encomiastic poetry for the Cypriot king

---

[24] For the date of Herodotus' *Histories*, traditionally set before 426 on account of an alleged allusion to the proem in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, see Sansone 1985, who offers an overview of the problem. Fornara 1971, 1981, and more recently Irwin 2011 have convincingly argued for a later date (possibly as late as the last decade of the 5th or even first decade of the 4th century). In either case, Herodotus will have been working at the end of Pindar's life, as *Pythian* 8, dates to 446, or in the generation immediately following his death, suggesting the representation of poetic engagement with powerful figures may not simply be a literary fiction, but offers some reflection of historical expectations of the interaction.

[25] For the programmatic importance of Solon to Herodotus' narrative goals in the *Histories*, see Shapiro 1996, Pelling 2006.

[26] Hunter and Rutherford 2009, 10. See also Bowie 2009 for a more in-depth exploration of archaic wandering poets and wisdom traditions.

Philocyprus.[27] In keeping with Haskin's observations on instrumental autonomy, poetry composed by an internationally famous and well-traveled poet—for better or worse—could help shape a tyrant's popular image. If Solon were to cave to Croesus' pressure, the king might have easily used his endorsement for propagandistic purposes and, for example, have represented his fortune as an illustration of his divine favor.[28] This, however, ran counter to Solon's world view, and despite Croesus' need for external validation, his hospitality, and overtures to the Athenian poet, in Herodotus' representation Solon was not able to be swayed into giving the king comforting flatteries. He offers only his view on Croesus' situation from the position of a Greek sage.

Solon's resistance is significant. Here we may see one explanation for how a poet could maintain his independence in the face of pressure from a despot: the ruler needed the cultural authority of a famous, independent, international poet more than the poet needed anything from the ruler.[29] The apparent slight deeply troubles the king:

> Σόλων μὲν δὴ εὐδαιμονίης δευτερεῖα ἔνεμε τούτοισι, Κροῖσος δὲ σπερχθεὶς εἶπε· "Ὦ ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, ἡδ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονίη οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδέν, ὥστε οὐδὲ ἰδιωτέων ἀνδρῶν ἀξίους ἡμέας ἐποίησας;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπε· "Ὦ Κροῖσε, ἐπιστάμενόν με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες ἐπειρωτᾷς ἀνθρωπηίων πρηγμάτων πέρι. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ πολλὰ μὲν ἔστι ἰδεῖν τὰ μή τις ἐθέλει, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παθεῖν… Οὕτω ὦν, ὦ Κροῖσε, πᾶν ἐστι ἄνθρωπος

---

[27] Hdt.5.113.2. Hornblower 2013, 297 is disinclined to seeing Herodotus' passage as an indication that Solon's poem for Philocyprus was in fact positive, but instead may have represented him "as the best of a bad lot." He takes the intense negativity of frg. 33 toward tyrants as incompatible with the praise for a tyrant suggested here. The difference between a domestic and foreign context may explain the difference, however. One may reject a form of government at home while finding it perfectly acceptable elsewhere. For a similar position, see Pindar's condemnation of tyranny at *P*.11.53 written for a Theban victor, despite his frequent praise of tyrants elsewhere.

[28] The rhetoric would be consistent with self-representation in the context of ancient near-Eastern kingship. See Allen 2005, 37-47, who discusses the rhetoric at play in the creation of the Achaemenid dynasty from Darius I on, with particular emphasis on the Bihistun inscription.

[29] Herodotus' representation of Solon's dispassionate and dismissive response to Croesus' wealth likely serves as an indication of the character's self-restraint and knowledge of true wealth. Solon's chacter contrasts markedly with Alcmaeon (Hdt.6.125), the eponymous founder of the Alcmeonid line, who grabbed up as much gold as possible from the treasury by wearing baggy clothes when offered an award by Croesus. The spectacle was such that Croesus burst out laughing at the sight of the Athenian.

συμφορή. Ἐμοὶ δὲ σὺ καὶ πλουτέειν μέγα φαίνεαι καὶ βασιλεὺς πολλῶν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων· ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἴρεό με οὔ κώ σε ἐγὼ λέγω, πρὶν τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι.”

> So, then, Solon granted the title of second most blessed to them (Kleobis and Biton), and Croesus, blurting out in anger, said: “Oh, Athenian foreigner, my fortune is thrown so far down to nothingness in your eyes that you would not even make me as worthy as private citizens?!” And Solon said “Croesus, with me knowing that all divinity is jealous and vexatious, you asked about human affairs. For over a long period of time there are many things to see a person would not wish to and many to endure… so then, Croesus, all humanity is chance. You now seem to me to be very wealthy and a king over many men. But that which you asked me I cannot tell you before I have learned that you have ended your life pleasantly.”

As scholars have noted, Solon’s response to Croesus’ perceived slight relies heavily on the Athenian’s own poetry.[30] While most have taken this as an indication that Herodotus was simply looking to Solon’s poetry to form his characterization—a distinct and important possibility—the use of distinctly poetic language and rhetoric suggests another possibility: Herodotus may have appropriated Solon’s poetry to frame his response as a poetic repudiation of Croesus’s world view.[31] Developing Solon as a poet in his response makes sense. As a politician, Solon would have had no grounds to reject Croesus’ expectations. Indeed, Herodotus emphasizes how at this time Athens was a small and insignificant mainland Greek city—Solon was in no position to look down on the wealth and power amassed by the Lydian potentate.[32] Yet, as a poetic wise man who understood the ephemerality of human prosperity through his world travels, Solon was well equipped to highlight the transience of Croesus’ fortune and assert his independent intellectual and culture power against Croesus' political authority.[33] Poetic language is the most efficacious force at Solon's disposal. As a tool for edification, poetry may speak to its listeners in ways simple speech cannot: Croesus, however, was immune to the wisdom Solon proffered him:

---

[30] Harrison 2000, 36-9, Pelling 2006 B, 106, for a comprehensive bibliography of the issue and discussion of the passage, see Asheri 2007, 97-9.

[31] Along with the parallels to Solon’s poetry, the gnomic declaration, πᾶν ἐστι ἄνθρωπος συμφορή, looks especially similar to elegiac maxims of the sort Solon composed. Myres 1952, 77, n.2, emphasizing the poetic nature of the passage, observes the iambic metrical flow of Solon’s lines of dialogue in his exchange with Croesus, and re-arranges several to compete iambic lines. This feature, however, may be due less to the intended poetic content and more to the verisimilitude of the passage to spoken Greek, which, like English, favored an iambic rhythm.

[32] Herodotus’ introduction to powerful cities of Greece at 1.56.2 and subsequent narration of Athenian and Spartan histories reveals Athens to be the weaker and least stable of the two powers in Croesus’ time.

Ταῦτα λέγων τῷ Κροίσῳ οὔ κως οὔτε ἐχαρίζετο, οὔτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δόξας ἀμαθέα εἶναι, ὃς τὰ παρεόντα ἀγαθὰ μετεὶς τὴν τελευτὴν παντὸς χρήματος ὁρᾶν ἐκέλευε.

> Saying these things, he was in no way pleasing to Croesus, and, making the speech to be of no worth, he sent him away, considering someone who would cast aside present good fortune and order him to look to the end of all affairs to be extremely ignorant.

Several further details of the passage demand comment. First, the oblique answer Solon gives to Croesus' obviously loaded question, "who is the wealthiest person alive," illustrates the use of *mythos* as parable. The device, termed "figured speech" by the ancients, avoided direct answers in circumstances where *parrhesia*, or blunt speech, might arouse anger in a powerful interlocutor.[34]

In keeping with traditional Greek morality, Solon defined human fortune in terms of least misfortune.[35] His Tellos the Athenian, for example, represents not meteoric success as much as the avoidance of catastrophic failure. With such a definition, Croesus could never have been his choice, but Solon resists a direct, insulting answer and instead speaks through his *muthoi*. Initially, at least, Solon leaves the door open to the possibility that Croesus could end his life and take the prize. It is only after Croesus' outburst that Solon makes his *muthos* explicit: the gods are jealous—if you experience tremendous fortune, they will take note and strip it from you.[36]

---

[33] The parallels between Herodotus' formation of Solon and his self-representation are also important in this context. See Fornara 1971, 77, and Fehling 1989, 194-5. For the role of *theoria* and travel in education, see Goldhill 1999, 1-33.

[34] For the role and development of indirect answers and oblique jabs in Greek and Latin literature, see Ahl 1984, and LeVan 2014, 146, *n*.92. For ancient discussions of "figured speech", Arist. *Rhet.*1382B, Demetr. *On Style*, 287. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 9.2.65.

[35] The concept dates back to Achilles' exemplum of the jars of Zeus at *Il.*24.525-30.

As an independent cultural agent, Solon retained a greater degree of independence than someone visiting from a satellite city and enjoyed greater recourse to reject the king's narrative. Much as the sophists of the late 5th century, poets, as visiting intellectuals, presented opportunities and dangers to the powerful—rewards and possible setbacks.[37] They may confirm the views of the people or subvert the expectations of the powerful by assuming a didactic wise persona.

The Poetic Power of Resistance

Though Solon's denial of Croesus' expectation is irksome to the king, Herodotus avoids having the king threaten the Athenian wise man. Instead, he dismisses the traveling intellectual from his palace and his wisdom non-parallel construction ignored: οὔτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δόξας ἀμαθέα εἶναι, ὃς τὰ παρεόντα ἀγαθὰ μετεὶς τὴν τελευτὴν παντὸς χρήματος ὁρᾶν ἐκέλευε. This offers us another important view on the dynamic between king and wise man. We may wonder, if the poet's message was so poorly received, how could he escape completely unharmed? To answer this question, the Irish bardic tradition offers us valuable comparative material. As Kenneth Jackson has observed in the case of the Irish, bards were free to travel throughout Ireland and maintained a striking degree of independence from rulers.[38] He argues this was due in part to the fact that “poets were all protected by an unwritten but nevertheless mighty sanction, the fear of satire. In a heroic aristocracy as described, glory and good reputation were essentially necessary, and the satires of the poets were dreaded because they could sing a man’s dispraises all through Ireland and destroy his fame and standing. Many passages show the importance of this, and the fear of the satire of poets is still alive in rural Ireland at the present day.”[39] It may be possible to detect a similar social constraint functioning in ancient Greece.

---

[36] The repetition of the leitmotif throughout the *Histories* suggests it is one of central importance to Herodotus' project. The dynamic is more fully developed in the story of Polycrates, where the Egyptian King Amasis serves as the wise man. Hdt.3.120-8, and 3.139-49.

[37] Associations between the activities of wandering poets and the sophists date back to antiquity, so Plato's Protagoras (316. D 5) goes out of his way to claim Homer, Hesiod, and Simonides as sophists *avant le lettre*. For the associations between the two in the use of the term *sophistai*, see Guthrie 1977, 29-30, who, following Jaeger 1939 [1983] (Vol. 1), 239, sees the sophists as the descendants of the poet's function as an instructor.

While we commonly accept the power of poetic invective in Comedy and the Iambic tradition, this is completely ignored in the case of lyric.[40] The primary genres of lyric offer little opportunity for direct censure. Yet, several cases offer tantalizing indications that invective was not entirely closed off to disenfranchised lyricists. Indeed, Pindar himself recognizes the option:

ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών
φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν.
εἶδον γὰρ ἑκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ
2.55 ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν
Πιαινόμενον.

> But I must flee the persistant bite of censure, for standing at a far remove I have seen Archilochus the blamer often in straits as he fed on dire words of hate.

---

[38] Jackson 1964, 22-8.

[39] Jackson 1964, 27.

[40] Even in the case of Attic comedy which viciously skewered leading political figures, reports of reprisals against poets are minimal. Aristophanes complains that the demagogue Cleon attempted to silence him through prosecution, (Arist. *Ach*. 377-82) but, if true, the ineffectual nature of the charge is evinced by the poet’s total lack of dissuasion from attacking Cleon. For problems with the historicity of the episode, see Sommerstein 2004. For a general overview of the rivalry between Aristophanes and Cleon, see Sommerstein 2014, 294-6. Additionally, the story that the poet Eupolis was drowned by Alcibiades for his lampoon in the *Baptai* (Cicero, *Ad Att*. 6.1.18) was discarded already in antiquity by Eratosthenes. Nesselrath 2000 sees the episode as responsible for the shift from political Old Comedy to apolitical New. More likely is the interpretation of Storey 2003, 44-6 who reads the episode as a Hellenistic invention extrapolated from the play and a possible *bon mot* of Alcibiades. For the sources on the episode, see Rusten 2012, 221-3.

Although Pindar invokes the specter of Archilochus only to reject it, the allusion to iambic invective suggests the option is open to him—he has simply chosen not to embrace it. Timocreon of Rhodes, however, had no such qualms.[41] In one poem, the Rhodian abandons his praise of Aristides to censure Themistocles:

ἀλλ' εἰ τύ γε Παυσανίαν ἢ καὶ τύ γε Ξάνθιππον αἰνεῖς,
ἢ τύ γε Λευτυχίδαν, ἐγὼ δ' Ἀριστείδαν ἐπαινέω
ἄνδρ' ἱερᾶν ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν
ἐλθεῖν ἕνα λῷστον, ἐπεὶ Θεμιστοκλῆν ἤχθαρε Λατώ,
ψεύσταν ἄδικον προδόταν, ὃς Τιμοκρέοντα ξεῖνον ἐόντα
ἀργυρίοισι κοβαλικοῖσι πεισθεὶς οὐ κατᾶγεν
πατρίδ' Ἰαλυσὸν εἴς<ω>,
λαβὼν δὲ τρί' ἀργυρίου τάλαντ' ἔβα πλέων εἰς ὄλεθρον
τοὺς μὲν κατάγων ἀδίκως, τοὺς δ' ἐκδιώκων, τοὺς δὲ καίνων·
ἀργυρίων δ' ὑπόπλεως Ἰσθμοῖ γελοίως πανδόκευε
ψυχρὰ τὰ κρεῖα παρίσχων·
οἱ δ' ἤσθιον κηὔχοντο μὴ ὥραν Θεμιστοκλέος γενέσθαι.

> But if you applaud Pausanias, or you Xanthippus, or you Leotychides, I myself praise Aristides as the finest man to come from Athens, since Leto hated Themistocles, that liar, that criminal, that traitor, who, persuaded by impudent silver, did not to take Timocreon–being his guest friend—to his native Ilasos, but set off, sailing to his destruction after taking three talents of silver. Restoring some unjustly, unjustly chasing out others, while still more he cut down. Stuffed full of silver, he was a ridiculous inn-keeper at the Isthmus, offering up cold meat; and those who ate, prayed they that they be no heed for Themistocles.

Timocreon's encomium begins with misdirection.[42] We hear nothing more about Aristides after the poet abandons him in favor of castigating Themistocles. The context of the poem and its classification have incited considerable debate. Since C.M. Bowra, the general consensus has been that the poem is a monodic *Skolion,* or sympotic song, written in dactylo-epitrite.[43] This would make sense, as the symposium offers the likeliest venue for a jocular lyric composition like this, and the use of dactylo-epitrite would suggest parallels with encomiastic compositions of Pindar and Bacchylides.[44] However, the meter has given scholars pause, as it should be indicative of a choral composition—a view inconsistent with the theme and overall finish of the poem.[45]

---

[41] Kirkwood 1974, 182-5 discusses the parallels between Timocreon and Alcaeus' use of invective in lyric. See also D'Alessio 2016, 65-6, who discusses the generally overlooked poem in the broader context of sympotic lyric and relates some of its features to the Bacchylides' Marpessa poem (20A).

[42] Scodel 1983,102-3 has proposed that the poem adapts language, tropes, and meter common to encomiastic to purposely surprise the audience when it shifts to attack.

Another possibility suggests itself. The length of the poem may be an indication of extemporaneous composition of the type David Sider has argued for in another composition of Timocreon.[46] If the classification of *Skolion* Bowra proposed is correct, perhaps the poem is not one composed *for* the symposium, but rather *at* one.[47] As Sider notes of Timocreon's elegiac poems directed against Simonides: "Timcreon's poem is not of the sort one directs at a mortal enemy. Rather, as is commonly taken to be the case by the editors, what we have here are two sallies between drinking companions having fun at other's expense, although it may also have been the case that these two poems are all that remains of a shcoliastic challenge for all concerned to compose two successive verses where the second contains the same words as the first but now in a different order. If this is merely an amoebic exchange between Timocreon and Simonides, then the editors may be right to find in the Simonides first line an echo of an otherwise unattested epic poem of Timocreon on Heracles."[48] Sympotic composition of

---

[43] For the classification of the poem, see Bowra 1934, Robinson 1960, Scodel 1983, 104, Stracca 2011. For conventions of sympotic *Skolia*, with special attention on their length, see Bowie 2016.

[44] Bowra 1934.

[45] Smyth 1906 [1963], 325-6, Bowra 1934, 350-1, Scodel 1983, 102, Stracca 2011, 13-6.

[46] Sider 2016. For a similar view on the length of short lyric poems indicating extemporaneity, see Gelzer 1985.

[47] Smyth 1906, 333 seems to have considered the possibility.

[48] Sider 2016, 149.

Timocreon's Themistocles poem would offer an explanation of the use of multiple second person pronouns in the opening priamel.[49] Furthermore, if the song were re-working existing lyric compositions to provide a humorous attack on Themistocles in a sympotic environment, the tension between the dactylo-epitritic meter and generally prosaic language noticed by Bowra is resolved,[50] as well as the reason for the generally unpolished feeling he and others have detected.

Despite its perceived aesthetic deficiencies, that the song survives for us indicates that it enjoyed greater circulation than a single performance at the symposium. Though it is impossible to know how seriously the invective is meant to be taken, the confluence of Timocreon's lyrics with some of the most commonly detailed features of Themistocles' biography suggests that the poem, among other things, could have contributed to the popular dialogue about Themistocles in his own time.[51] If nothing else, it may have served to confirm hostile views of Themistocles by repeating details people had already heard elsewhere. We know for certain that Timocreon played a significant role in subsequent generations assessment of the character of the famous Athenian general, as Plutarch illustrates[52]: he may have had a similar impact on his contemporary world. From the traditions involving Timocreon and Themistocles we may observe how poets could confirm or reject features of political figures' public images. A second case illustrates these tendencies more clearly.

---

[49] In particular, the phrase "ἀλλ' εἰ τύ γε" in the first line suggested this to Smyth 1906, 333.

[50] Bowra 1934.

[51] Steisimbrotus of Thasos, a contemporary biographer and historian, seems to have shared the open hostility toward Themistocles Timocreon exhibits. Whether one is dependent on the other remains an open question. McMullin 2001 considers the role of the poem in shaping Themistocles' public image, and the possibility that Timocreon was attempting to deflect/project onto Themistocles' his reservations about his own exile to Persia.

[52] The preservation of Timocreon's lyrics on Themistocles is exclusively due to Plutarch's use of them as a historical source for his *Life of Themistocles*, for which, see Podlecki 1975, 53-4, and Frost 1980, 181-3, and Zadorojyni 2006.

The ancients were unanimous on the detrimental impact of the lyrics of Philoxenus of Kythera on the career of Dionyisus I of Syracuse. While Philoxenus' output has been reduced to a handful of fragments, the court intrigue involving the dithyrambic poet and Dionysius captivated ancient historians. The first century historian Diodorus offers us the fullest treatment of the episode:

> "In Sicily, Dionysius, the tyrant of the Syracusans, now that he was relieved of wars with the Carthaginians, enjoyed great peace and leisure. Consequently, he devoted himself with much seriousness to the writing of poetry, and summoning men repute in this line, he accorded them special honors and resorted to them, making use of them as instructors and revisers of his poems. Elated by the flattering words with which these men repaid his benefaction, Dionysisus boasted far more of his poems than of his successes in war. Among the poets in his company was Philoxenus, the writer of dithyrambs, who enjoyed very high repute as a composer in own line. ?
>
> After dinner when the compositions of the tyrant, which were wretched, had been read, he asked what his judgement of the poetry was. When he replied with a good deal of frankness, the tyrant, offended at his words, found fault with him that he had been moved by jealousy to use scurrilous language and commanded his servants to drag him off forthwith to the quarries. On the next day, however, when Philoxenus' friends made petition for a grant of pardon, Dionysius made up with him and again included the same men in his company after dinner. As the drinking advanced, again Dionysius boasted of the poetry he had written, recited some lines which he considered to be happily composed, and then asked, "what do you think of the verses?" To this Philoxenus said not a word, but called Dionysius' servants and ordered them to take him away to the quarries. Now at the time Dionysius, at the ready wit of the words, tolerated the freedom of speech, since the joke took the edge off the censure.
>
> But when some time later his acquaintances and Dionysius as well asked him to desist from his untimely frankness, Philoxenus made a paradoxical offer. He would, he said, in his answer both respect the truth and keep the favor of Dionysius. Nor did he fail to make his word good, for when the tyrant produced some lines that described harrowing events and asked, "how do the verses strike you?", he replied, "pitiful!", keeping his double promise by the ambiguity. For Dionysius took the word, "pitiful" signifying harrowing and deeply moving, which are successful effects of good poets, and therefore rated him as having approved them; the rest, however, who caught the real meaning, conceived that the word "pitiful" was only employed to suggest failure."
>
> (D.S. *Bib*.15-6)[53]

Diodorus' narrative of life at the court of Dionysius offers us some valuable indications of how poets were expected to engage tyrants.[54] The historian foregrounds Dionysius' fervent desire to write accomplished poetry and be taken seriously as a poet.[55] Yet, despite the exigent demands on courtiers to treat the tyrant as an equal, Philoxenus not only refused to recognize Dionysius as a colleague, but actively subverted the tyrant's claim to poetic legitimacy. Philoxenus' actions illustrate how, in his view, the tyrant produced only doggerels.[56] While we should not expect this degree of freedom of expression to be the standard for engagements with tyrants, and, indeed, the poet was punished for it, the accepted interaction was still surprisingly free—as we can detect in Diodorus' humorous anecdote about Philoxenus requesting to be sent back to the mines. In Diodorus' representation, the issue is not *what* was said, so much as *how* it was said.

---

[53] Trans. Oldfather with modification.

[54] Generally, recent scholarship has emphasized that the historical figures of tyrants were more forgiving than the traditions imply. For considerations of how narratives of tyranny were formed and the evolution of the political figure into in trope of abusive autocracy, see McGlew 1993, 14-50, Forsydke 2009, Hölkeskamp 2009, and in the Athenian context, Raflaub 2003.

[55] LeVen 2014, 144-8 sees Philoxenus' criticism of Dionysius' poetry as an equation to an attack on his political power because the two are competing in the same sphere. While this may, in part, be true we should be cautious not

The final case offers us a clear view on "figured speech." After Dionysius asks his poets their view on his poetry, Philoxenus' response of "pitiful" reveals the tyrant's vacuousness to his fellow court poets while avoiding the wrath a frank response of "poor" would incur. Should someone else suggest that the meaning be taken as "poor", responsibility for the negative interpretation is placed on them and the poet is left with the ability to deny the negative reading.[57] In this way, the story reads much like a manual for how to engage a tyrant. Open, frank speech is to be avoided, but allegory, humor, or figured speech remain powerful forms of communication and criticism.

---

to attribute too much meaning to the story which was written at a great distance from the events and so clearly exhibits tropes common to all narratives on tyrants. As such, we may reasonably ask, if the poet were to respond frankly to the tyrant about anything else, e.g. his clothes, hair, etc., would he not be met with the same anger?

[56] Berve 1967, 221-60 contains a more traditional reading of his tyranny focusing on Dionysius' realpolitik. For reassessments of the tyrant's rule and literary output, see Stoheker 1958, Sanders, 1987, and Craven 1990. Ducan 2012, 141 is skeptical about the need to revise the ancient portrait of Dionysius and finds the evidence advanced in favor of the tyrant uncompelling. Her subsequent analysis of the evidence demonstrates the ways in which Dionysius may have been an innovator in Western Greek theater but is cautious to avoid attributing too much meaning or value to the meager traces we possess.

[57] Ahl 1984, 185-7, who cites parallels with moral censorship in Victorian culture in the plays of Gilbert and Sullivan.

While Diodorus' account offers valuable details for poetic engagement with a tyrant at his court, the relationship of Philoxenus' stint in court of Dionysius to his most famous poem, the *Cyclops*, is omitted. Phaineus of Arisos completes the picture:

> Dionysios was fond of getting drunk with wine in the company of Philoxenos. But when Philoxenos was caught in the act of seducing the king's mistress Galateia, he was thrown into the quarries. There he wrote his Cyclops, telling the story of what had happened to him, and representing Dionysios as Cyclops, the flute-girl as the nymph Galateia, and himself as Odysseus.
>
> (Phaineus, frg. 2)

The extent and transparency of the poem's satire is impossible to recover from its meager fragments. Its opening, at least, presents the work as a serious endeavor, and nothing in the remaining fragments points to open parody.[58] If an accurate reflection of the poem, this is a significant feature.[59] Had the composition developed its parody of Dionysius through intimation instead of direct assault, as seems likely, the *Cyclops* serves as an indication that a poet could compose a generically pure lyric composition with barbs that intelligibly cut through its reverential veneer.

As L.J. Sanders has observed, the production of the *Cyclops* perfectly coincides with a period of hostility toward the Syracusan tyrant at Athens and elsewhere on the mainland.[60] The inclusion of a parody of the *Cyclops* in Aristophanes' second *Plutus* (Aristoph. *Pl.* 289-302) suggests that Dionysius' public image was being challenged on the Attic stage.[61] 388, the year of *Plutus*' production, also coincides with a speech of Lysias given at the Olympic games (Lys. 33. 522), which portrayed Dionysius' growing power as a threat to the security of Greece. The souring of diplomatic relations between the two states may be further evidenced by another prominent event placed in the first years of the 380s: the visit of Plato to Syracuse[62] and his alleged sale into slavery by Dionysius.[63] Indeed, Sanders has observed that after the publication of the *Cyclops*, our evidence suggests a crisis in the royal court and an overt crackdown on the poets and literati gathered there.[64]Attributing this calamity entirely to a single poem is no doubt oversimplifying a much more complex political reality.[65] However, the cultural power the poet enjoyed and the potential for widespread dissemination of his critical compositions demonstrates the potency of politically weaponized poetry. For this reason, we may expect that power was not unidirectional at the courts of tyrants—flowing from tyrant to everyone else—but moved instead between the tyrant and cultural elite. This may in part help explain why the king was so invested in composing his own propagandistic poetry. Threats, intimidation, or financial incentives could only procure so much control over what poets said: the only way the tyrant could ensure his message reached its audience was by creating it himself.

---

[58] ἄνδρα δὲ τὸν Κυθέρηθεν ὃν ἐθρέψαντο τιθῆναι
Βάκχου καὶ λωτοῦ πιστότατον ταμίην
Μοῦσαι παιδευθέντα Φιλόξενον, οἷα τιναχθεὶς
Ὀρτυγίηι ταύτης ἦλθε διὰ πτόλεως
γιγνώσκεις, ἀίουσα μέγαν πόθον ὃν Γαλατείη
αὐτοῖς μηλείοις θήκαθ' ὑπὸ προγόνοις.

The opening few lines include a muse invocation which claim the goddesses inspired the poet to compose the work while in Syracuse. This is likely the source of Phaineus' statement that the poet conceived of the poem while in the mines; however, nothing in the surviving material supports the position beyond the reference to Ortygia, which may simply be a poetic flourish. The remaining fragments, collected by Page 1964, 423-32, mostly consist of single line attributions.

[59] Power 2013 sees the poltical content of the poem as a latter biographical invention. While this is a possibility, the state of its preservation is too poor to say anything for certain.

[60] Sanders 1987, 18-9.

---

[61] For Aristophanes' attitudes toward Dionysius, see Sanders 1987, 1-29, who views Aristophanes as partly responsible for the development of the "hostile tradition" of Dionysius' reign. McDowell 1995, 326 is more cautious about treating *Plutus* as a serious attack on Dionysius and prefers to see its allusions to the *Cyclops* as a way to update the play of 408. Vickers 2015 explores the dramatic reasons for Aristophanes' political *Komodoumenoi*.

[62] See Brunt 1993, 282-342 for a discussion of the Academy's political interests and Plato's possible motivations for undertaking the trip.

[63] The historicity of the trip has been a hotly debated topic in scholarship, which effectively hinges on faith in the authenticity of the Seventh letter. For discussions of the authorship of the letters, see Adam, 1906, Hackforth 1913, Boas 1948, Morrow 1962, 1-18, Caskey 1972, Gerson 2000, Irwin 2009, Morrison 2013. On Dionysius' sale of Plato into slavery, see Monoson 2012, 161-2 who views stories of a quarrel between Dionysius and Plato as an invention of friends and allies of Plato propagated as a way to downplay the philosopher's connections to the tyrant.

[64] The best documented victim of Dionysius' crackdown is the Syracusan general, partisan of Dionysius, and historian Philistus, whom Dionysius sent into exile for fear of his political ambitions. For Philistus' literary output and place in western historiography, see Pearson 1987, 19-36, and Vattone 2007, for his biography and surviving text, see Pownall 2013. The second case is Dionysius' alleged execution of the Athenian tragedian Antiphon for his endorsement of the tyrannocides Harmodius and Aristogiton (Arist. *Rhet.*2.6.1385.a, Philostrat. *Vit. Soph.* 1.15.3).

[65] For an attempt to understand the political turmoil Dionysius faced in the context of the third Punic war, see Craven 1990, 186-212. For criticisms of the political reading of Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, see Power 2013, 252-4, who attempts to situate the Cyclops in the kitharodic environment of the late 5th and early 4th centuries.

Simonides, Hieron, and Successful Poetic Engagement

The resurgence of tyranny as a viable political system of governance in the late fifth and early fourth century made the era particularly rich for intellectuals considering the system of governance.[66] Of these explorations, Xenophon's fictional dialogue between Simonides and Hieron deserves special attention. As an elite Athenian exile, Xenophon engaged with some of the leading figures of the period.[67] As such, his works offer a window on contemporary autocratic rule afforded by few others. Indeed, as Vivienne Gray has seen, this dialogue may indicate some degree of his own findings on the subject of tyrannical interaction.[68] Observing the significance of the dialogue for the contemporary Syracusan ruler, Marta Sordi has argued that the text served as a corrective to Dionyius I.[69] On this view, Hieron's successful rule over the city of Syracuse and development of a highly cultured court, for example, might have served as a role model for Dionysius.[70]

---

[66] Both Plato and Isocrates wrote extensively on the subject. Additionally, Xenophon's work on the education and ascent of Cyrus the Great engages many of the same problems of governance and charismatic autocracy.

[67] His relationship with King Agesilaus of Sparta left an especially rich literary record, most of which was his encomium of the king.

[68] Gray 2007, 35.

[69] Sordi 1980.

While this may justify the use of Hieron, why choose Simonides as a voice of intellectual engagement—particularly as he is known to us for his shameless avarice—and not e.g. Xenophanes, Aeschylus, or Pindar who were all also visitors to the court of Hieron? A fragment of the Sicilian historian Timaios persevered in the scholia to *Olympian 2* provides a possibility.

ζητεῖται, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν εὐξάμενος τῷ Θήρωνι τὰ κάλλιστα, κατάπαυσιν τῶν πραχθέντων δεινῶν αἰτεῖται τὸν Δία. καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχός φησι, διὰ τὸ κεκμηκέναι τοὺς τοῦ Θήρωνος πατέρας κατὰ τὴν Ῥόδον, τῶν πραγμάτων στασιαζομένων, καὶ οὕτω τὴν μετοικίαν εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν στειλαμένων. ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος τὸ ἀκριβέστερον τῆς ἱστορίας ἐκτίθεται, μάρτυρα Τίμαιον (*FHG* I, 214) τὸν συντάξαντα τὰ περὶ τῆς Σικελίας προφερόμενος. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία οὕτως ἔχει· Θήρων ὁ τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων βασιλεὺς Γέλωνι τῷ Ἱέρωνος ἀδελφῷ ἐπικηδεύσας γάμῳ συνάπτει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Δημαρέτην, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ Δημαρέτειον νόμισμα ἐν Σικελίᾳ. τοῦ δὲ Γέλωνος τελευτᾶν τὸν βίον μέλλοντος, Πολύζηλος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τὴν στρατηγίαν καὶ τὴν γαμετὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ διαδέχεται κατὰ τὰς Γέλωνος προστάξεις, ὥστε τὸ Θήρωνος εἰς Γέλωνα κῆδος εἰς τὸν Πολύζηλον μετατεθεῖσθαι. λαμπρῷ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ περιβλέπτῳ τυγχάνοντι κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν Ἱέρων φθονήσας ὁ ἀδελφὸς καὶ πρόφασιν σκηψάμενος τὸν πρὸς Συβαρίτας πόλεμον, ἀπελαύνει τῆς πατρίδος. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτον κατώρθωσε τὸν πόλεμον ὁ Πολύζηλος. ὁ δὲ μὴ φέρων γυμνότερον αὐτοῦ κατηγορεῖν ἐπειρᾶτο νεωτερισμοῦ. καὶ οὕτω τὸν Θήρωνα, ὑπεραγανακτήσαντα θυγατρὸς ἅμα καὶ γαμβροῦ, συρρῆξαι πρὸς Ἱέρωνα πόλεμον παρὰ Γέλᾳ τῷ Σικελιωτικῷ ποταμῷ, οὗ Καλλίμαχος μέμνηται (fr. 361)·οἱ δὲ Γέλᾳ ποταμῷ ἐπικείμενον ἄστυ. μή γε μὴν εἰς βλάβην, μηδὲ εἰς τέλος προχωρῆσαι τὸν πόλεμον· φασὶ γὰρ τότε Σιμωνίδην τὸν λυρικὸν περιτυχόντα διαλῦσαι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τὴν ἔχθραν. τούτοις οἰκείως τοῖς φθάσασιν εὔχεσθαι τῷ Διί φησι τὸν Πίνδαρον ὁ Δίδυμος, ὥστε λοιπὸν αὐτοῖς εἰρηναῖον εἶναι τὸν βίον.

> It was asked for what reason he was praying for the best things for Theron, beseeching Zeus for a cessation of the terrible things that had been done. And Aristarchos says (this) on account of the ancestors of Theron having been hard-pressed at Rhodes, in conditions of civil strife, and undertaking the colonization in Sicily, but Didymos lays out the more accurate history, surpassing Timaios the writer on Sicilian matters. The history is as follows. Theron the king of the Akragantines, making an alliance by marriage with Gelon the brother of Hieron, gave his daughter Demarete, from whom there is also the name of the coin Demareteion in Sicily. When Gelon was on the verge of death, Polyzelos his brother received power and the marriage according to the instructions of Gelon, so that the gift of Theron was transferred from Gelon to Polyzelos. But his brother Hieron envied him, as he was doing exceedingly well in Sicily, and finding the war against the Sybarites as a pretext, he kept him at a distance from the country. But Polyzelos put things to right even in this war. And not being defenseless he accused him, and fomented revolution, and thus Theron, angered on behalf of his daughter and son-in-law, brought about a war against Hieron by the Sicilian river Gela, which Kallimachos mentions, ‘I know the city lying at the head of the river

---

[70] For Hieron’s development of a successful court, see Cole 1992, 113-32, Bosher 2012, Morgan 2012, and Morgan 2015, 87-132.

> Gela'. But at any rate the war proceeded neither to the destruction of one of the parties nor to a decisive conclusion. They say that then Simonides the lyric poet, who happened to be present, softened the hatred between the kings. Didymos says that Pindar prayed to Zeus on their behalf, who were taking action before it was too late, with the result that they lived out the rest of their days in peace.[71]

Timaios of Tauromenion's authority for the story is significant.[72] The historian's antiquarian habits were well known in antiquity and made him an object of attack in Polybius' *Histories*.[73] This suggests a strong possibly that the material preserved in his text dates back much further than the mid-4th century when he composed his history of Sicily.[74] Looking to the details of the passage itself, unlike so many of the stories that have survived about Simonides, it is difficult to imagine how the poet's mediation could have arisen from his own poetry.[75] From a practical perspective, the poet's intervention makes sense. As an independent cultural agent who composed for tyrants and private citizens alike, Simonides would have enjoyed established personal relationships with both parties and their surrogates.[76] Moreover, his status as an internationally famous poet would have granted him a reputation for wisdom, putting greater pressure on both parties to hear him out.[77] With this background in mind, let us now turn to Xenophon's dialogue.

---

[71] Trans. Champion 2010 with modification.

[72] For Timaios' role in Western Greek historiography, see Pearson 1987, 37-51.

[73] Polybius' attack on Timaios comprised an entire book of his *Histories*. In particular, it seems Polybius found Timaios' antiquarianism methodologically weak relative to his own autopsy and led the later historian to cast the Sicilian in a similar light to the modern rebuke of "armchair historian." For Polybius' disparagement of Timaios' method, see Champion 2004, 198-9, and Burton 2013, 58-88.

[74] For source criticism and the antiquity of the material preserved in Timaios, see Pearson 1987, 125-56, and Baron 2013, 202-55.

[75] Wilamowitz 1901 rejected the tradition, believing Simonides was still in Athens at the time of the incident (476/5). Podlecki 1979, 9 partially believed it, suggesting Simonides was acting exclusively on Hieron's interest. More scholars have favored accepting the account as it stands in the scholiast's rendering, so Schmid 1929, 513, Bowra 1961, 359, Hackforth, *CAH*, 5, 146. See Molyneux 1992, 224-33 for an overview of the scholarship on the issue, and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of both sides.

[76] Both Simonides and Pindar composed poetry for Hieron, his in-law Chromios, and Theron of Akragas. See Morgan 2015, 359-412 for a discussion of Pindar's poems for Hieron's henchmen and his extended political network in Sicily.

Xenophon constructs the *Hieron* in two parts. The first explores the contrast in personal pleasures enjoyed by the tyrant and private citizen. In this section, Simonides plays a mostly passive role, allowing Hieron to comment on his experiences as both tyrant and citizen. The tyrant takes the opportunity to lament his current situation, claiming that whatever pleasure he enjoys, it is less than the private citizen because it is always colored by threats or insincerity. Hieron's observations on the restrictions of tyranny highlight the value of a poet's insights:

> "I find by calculation that in regard to sight-seeing, despots are worse off. In every land there are things worth seeing: and in search of these private citizens visit any city they choose, and attend the national festivals, where all things reputed to be most worth seeing are assembled. But despots are not at all concerned with missions to shows. For it is risky for them to go where they will be no stronger than the crowd, and their property at home is too insecure to be left in charge of others while they are abroad. For they fear to lose their throne, and at the same time to be unable to take vengeance on the authors of the wrong"
>
> (Xen. *Hieron* 1.12)

Hieron's repudiation of tyranny's pleasures provides a clear answer for why itinerant intellectuals like Simonides would be prized by tyrants: they have seen and engaged with things the tyrant can only imagine.[78] On Hieron's view, once a tyranny is established, the tyrant must remain stationary to protect his reign, since the tyrant faced threats of revolt at home and assassination abroad. The threat from crowds deserves special attention. Diodorus' narration of the reception of Dionysius' poetry at the Olympic games of 388 supplements Hieron's fears:

> With the Olympic games in the meantime drawing on, he sent to that solemnity many chariots drawn with four horses a-piece, and exceedingly swift; and likewise tents glistening with gold, and adorned with rich and various

---

[77] For the use of a culturally powerful figure to further political interests, see section Poets and Politics Abroad below.

[78] For the complex interplay between traveling, wisdom, and the transference of knowledge in the dynamic of the traveling poet, see Martin 2009, and Bowie 2009 in Hunter and Rutherford 2009.

> embroideries of admirable workmanship; and with these he sent, likewise, the most skillful singers, to advance his own praise by the recitation of his own poems; for he was (even to madness) given to poetry: and he committed the care and oversight of all these things to his brother Thearidas, (who, when he came to the ground, by the multitude of the chariots, and richness and splendor of the tents and pavilions), attracted the eye of all the beholders. And, when the singers began to recite the poems of Dionysius, the people at first ran together, and greatly admired the sweet and pleasant airs of the stage-players. But, as soon as they perceived how bad and ballad-like the verses were, they ridiculed Dionysius, and despised him to that degree, that they rifled the tents. Lysias, the orator, then at Olympia, advised the people that they should not admit any of those procurators, sent by so wicked a tyrant, to have anything to do with those sacred sports. At which time he made the speech, styled by him the *Olympiacus*.
>
> (D.S.*Bib*. 14. 109.)

In Diodorus' account, Lysias' hostile oration coupled with the performance of the king's poetry was enough to drive the audience to ransacking the king's lavish tent. Had he occupied it, there is no saying what would have happened to him. Numerous stories survive of tyrants meeting their ends at the hands of assembled crowds.[79] On this point, Hieron is no doubt right to fear the prospect of leaving the city and facing the throng his presence would attract. Hieron continues, rejecting in-house performances as well:

> "Perhaps you may say: 'But, after all, such spectacles come to them even if they stay at home' No, no, Simonides, only one in a hundred such; and what there are of them are offered to despots at a price so exorbitant that showmen who exhibit some trifle expect to leave the court in an hour with far more money than they get from all the rest of the world in a lifetime."

Hieron's comment should give us pause. The representation of the courts of tyrants—especially Sicilian tyrants—as a solvent opportunity for performers was a common-place in Greek literature.[80] Yet, Hieron's resentment of performers' greed strikes a harsh note if we accept the ancient biographical tradition of Simonides.[81] Unless we read the passage as Leo

---

[79] See Teegarden 2014 for a history of tyrannicide in Greek political culture and a discussion of the practical reasons why the architype of Aristogeiton and Harmodius' assassination scheme remained prevalent in Greek thought and actual practice.

[80] Sicily itself was commonly thought of as an easy place to make a living. It was for this reason Greeks associated the island with the land of the Cyclopes in the *Odyssey*. So, too, the famous story of the Sicilian envoys enticing the Athenians into launching the Sicilian expedition with the promise of gold and silver loot. Herodotus' story of the Dithyrambic poet Arion makes the acquisition of wealth in Sicily the performer's primary goal for his western Greek tour.

[81] Hunter 1996, 98-100 reads avarice into the dialogue, suggesting Simonides' excitement at the prospect of his songs securing fame for Hieron's reformation (*Hieron* 11.8) is rooted in his desire for pay. I see no need to supply

Strauss had and attribute the response to irony, we are confronted with a real problem.[82] Is Hieron purposely implicating Simonides? Did Xenophon carelessly overlook the tradition of Simonides' avarice? Was Xenophon simply ignorant of it? The following passage offers some possibilities.

Simonides concedes that tyrants likely fail to enjoy the pleasures of sight-seeing and performance, yet counters that they must enjoy greater praise. Again, Hieron rejects the poet's claim:

> "And what pleasure", asked Hieron, "comes you suppose, of this shrinking from evil words, when one knows well that all men harbor evil thoughts against the despot? In spite of their silence? Or what pleasure comes of this praise, do you think, when the praises sound suspiciously like flattery?" "Well yes" relied Simonides, "in this of course I agree with you entirely, Hieron, that praise from the freest is sweetest."
>
> (Xen. *Hier*. 15-6).

Roberta Sevieri has taken these lines to suggest the text is engaging in criticism of the epinican genre directly, and Laura Takakjy, expanding Sevieri's argument, sees the dialogue as actively impugning the epinician genre.[83] The temptation is understandable. There are conspicuous similarities with the genre in which Simonides composed; however, both fail to notice a vital point: epinician as a genre had been functionally extinct for over a half century at

---

this interpretation since the notion Simonides develops is common in epinician, and, as Gray 2007, 143, has seen, perfectly parallels the conclusion of Pindar's *P.*1 composed for Hieron.

[82] Strauss 1948, 35-66. For criticisms of Strauss' reading of the *Hieron*, see Gray 2007, 211-3.

[83] Sevieri 2004, Takakjy 2017. If, as both wish to interpret the dialogue, Xenophon's *Hieron* is actively challenging the validity of the epinician genre, a particularly surprising omission by both is the dramatic context of Xenophon's *Symposium*. In this dialogue, the Panathenaic victory of the young Autolycus is the reason for the gathering. The gathering features no epinician song, and the conduct of the young Autolycus is quiet, dignified, and humble. This is a valuable contrast to how, in Takakjy's view, "Xenophon may have written the dialogue as a way to comment on the folly of Hiero and all ethically compromised rulers who paid for poetry yet who were ultimately unable to secure for themselves positive reputations." However, the *Symposium*'s neglect of epinician may simply illustrate that in Xenophon's mind epinician was an outdated genre by the dramatic date of the composition (422).

the time Xenophon composed his dialogue.[84] Why should the Athenian intellectual expend so much energy attacking a culturally defunct literary form? To employ a modern analogy, this would be rather like composing a dialogue to rail against big-band music in the 2010s.

Taken in tandem with the preceding passage, Simonides' comment on praise offers a coherent view on the value of poetic encomia—a view free from the irony Strauss detected or the authorial hostility seen by Sevieri and Takakjy. Hieron's comment that, "showmen who exhibit some trifle expect to leave the court in an hour with far more money than they get from all the rest of the world in a lifetime," is vital to understanding the engagement. The motivation for these figures was not intellectual engagement with the tyrant, his court, or the cultural environment of his city, but simply and exclusively financial gain. This is precisely the character Athenian comedy cast Simonides as, but also, as Rheinhold Merkelbach observed, was a salient feature of *Bettelgedichte*, or beggar-poetry, which was performed by the impoverished to survive.[85] This may offer an explanation of the comic characterization of Simonides: a carnivalesque inversion of the poet's character of the sort Athenian comic poets loved.[86]

On this view, we should not expect that the poet was actively seeking out commissions but instead composing for friends in his intellectual, personal, or political network.[87] This should not preclude the possibility that the poet received goods for his composition; rather, that he avoided the appearance of composing to become wealthy by offering a composition upfront and receiving reward for it afterward. The independence afforded by this reading is vital for understanding how Simonides could respond, “in this, of course, I agree with you entirely, Hieron, *that praise from the freest is sweetest,*” without irony or insult. Such a model would imply that the praise contained in epinician or encomiastic poetry was ostensibly freely offered, and any money exchanged represented as a gracious gift.

---

[84] There is a possibility that the form was not completely extinct, since Euripides composed an epinican for the chariot victory of Alcibiades in 416. However, it is more likely that Euripides was utilizing an archaic genre to celebrate the unprecedented double chariot victory at Olympia, see Bowra 1960, Carey 2012.

[85] Merkelbach 1952. The reworking of existing poems and recitation of famous or popular poems all seem to have part of the repertoire of these beggar poets. The reflection of which is central to Aristophanes' representation of the poet Kinesias in the *Birds* (Dunbar 1995 ad loc). For the reception of the Bettelgedichte tradition in the Simonidean biographical tradition, see Rawles 2018, 235-8, with specific reference to Theocritus 16 as a humorous example.

[86] Sommerstein 1996's discussion of *komodoumenoi* in Old Comedy illustrates the ways Aristophanes attacked political and cultural figures. Olson 2016 offers an exploration of the carnivalesque in the context of the *Acharnians*.

[87] Pelliccia 2009, 243-7.

Freely given praise, as Hieron observes, carries with it the authority to criticize. Kathryn Morgan has recently demonstrated that parainesis and admonition play a significant—and underappreciated—role in Pindar’s poetry for Sicilian tyrants.[88] In her analysis, she examines how the poet’s authorial voice, use of myth to express potentially controversial topics, or appropriations of traditional gnomai may have removed some of the sting of criticism—offering the poet an imbedded buffer in his poetry. The independence resulting from a lack of commission helps provide an explanation for how this material was not intended to slip past the tyrant, as some scholars have suggested, but instead designed to offer constructive criticism made palatable through figured speech.[89] The tonal discrepancy scholars have observed between epinicia for private citizens and rulers supports this view: rulers have more to lose than private citizens and need to be reminded of it.[90]

This is precisely the dynamic we observed in the case of Solon and Croesus. Solon first used the stories of Tellos and Kleobis and Biton to convey the force of his gnome: call no-one fortunate until they have reached their end. This admonishment to Croesus acknowledges his good fortune, but warns the ruler to militate against the expectation of unbroken good fortune. Croesus, however, failed to recognize the value of the Athenian's wisdom and dismissed him from his court with nothing. The scales eventually fall from his eyes, and Herodotus has Croesus dispiritedly invoke the name of Solon three times as he is placed on pyre by the conquering Cyrus. Being asked who he meant when invoking the name Solon, Croesus highlights the reward a successfully received message could bestow on the independent intellectual (Hdt.1.86.4-5):

---

[88] Morgan 2015, 90-131.

[89] For the notion of subversive material in the epinicia intended to slip past the ruler, see Fennel 1893, 184-5, and Nicholson 2005, 42-63.

[90] The idea seems to be central to Herodotus’ famous account of Darius requesting his servant to command him to “remember the Athenians” three times at dinner following the Ionian sack of Sardis (Hdt. 5.105.2).

> "Croesus kept silent at first, but when they pressed him to answer, he said, **"A man to whom I would pay a fortune if only he could talk to all tyrants."** Since his words were obscure to them, they questioned him again, asking what he meant, and they continued to pester him until he told them what had happened when Solon the Athenian had visited him; indeed, he related the whole story from beginning to end, even repeating Solon's very words, of how after the Athenian had seen all of the king's prosperity, he had still made light of it and refused to call Croesus a fortunate man. And now everything had turned out just as Solon had said, and indeed it was clear that his words applied no more to Croesus himself than to the whole human race, and especially to all those who consider themselves happy and prosperous.

When Croesus finally comprehends Solon's message, he expresses his desire to reward the Athenian for the value of the truth he spoke. This reward was impossible before because of Croesus' failure to comprehend the content of Solon's speech. Only after he has lived through the pain of what Solon warned against can Croesus appreciate the truth of what the Athenian said to him. We should not assume all potentates were so slow to comprehend the gnomic wisdom poets directed at them.[91] Indeed, Herodotus has Cyrus immediately comprehend the wisdom of Croesus' second-hand account of Solon's advice.[92] In this representation, he, too, feels compelled to issue a reward for Croesus' choice to share Solon's wisdom: he frees the deposed Lydian king and appoints him as an advisor.

---

[91] The conclusion of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* reflects the tradition of the good king engaging the wise poet in several ways. First, the choice of king Penedes to award Hesiod, whose recitation of the *Works and Days* was unpopular with the crowd, the prize in the contest indicates that the frequent criticisms of kings peppered throughout the work did not hinder him from appreciating its edification. Secondly, by rejecting the populace's zeal for Homer, Penedes illustrates his appreciation of wisdom instead of popularity.

[92] For representations of Cyrus in the Greek tradition, see Avery 1972, Briant 2001, 31-35, and Gray 2011, 24-30, and 246-90.

Significantly, the contrast of praise and admonishment roughly structures the *Hieron*. In the first half of the dialogue, Simonides praises the tyrant's great fortunes. On Simonides' view, Hieron's repudiation of the praise, however, demonstrates his own failings. Simonides waits to raise this challenge. His eventual answer to Hieron's series of laments is forceful, direct, and truthful, but still maintains the decorum he exhibits throughout the dialogue:

> In answer to this Simonides said: "Hieron, I do not deny that all these matters must receive attention. But I should divide a ruler's activities into two classes, those that lead inevitably to unpopularity, and those that are greeted with thanks. **The duty of teaching the people what things are best and of dispensing praise and honor to those who accomplish the same most efficiently is a form of activity that is greeted with thanks.** The duty of pronouncing censure, using coercion, inflicting pains and penalties on those who are short in any respect, is one that must of necessity give rise to a certain amount of unpopularity. Therefore, **my sentence is that a great ruler should delegate to others the task of punishing those who require to be coerced, and should reserve to himself the privilege of awarding the prizes**.
>
> (Xen. *Hier*. 9. 2-4)

Simonides sees the tyrant's role as an essentially didactic one. He must instruct the citizens in what is best and correct detrimental behaviors. The activities espoused by Simonides conform to the social demands on encomiastic poetry. On Simonides' view, the tyrant should offer praise in his own person and directly engage in activities that acquire admiration. This action closely corresponds to the use of first person in praise poetry, where the poet in his own persona commonly offers praise to a victor, his city, and his achievement.[93] Simonides then suggests the uncomfortable task of correcting or censuring should be left to others: the king's will should be enacted indirectly. Again, poetry is instructive. Archaic poetry commonly employed allegory and gnomai to express potentially challenging or event threatening views.[94] These are indirect tools to impress an uncomfortable point which may have repercussions for the person issuing them if spoken in *propria persona*. In this way, I suggest we may see the reason for Xenophon's choice of interlocutors. Simonides' suggestion on how an ideal sovereign should rule over his people is that the powerful should engage his subjects as poets engage them: through a mixture of direct and indirect actions which maximize sympathy to the ruler and minimize the damage from criticism.

---

[93] For an analysis of the first-person in Pindar and its encomiastic function, see Lefkowitz 1991, 1-71.

In the historical context Sordi and Gray and have developed, this makes sense.[95] If Xenophon sought to engage Dionysius I through his dialogue, the use of a poet and tyrant to discuss the challenges of ruling is a perfect pairing to appeal to the poetry mad ruler. On this reading, Simonides's wisdom entices the tyrant to embrace the persona of the poet in his public engagement, possibly manipulating the tyrant's poetic pretensions. Xenophon's message is clear: being a wise ruler, like a wise poet, demanded more than beautiful words—magnanimity, virtue, and encouragement should be central to a leader's character. They should avoid punishment and castigation. Their shining example should encourage emulation of the king. In this way, the ruler might reign with fear knowing that his people love and protect, rather than loath and resent him.

Having explored the Greek literary tradition of the itinerate wise poet and fleshed out some of the cultural expectations of these figures, I would now like to turn to some possible examples preserved in the historical accounts. These examples will illustrate the international political power famous poets may have had.

Poets and Politics Abroad

---

[94] For a catalogue of gnomai in early Greek literature, see Lardinois 1995, 278-353, for definition and function, see Lardinois 1997, and Boeke 2007, 12-16.

[95] See notes 51 and 52 above.

Xenophon's representation of Simonides at the court of Hieron and the ancient evidence concerning Simonides' diplomatic intervention in Sicily encourages us to consider another mode in which poets were used. While the tradition of the wise poet emphasized the apparently personally motived participation with politics, it is important to consider the possibility of civic motivation as well. When we look to the intensely political circumstances under which Attic drama was produced,[96] it is unsurprising that the poets who produced tragedies exercised their voices to political ends.[97] In recent years, however, scholars have begun to consider the reception of Attic drama outside of Athens.[98] How did a non-Athenian audience understand this political content? How might an Athenian poet's international reputation play into politics? Ancient traditions involving poetic itineracy suggest some possibilities.

As David Grene's views on Aeschylus' time in Sicily illustrate, scholars and ancient scholiasts have traditionally treated the courts of tyrants as a refuge for failed poets: "Euripides was a failure in his own lifetime, and it made him a defeatist and escapist. Of Aeschylus, we can say with confidence that he was neither of these things."[99] Yet, there is little to no evidence to suggest that Grene's harsh assessment holds true. More recently, scholars have emphasized the cultural pastimes the wealthy royal courts offered famous poets in addition to the intellectual community there.[100] To be sure, these are important features which, no doubt, attracted poets into the orbit of tyrants, but were they the only reasons Athenian dramatists found their way abroad?

---

[96] For the intersection of politics, rhetoric, and drama, see Ober and Strauss 1990.

[97] For the famous example of Euripides' reshaping of Athenian myth in *Heraclidae* and *Supplices*, see Zuntz 1955.

[98] The articles in Bosher 2012 well illustrate the trend.

[99] Grene 1953, 2.

Euripides provides us with a valuable possibility. Of the three great tragedians, we have the best evidence that Euripides' poetry enjoyed a robust international appreciation in his own time. Plutarch's famous passage on the fate of Athenian captives held by the Syracusans is instructive:

> "The Sicilians, it would seem, more than any other Hellenes outside the home land, had a yearning fondness of his poetry. They were forever learning by heart specimens and morsels of it which visitors brought them from time to time, and imparting them to one another with fond delight."
>
> (Plut. *Nicias*, 29.2.)

As Plutarch continues his narrative he relates how the Syracusan passion for Euripides' poetry lead them to free Athenian prisoners captured after the failed Sicilian campaign if they could recite the author's poetry. The poet's international fame in the period is supported by the affinity of Sicilian and Southern Italic Greek potters in the last quarter of the 5th and first of the 4th century for illustrating scenes from Euripidean drama.[101] Signifianctly, Plutarch's story illustrates the international value of new poetry by famed authors—especially as a potential political tool. Indeed, looking at the traditions of the "exiles" of Aeschylus and Euripides from a pragmatic, political perspective, we may see a more convincing reason for why the tragedians visited foreign kings.

Euripides' Macedonian sojourn has been well explored. Recently, Scott Scullion, drawing from Aristophanes' reticence on the subject in the *Frogs*, posed an influential challenge to its historicity: "It would seem incredible that Aristophanes could have resisted the splendid comic opportunities thus offered him, and unaccountable why he should have done so. Did some

---

[100] Recent studies on Hellenistic court life have been especially valuable for rethinking the culture of the courts of tyrants; see Petrovic 2017.

[101] For the propensity of Southern Italic potters to illustrate scenes from Euripides and other scenes from Attic drama, see Taplin 2007 and Taplin 2012. For similar images depicting scenes from Attic comedy, see Taplin 1993, Csapo 2003, and Rusten 2006.

wholly uncharacteristic kind of pietas prevent the comedian dressing Euripides in a barbaric get-up or indulging in a little dialect-humour? No joke about 'Macedonian' Euripides, the lackey of Archelaos, when the comedian is railing against alien influence and aliens in Athens (678–82, 730–3)? When the poets cast round for judges (805–10), Aeschylus rejecting the Athenians as crooks and the rest as incompetent, no nomination by Euripides of the Macedonians? No stage-Macedonian divinities among those invoked by Euripides (888–94)? No dig from Aeschylus that Euripides ought to understand about exiles 'arriving' and 'returning' when the opening lines of *Choephori* are being interpreted (1155–69)? Nothing about the courts of autocratic kings when Dionysus warns Euripides off the topic of democracy (952–3)? When Aeschylus claims that Euripides gathers the honey of his song from everywhere (1301–3), no mention of Macedonian sources? Nowhere a word of reproach nor a touch of pathos about Euripides' death so far from Athens?"[102] Although these are undoubtedly valuable observations, Scullion's explanation for the composition of the *Archelaos* rests on conjecture: "It is perfectly possible and must seem probable that Archelaos commissioned the play earlier on in his reign, which began in 413, and that Euripides had subsequently produced it at Athens or on the deme-circuit in time for it to be familiar to Aristophanes and his audience in 405."[103] A consideration of the play's content and the historical context of its composition is instructive.

In 410, Athens' hopes of winning the Peloponnesian War were rekindled by a surprising victory over the Spartans at Kyzikos.[104] The resurgence of Athenian naval power in the last years of the decade demanded considerable timber to fit and repair their ships. It was at this moment that the Athenian exile Andokides sought his repatriation, in part, recalling his gift to the Athenian war efforts: “I at once proceeded to supply your forces in Samos with oar-spars… since Archelaos had hereditary connections with my family and offered me the right of cutting and exporting as many I wished” (Andok. *De Reditu Suo*. 11) Andokides claims he used his personal connections to benefit the state: Archelaos’ role is particularly important. While his father, Perdikas II vacillated between ally and enemy of the Athenians, Archelaos pursued a generally warm relationship with Athens. At this moment, ties to Macedon were crucial. After the loss of Amphipolis in 422, the Athenians were cut off from easy access to timber. The frosty relationship with Perdikas, who played a significant role in the loss of Amphipolis, made it impossible to acquire the supplies from Macedon. With Archelaos’ ascent to the throne in 412 a new door had opened—there was tremendous motivation for the embattled Athenians to procure a Macedonian alliance.

---

[102] Scullion 2003, 393.

[103] Scullion 2003, 395. For this view, Scullion seems to have in mind the scholiastic explanation of Aeschylus' composition of the *Women of Aitna*. This story, however, likely arose from ancient scholiasts' and biographers' need to explain how and why the poems were created. For the flaws in their assumptions about the biography of Aeschylus, see Lefkowitz 2012, 72-7.

[104] Xen. Hellen. 1.1.10-24., D.S. *Bib*. 13.48-52.

It is in this context that three famous Athenian cultural figures found their way to Archelaos’ court. First, and indisputably, is the Athenian tragedian Agathon. Agathon’s departure to the north is confirmed by Dionysius’ quip in the *Frogs* answering Heracles’ inquiry about Agathon: “He’s gone and left me—a fine poet, and much missed by his friends.” (Aristophanes, *Frogs*. 84)[105] The passage firmly establishes that the poet had left Athens prior to the 405 production of the play. Regrettably, the near total loss of Agathon’s literary output makes it impossible to know how much his work was influenced by his time in Macedon—or, indeed, what most of it even looked like. A few salient points, however, demand comment. From Plato's *Symposium* we learn that Agathon won first prize with his first tragedy.[106] Athenaeus, as Austin and Olsen observe, "apparently drawing on official records, dates this to the Lenaia in 416."[107] It is clear from Aristophanes' mockery of the precocious young tragedian's effeminacy in *Thesmophoriazousai* that he enjoyed enough fame to be a worthy subject of comic abuse in 411.[108] The evidence points to Agathon being at his poetic prime when he left for Macedon.

---

[105] As Dover 1993, 200-1 observes, the force of the pun in the next line (Ἐς μακάρων εὐωχίαν) relies on play of words between *makaros* and Makedon. Agathon’s departure from Athens in the last decade of the 5th century is also references at Plato, *Smp.*172C4, where no specific date is given.

The second figure, Callimachus, is likely attested by an inscription found at the Macedonian Royal palace of Aigai[109] :

> ἐνθάδε̣ [Κα]λ̣λιμ[□ – □ □ – □ □ – □ □ – ×]
> ναῶν εὐστύλων [– □ □ – □ □ –]
> εὐδοκίμο[υ] πατ[ρὸς — — —]
> τ̣έχνη

Callimachus was remembered as one of the most talented architects who worked on the Acropolis complex during the Peloponnesian War period. In particular, his work on the interior of the Erechtheon was remembered by Pausanias (1.26.6-7) for its ingenuity. The inscription, dated to the last decade of the 5th century, suggests that the architect had a hand in the construction of the new royal palace which would remain the seat of Macedonian power for the duration of Temenid rule. This action is significant from a propagandistic perspective. By incorporating the architectural styles of Athens in the royal palace, the king was making an emphatic claim for his own Hellenism. An Athenian architect contributing to the project helped legitimize his message.

---

[106] Pl. *Smp.*173 A.

[107] Austin and Olson 2004, XXXV, n. 17.

[108] Austin and Olson 2004, 97-98.

[109] *SEG* 46, 830.

We may now turn to the evidence for Euripides in Macedon. The poet's departure from Athens has traditionally been dated to 408, with his death, as recorded by the Marmor Parium, placed in 407/6.[110] During this time, he is alleged to have written four plays, the *Bacchai*, *Iphigenia at Aulis*, *Alcmeaon at Corinth*, and the *Archelaos*. While scholars have exerted considerable energy to identify the Macedonian elements in the two surviving plays from the period, as Dodds has observed, little, if anything, in them deviates from traditional Attic dramaturgy.[111] This is significant since it suggests that Euripides was not conforming to local traditions, but bringing Attic tragedy to the Macedonian court. As such, there is no reason to think his Macedonian plays would fail to appeal to an Athenian audience also. Despite the controversies over where these plays were produced, both Athens and Macedon were fitting venues.[112] This is important in the case of the *Archelaos*.

The play, titled after the founder of the Macedonian Temenid house, focused on the events precipitating the hero's exile from Argos and founding of the Macedonian kingship. While scholars have commonly understood the play as payment for Euripides' kind treatment by the Macedonian King during his time there, Annette Harder has suggested the intriguing possibility that: "the play was celebrating the Greek ancestry of Archelaos and at the same time elevating the Macedonians in general, in order to connect them more closely with the

---

[110] Scodel 2017, 29.

[111] Dodds 1987, XXXIX-L.

[112] Revermann 1999, Scullion 2003.

Athenians."[113] On Harder's view, Euripides was acting like a modern cultural ambassador. This interpretation sheds valuable light on the play, its content, and Euripides' time in Macedon.

In the last decades of the 5th century, the Hellenic status of Macedonian ethnic identity remained an open question. Herodotus' and Thucydides' responses to challenges to the Hellenism of the Macedonian royals, as well as the rhetoric of the Athenian orators that the ethnic identity of the Macedonians?, confirm that Macedonian identity remained an unsettled—and contentious—question well into the 4th century.[114] Having an Athenian playwright compose a poem about his family's Greek roots—in conjunction with a palace designed in part by one of the leading Athenian architects—granted Archelaos a powerful tool to counter these political attacks. But performance in Macedon alone would have been meaningless to convey the message. Surely the Macedonian royal court already sufficiently bought into their own propaganda; it was the wider Greek world that needed to be convinced.

For this reason, the apparent conformity of Euripides' "Macedonian plays" to standard Athenian dramaturgy is important. Divergences in content or composition from accepted standards would call more attention to the play as an aberration and potentially undermine its political goals.[115] To be sure, an Athenian audience of the *Archelaos* must have approached it with a degree of cynicism in the wake of Perdikas' role in the loss of Amphipolis. But if successful, the play could have helped soften Athenian attitudes toward the northern kingdom and make Athenian overtures to Archelaos more palatable. There were strong motivations on both sides to produce and disseminate the play and its message.

---

[113] Harder 1985, 130. There is a further case which shares striking parallels with the Archelaos. Sophocles' *Tereus* seems to have influenced a popular association in Athens with the Thracian king Tereus based on Thucydides' corrective on the issue at 2.29.3. The historian asserts: "this Tereus is not in any way connected with the Tereus who took the Athenian Philomela, the daughter of Pandion for his wife, nor indeed did they even come from the same Thrace." Significantly, Sophocles seems to be the first to make his Tereus Thracian, and his play dates before 414 based on Aristophanes' parody in the *Birds*. The play's representation of Tereus' brutality makes it difficult to know how Sophocles might have treated the subject if he did, indeed, attempt to connect Athens and Thrace through the myth, or even use the myth to inspire friendship with the Thracian king; however, Dobrov 1993; Fitzpatrick 2001; and Patterson 2010, 53-9 offer some valuable observations and possibilities.

[114] Hdt. 8.137-39, Thuc. 2.99.2. For the shared confusion of the Peloponnesian Argos with the Thessalian, see Kelly 1976, 38-50, who views this as an intentional conflation to grant the Temenid dynasty greater prestige, and Hall 2002, 154-6 who sees the traditions as indicative of how the Macedonians manipulated mythology to suit their political needs.

A potential objection should be addressed. Euripides has traditionally been understood as hostile to Athenian imperial ambitions.[116] Why would he act on behalf of Athens' interests to write a play designed to secure better relations with an estranged ally? To answer this question, is well to recall the position of Jazz ambassadors during the Cold War. Many of these musicians were personally harmed by racist political policies of their own country—they had every reason to be critical or even hostile toward the political regime they represented and in whose interests they were acting. Yet, as Penny Von Eschen has seen: "for those who had long been denied artistic recognition and fundamental rights as citizens, the tours represented a critical victory in the civil rights… Indeed, this irresistible combination of a chance to work, support a big band, serve one's country, meet musicians abroad, and contribute to the civil rights movement made State Department tours highly prized gigs."[117] A similar impulse may have been functioning with Euripides. For an artist like Euripides, whose success in the dramatic contests of Athens was disproportionate to the popularity he enjoyed, the opportunity to perform and engage on an international stage may have offered a degree of state-level recognition that had previously been

---

[115] A valuable contrast is Eurpides' *Orestes*, which, as Willink 1986, XXII, observes: "is a *tour de force* of audacious myth-invention and poetic art, instinct with the spirit of its art, by a supreme *mythopoios* and dramatist… a baroque kind of tragi-comedy or *drame noir* looking at once backward beyond Aeschylus' *Oresteia* to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and forward to the New Comedy of Menander." The kind of innovation Willink observes in Euripides' application of tragi-comedy in the *Orestes* would be dangerous in as politically charged a poem as the *Archelaos*.

[116] For an analysis of the anti-imperialism of the *Trojan Women* and its reception as an anti-imperialism play, see Lauriola 2015.

[117] Von Eschen 2004, 29.

denied to him. Furthermore, the state's need for the famous artist to advance Athenian interests abroad would have granted the poet an uncommon degree of freedom. Again, the Jazz ambassadors are instructive: "Dizzy Gillespie had been a card-carrying member of the Communist Party because it enabled him to get gigs in CP halls. Later, in the 1970s, Charles Mingus, long known for his outspokenness, was accused of attempting to disseminate his pro-civil rights and antiwar politics through his song titles while on a State Department sponsored Newport Jazz Festival tour of Eastern Europe. Yet rather than challenging Mingus, much less punishing him, officials simply altered the titles for playbills."[118] It is remarkable that in the intensely fearful McCarthy era Gillespie's affiliations with the Communist Party did not disqualify him from participation in the State Department tour, much less make him the subject of possible persecution. The international stage, however, demanded a different view of American ideals than was expressed at home.

For this reason, Euripides, whose traditional animus toward the democracy's imperialist policies alienated him at home, would make a perfect choice for international diplomacy. Abroad, the action would project an image of Athenian tolerance, confidence, and diversity. For Euripides, the potential to effect change at home, while preserving its stability through international contacts, or, indeed, the opportunity to expand his network of friendship beyond Athens were ample rewards for working on the state's behalf. Therefore, we should not expect that his choice to go abroad was motivated by untrammeled patriotism, but rather an uneasy alliance of personal and public interests which roughly aligned with Athens' needs on the international stage.

This view is consistent with an overlooked passage from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Aristotle recalls the dramatist in passing: “Such are those who have recently sought their friendship—for they have only seen what is best in them, which is the point of the answer of Euripides to the Syracusans.”[119] The oblique reference to the episode suggests that it was well known to Aristotle’s’ audience.[120] Fortunately, a scholiast provides us with further details to understand what the philosopher is talking about: “Euripides, having been sent as an ambassador to the Syracusans to ask for peace and friendship, when they refused said: ‘Syracusans, if for no other reason than that we are just feeling the need of your friendship, you ought to respect our admiration.’”[121] The choice of Euripides as ambassador is a clear indication that the Athenians were aware of the power of cultural figures to exact political outcomes. While we are unable to precisely date the event, it almost certainly had to have occurred before the Sicilian expedition. This suggests that both Euripides and Athens were aware of the poet’s cultural clout and its utility for diplomacy long before Euripides went to Macedon. Indeed, as Ruth Scodel has observed of Sophocles’ selection for office: “Surely he was chosen, at least in part, because he had seemed to be a competent administrator as *Hellenotamias*. He was also very popular—a witty and charming man, and a famous tragedian, hence an ideal person to work closely with the leaders of the “allies,” the cities of the Athenian empire.”[122] Sophocles’ appointment to the office has been dated to 441, followed by his generalship in the next year. The evidence suggests that the use of culturally prominent figures for political purposes was a common Athenian measure. Yet, we may ask, if Euripides went to Macedon for political reasons what practical outcomes came of it?

---

[118] Von Eschen 2004, 21.

---

[119] Arist. *Rhet*. 2.20.

[120] See Grimaldi 1989, comments ad loc.

[121] Trans. Freese 1972, 216.n.B.

[122] Scodel 2012, 31.

Our evidence suggests benefits for both parties. The cultural capital of a Euripides play celebrating the king's genealogy and confirming the Temenid dynasty's Argive roots was no doubt a powerful piece of propaganda for the young monarch looking to expand his kingdom's presence in the wider Greek world. This conforms to the narrative of cultural legitimacy and Hellenism we noted with the architectural designs of Archelaos' palace at Aegai. Athens, as the cultural capital of the Greek world, surely wielded a powerful influence to confirm or deny the propagandistic messages of the Macedonian royals: its leading cultural figures could play a central role in this process.

This reading of Eurpides' time in Macedon is also supported by an inscription discovered on the Athenian Acropolis. Inscription *IG* I^2. 105 (Meiggs-Lewis 91) dates to 407/6 and gives thanks to Archelaos, naming him an *Euergos* and *Proxenos* to the Athenians.[123] The surviving details of the dedication suggest the king granted the Athenians timber to build new triremes. Meritt has suggested that the inscription should be restored to read that the Athenians dispatched shipwrights to Macedon to build the new vessels onsite.[124] The fragmentary nature of the *stele* makes a full reading of its content impossible; however, the precious few details we have confirm the acute Athenian desire to foster diplomatic relations with Archelaos and demonstrates their ultimate success.[125] On this view, each side had something the other wanted and attained it.

One vitally important question posed by Scullion remains: why did Aristophanes mock only Agathon for going to Macedon? If these poets were in Macedon acting to further Athens' political interests, the simple act of leaving the city to write or produce a play elsewhere would make for poor comic fodder—it would be in poor taste, indeed, to mock the dead poet's activity in Macedon if it produced a civic benefit. However, a poet's choice to refuse to return to Athens after the completion of the mission might easily put him in the comic poet's sights. This, then, may be the difference—Agathon actively chose to stay in Macedon, while Euripides either did not, or, as the tradition suggests, died there.

---

[123] Meiggs-Lewis 1969, 276-9.

[124] Merit 1935, 107-15.

[125] Numismatic evidence is also valuable for an illustration of increased trade between Athens and Macedon during the reign of Archelaos. Greenwalt 1994 observes that that Archelaos oversaw a re-caluclation of Macedonian coinage weights to correspond with the Athenian drachma, thereby making trade considerably easier. Cf. Borza 1999, 10.

Returning to our passage from the Second Platonic Epistle, the reasons for its genealogy of wisdom and power become clearer. During the Hellenistic period, the strategy of cultural ambassadorship I have argued we see with Euripides was not only not uncommon but was a form of diplomacy in which the Athenians were preeminent.[126] Yet, in this period it was philosophers not poets who served in this capacity.[127] As J.G.F. Powell has observed: "In an attempt to explain this development in Athenian Diplomatic practice, it is customary to refer to the prestige of philosophy in an Athenian context… It may well be, in fact, that the appointment was influenced by other factors than just the prestige of the profession. Philosophers tended to have two other advantages compared with ordinary Athenian citizens. For one thing, they could be seen as unusually incorruptible… But still more important, they were often experts in the art of argumentation."[128]

For an interested Hellenistic scholar looking back on the tradition of Plato's visits to Sicily, it seems natural that they would place the philosopher in a role familiar to them from their own world. This may be why the author feels compelled to include the famous examples of wise and powerful men meeting: he’s arguing for the philosopher’s inclusion in the list of traveling wise men, though he may not have belonged there. For a Hellenistic reader of the letter, intimately familiar with use of philosophers as diplomats and aware of poets having served a similar function, the passage suggests a beginning of the practice of philosopher diplomats and subtly attempts to strengthen the letter’s claim to authenticity.

---

[126] See Rubinstein 2013 for the development of the trend and an analysis of the rhetoric employed to bind states to one another.

[127] Arguably the most famous example of which is the embassy of Carneades to Rome in 155 (Cic. *Tusc*. 4.5).

[128] Powell 2013, 223-4.

*

As we have seen, Greek literature and culture imagined numerous contexts in which the poet was seen to offer uniquely important insights or serve specialized political functions excluded to other citizens. With our findings on the subject in mind, let us now consider how *P*.4 has been situated in the Pindaric corpus.

II

A POETIC NOSTOS?
RETHINKING *P*.4

With a dominating central myth that tantalizingly corresponds with the historical circumstances of its composition, an unprecedented concluding plea for an exile's return, rich historical and genealogical interests, and exceptional length, *P*.4 provides exceptionally fertile ground to explore unconventional aspects of Pindar's poetry. However, despite frequent scholarly comments noting the singular genius of *P*.4, few academic studies have explored the longest surviving lyric poem from Ancient Greece.[129] The absence of academic discussion offers us a partial explanation for the ode's interpretive stagnation, but to better understand this neglect we may wonder if traditional interpretations have explained the ode and its anomalous content so well that scholars spanning a century have been unable to improve them. Should we instead see the scholarly consensus as a reflexive avoidance of the ode's abnormalities? An analysis will show how the answer to both questions is effectively yes—the scholarly consensus has largely suppressed the anomalies of the ode.

---

[129] See Gerber 1969, 52-6 for an overview of bibliography, and an updated list in Gentili 1995, 112-115 focused on critical bibliography. For comments on the quality of the ode, there are numerous examples; e.g. Gildersleeve, 1885, 278, "Not only in size, but also in many other respects, the Fourth *Pythian* is Pindar's greatest ode." Fennell 1893, 184, "This ode is the finest extant specimen of Pindar's poetry. It comprises a masterpiece of Lyric, as opposed to Epic, narrative in the story of the Argonauts." Schroeder, 1922, 33, "Sein Meisterstück in den lyrischen Erzälungskunst." Kirkwood, 1982, 161, "*P*.4 is, at least in some sense, Pindar's masterpiece."

Prevailing Views on *P.*4

Resisting the contemporary continental moralizing trend in Pindaric analysis, Basil Gildersleeve's commentary on the Olympian and Pythian Odes was among the first to adopt a classical historicist methodology.[130] Since the positions he advanced have remained influential, the commentary's introduction to *P.*4 offers a valuable starting point for our discussion: "Arcesilaus the IV won a Pythian victory with the chariot. The victory is commemorated in the Fourth and Fifth *Pythian* odes… The Fourth [Pythian] ode was doubtless composed to be sung at a banquet in the royal palace and seems to have been prepared at the urgent request of one Damophilos, who had been exiled by Arcesilaus for participating in an aristocratic rebellion… 'Urgent request' means in Pindar's case a lordly recompense. The poem was a grand peace offering, and the reconciliation had doubtless been arranged quietly in advance."[131] For Gildersleeve, the composition is an epinician, albeit one of exceptional size. The size of the ode suggests a tremendous expense, and this in turn implies the ode was a "grand peace offering" to the victorious king. Gildersleeve's findings on *P.*4 offer one major innovation: advocacy of Demophilus as commissioner.

---

[130] See Young 1964 9-40 in Calder and Stern 1970 for an analysis of the contributions of Boecke and Dissen and this phase in Pindaric analysis generally.

[131] Gildersleeve 1885, 278.

Over a century later, Gildersleeve's views on the ode have remained unchallenged. In his extensive commentary on *P*.4, Bruce Braswell echoes Gildersleeve and expands on his view: "It should be obvious to anyone with even a little sense of political reality that Pindar could not have entered a plea for Demophilus' recall in an ode to be performed in Cyrene unless the king had agreed to it beforehand. In other words, the plea was carefully staged to afford a public demonstration of the King's clemency, which would have also been a gesture of reconciliation to the political opposition. Since Demophilus was the direct beneficiary of Pindar's successful plea and since Arcesilaus' victory was adequately celebrated by *Pythian* 5, it is hardly a bold guess to presume that the exile also paid for the *Fouth Pythian*."[132] Like Gildersleeve, Braswell believed Pindar to be a mercenary poet whose sole interest was profit. As such, the notion that the poet possessed anything approaching independent authority was not only discounted, but completely suppressed as a fanciful whim of the "politically naïve."[133] On Braswell's reading, *P*.4 was an epincian designed to be a political show piece, and no more.

The scholarly view that the ode was political theater has profound ramifications for readings of its Argonautic myth. Gildersleeve rejected the prevailing view of Boeckh and Dissen that parallels between the myth and the Cyrenean historical players encouraged an allegorical reading of the ode.[134] Instead, he pursued a thematic approach to the myth: "There are those who see in Pindar's Argonautic expedition a parable. Damophilos is Jason. Then Arkesilas must be Pelias—which is incredible. Damophilos is anybody else, anything else. Sooner the soul of Phrixos, sooner the mystic clod that Euphemos received… The true keynote, then, is the sweetness of return, the sweetness of the fulfilment of prophecy and the fruition of hope long delayed."[135] For Gildersleeve, the implication that the poet could characterize the victorious King as anything but a proper gentleman—let alone imply parallels with a noted mythical villain like Pelias—was a "monstrous" scholarly conceit.[136] Instead of a discomforting, potentially polemic myth, Gildersleeve believed its messages, stemming from Demophilus' commission, were benignly pointing to the exile's enthusiasm and longing for a homecoming.[137]

---

[132] Braswell 1988, 5.

[133] Braswell 1988, 360.

[134] For Boeckh, the Argonautic myth of *P*.4 shared important parallels with the historical circumstances of Pindar's composition of the ode and serves a largely didactic function: "Quippe Iason a Pelia tyranno consanguineo in longinquam et periculosam expiditionem missus erat; Demophilum genere sibi coniunctum (schol. vs. 467) ex patria eiecerat Arcesilaus, atque illum poeta reduci vult: Significantur credo discrimen, in quod rex adduci possit, si patria carere clarissimos et sibi propinquos homines iubeat; qui aliquando reduces exitium afferre imperanti possint, ut Peliae Medea at Iason. Igitur alia ratione utendum esse ex hoc carmine debuit Arcesilaus discere, praesertim inter conisanguineos." Problematically, Boeckh was convinced of a close, if not direct, correlation between Jason and Demophilus and subsequently pressed the point; however, the parallelism that Boeckh observed has not been convincingly rejected by subsequent generations of scholars. The prevailing strategy has been to ignore them.

In a similar vein, working within the encomiastic model of epinician formulated by Elroy Bundy's *Studia Pindarica*, Bruce Braswell argued that the Argonautic narrative was formed to praise the Battiads: "Pindar's primary aim was to show that the Euphemids were divinely chosen to become kings in Cyrene and that their rule is in accord with the will of the gods. The means which Pindar uses to demonstrate this is the narration of the Argonautic myth suitably adapted to reveal Euphemus' divine mission."[138] For Braswell, the myth goes further than reflecting the exile's enthusiasm for return. While this is an aspect of the ode, the true purpose is to be a bulwark for Demophilus' repatriation claim and offer the king a return for it. To accomplish this,

---

[135] Gildersleeve 1885, 281.

[136] Gildersleeve 1885, 302.

[137] The general interpretation is also shared with Fraccaroli 1894, 395-403, Schroeder 1922, 33-5, and Burton 1962, 167-8: "Any identification of Pelias with Arcesilaus and of Jason with Damophilus must be rejected out of hand, but if we bear in mind the natural tendency of the Greeks to see in myth and legend precedents and patterns of conduct we see one or two features which form an appropriate background." Burton then goes on to agree with Gildersleeve that *nostos* is the central theme of the ode.

[138] Braswell 1988, 23.

Braswell argues the myth was formulated to be politically useful propaganda designed to please the king.[139] Like Gildersleeve, Braswell firmly believed that Demophilus as commissioner was directing the narrative of the nearly 200-line myth.

These two scholars set over a century apart help delineate the modern strictures on the interpretation of *P*.4. Crudely put, these lines of thought can be posed as follows: 1.) the ode is an epinician. 2.) The ode was commissioned. 3.) Since the ode was commissioned and since the chariot victory of Arcesilaus was amply covered in Pythian 5 but largely ignored in *P*.4, the exile Demophilus must have been commissioner.[140] 4.) With Demophilus as commissioner, the ode was a peace offering to the king who exiled him. 5.) The poem is simply political theater designed to praise Arcesilaus for allowing Demophilus to return in a pre-arranged repatriation deal. Since Demophilus had no political power in exile no real negotiation is happening in the presentation of the ode. 6.) The myth of the ode reinforces the praise of the ruling house to bolster the pre-arranged repatriation deal by illustrating the benignity of the exile, and evincing his acceptance of the divine right of the Battiads to rule Libya.

Problems Explained Under the Current Model

Having set out the basic lines of thought in the contemporary scholarship on the *P*.4, we may ask what solutions they proffer.

---

[139] CF. Kirkwood 1982, 161: “The myth of the Argonauts is, as Pindar treats it in the poem, the story of the origin of the city of Cyrene, or, more especially, of the Battiad dynasty to which Arcesilaus belonged.”

[140] Braswell goes to some lengths to reconstruct how the exile would have paid for the ode since he was unable to remotely access his funds (Braswell 1988, 6). Despite the energy he exerts to defend his assumption, this point manages to instigate further questions about how the commission must have worked and demands we assume, as Braswell does, that Pindar was willing to accept IOUs; even when the risk of never being paid was still a real possibility, as Arcesilaus could have easily denied the exile access to his funds upon his return. However, even if we do accept all of this, we must concede that Braswell is firmly in the realm of conjecture here since no direct evidence of commission, let alone commission on good faith, exists.

Epinician and Commission

From a generic standpoint, *P*.4 is deeply problematic. The ode abounds in features unattested in epinicia. At 299 exceptionally long lines the poem is over twice as long as the next largest surviving poem of Pindar's. Moverover, these lines are exceptionally large relative to many dactyl-epitrite compositions. Additionally, the poem engages minimally with Arcesilaus' Pythian victory, includes a continuous narrative in the myth, and concludes plea for the repatriation of an exile. As such, the ode's deeply irregular features have created substantial scholarly discomfort with the application of traditional approaches to Pindaric poetry to it. How do we understand an epinician that has so many seemingly non-epinician features? Is the ode an epinician at all? And if not, then what is it?

To circumvent the generic complexities of *P*.4, seeing the ode as an epinician alleviates the uncomfortable possibility that scholars have been mistaken in their approaches to it. Braswell offers the clearest defense for classifying *P*.4 as an epinician; "The classification of the ode as one celebrating a chariot victory of Arcesilaus in the Pythian Games is formally justified by the single reference to it in 66-7 and the allusion to it in 2-3."[141] Despite the tenuousness of this position, Braswell's defense of the ancient epinician classification of *P*.4 enables him to read the ode much as it always has been, and effectively silences opposition to the epinician classification.[142] The consequences of this choice for scholarly interpretation are immense. To begin, it forces the irregular features into an epinican mold without always offering convincing explanations for why we should do so, particularly when the traditional methods of interpreting epinicia must be appended to account for the irregularities of the ode. This is especially clear in the case of commissioner.

---

[141] Braswell 1988, 56.

[142] Braswell 1988. "It is wrong to go so far as Schmid-Stahlin who maintain that it is "kein Siegeslied, da sie des Sieges gar nicht gedenkt." Quoting Schmid-Stahlin 1929, 569.

Commissioner

Arguably, the most deeply entrenched view on the composition of Pindaric poetry is the notion that all the extant odes were commissioned. While we have no evidence for the mechanisms by which commission transpired, the most common articulation is that the athletic victor, as the party most interested in preserving a memory of the victory, was responsible for commissioning the ode.[143] As such, the victor's triumph at a pan-Hellenic venue takes centerstage in the commissioned ode and is the point to which the poet must return amid discursive embellishments.[144]

This view, however, has failed to gain favor in studies of *P.*4 for the fact that the ode only perfunctorily acknowledges Arcesilaus' recent Pythian chariot victory. To explain the apparent inconcinnity with these traditional models of epinician, Gildersleeve concluded that the plea for the repatriation of Demophilus gives us reason enough to see the exile as the commissioner.[145] Despite the deviation from traditional views on commission, Gildersleeve's proposal has remained current for the solutions it offers. Particularly, the length of the composition and the oddity of its concluding plea could be seen as functions of its irregular commission.

---

[143] Gentili 1965, Gentili 1988, 115-154, and 160-6, Kurke 1992, 119-139 have remained the seminal works arguing for the commission model. Gentili, who employs an old historicist methodology to make his case, is especially deeply indebted to scholiastic comments on the economic interests of ancient poets and agrees with them on the thought that there is a clear rupture in traditional poetic practices in the figure of Simonides. For Gentili, Simonides was the first poet who openly sought pay up front for his compositions (Cf. Podlecki 1984, 178-9). He then argues that poets in his wake followed Simonides' lead in demanding pay. For criticism of the traditional biographic readings of Simonides and the ancient conjectures on which they are based, see Lefkowitz 2012, 55-60. Slater 1972 is an especially insightful (and troubling) case study of a story, which both Gentili and Kurke use extensively to support their economic models, involving Simonides requesting pay from Thessalian nobles and being told to retrieve it from the mythic heroes he wrote about in his poem. Slater effectively illustrates how the story demands an ignorance of the art of epinician to make sense. Slater then convincingly argues that this ignorance of the art form and focus on the biographical figure of Simonides cannot have pre-dated the late 4th century—over a century removed from the floruit of the genre. Kurke 1992, 52, n.47 acknowledges Slater's study but largely avoids the implications for her project. Nicholson 2000, 235 offers a synopsis of Kurke's position. Recently, significant challenges to the traditional commission models have been posed by Pelliccia 2009, 241-7 and Bowie 2012, 83-5, who illustrate how little we actually know about the composition of occasional poetry in the late 6th and early 5th century and how reliant we continue to be on likely scholiastic inventions on the topic. Morgan 2015, 114-7 offers a valuable survey of the controversy and successfully reads Pindar's poems for Hieron without seeing a reliance on pay or anxiety over pay functioning in the praises for Hieron.

[144] Bundy 1962 remains the seminal work on the issue.

On this view, the size of the composition celebrating the Battiads adumbrates the desire of the exiled commissioner to please the ruling king. For Gildersleeve, this is accomplished through the length and by extension the expense of the ode: "in the length of the myth, nothing more is to be seen than the costliness of the offering."[146] In short, Gildersleeve believed the longer the ode and more expensive the performance, the better the graces of the king toward the exile.[147] While this view may ignore whether the content is unequivocally encomiastic toward the dynasty, it offers as compelling an answer for the length of the ode as any.

Equally anomalous, the final plea for the exile's repatriation has no direct parallel in Greek poetry. To answer why the poet would conclude the composition with this strikingly irregular request, Braswell provides an explanation in his introduction; "When Pindar turns in this last section from the general glorification of the Euphemids to enter a plea for Demophilus, he is setting the stage for a public demonstration of their contemporary greatness."[148] For

---

[145] Gildersleeve 1885, 279 quoted above.

[146] Gildersleeve 1885, 280.

[147] Vestiges of the thought remain current in scholars who advocate for commission. Mann 2000 is perhaps the clearest articulation. In his article, Mann suggests a system where each line had a fixed price and attempts to calculate the price of odes accordingly. There are many aspects of the article which must resort to conjecture to sustain the argument, but the basic point Mann argues for is the one Gildersleeve struck on over a century ago—the longer the poem, the greater the price. By this thinking, Pythian Four was exceptionally pricey, offering Pindar a "lordly recompense."

[148] Braswell 1988, 29.

Braswell and Gildersleeve, the plea provides a dramatic moment of political theater to conclude the performance of the ode.

***P.*4 as Political Theater**

Unity in the ode is another traditionally problematic issue for scholars.[149] What elements bind the colossal poem together? Is there a vantage point from which its content and form can be made mutuallyintelligible? Braswell's reading views *P*.4's political mission as its uniting factor: "none but the politically naïve would suppose that the whole show had not been carefully planned and rehearsed before. The recall of Demophilus had obviously been agreed upon beforehand (the negotiations for which may have begun at the time of the Pythian victory celebrated in the ode; v. 299 [e]) and quite likely was in fact announced during the continuation of the public festivities after the completion of the performance of the ode. With the timing of this gesture of clemency Arcesilaus was clearly attempting to give maximum publicity to an act which was meant to place his regime in a favorable light."[150]

For Braswell, the praise of the Battiads also combines the epinician mission with the political goals of the dynasty: "With the prestigious Pythian victory secured, Arcesilaus' next concern will have been to exploit it to the best advantage. Pindar had doubtless come to the

---

[149] Wilamowitz 1922, 392, was famously frustrated by the ode's apparent patch-like quality: "Dies längste Gedicht ist wahrlich ein seltsames Gebilde, Chimaerahaft."

[150] Braswell 1988, 360.

Games from Thebes prepared to accept to commissions from the winners… Presumably Euphemus and Carrhotus would have been authorized in advance to order an epinikion from Pindar either on the spot or after further negotiations... For an exile longing to return home the opportunity of meeting on neutral ground men so close to the king would hardly have been missed. The result of such a meeting was presumably the beginning, or continuation, if they had already begun, of negotiations which would ultimately lead to the recall of Demophilus as envisaged in the Fourth Pythian… We may therefore be reasonably sure that Demophilus used the occasion of the royal Cyrenaean victory at Delphi to negotiate for his recall, the price of which was presumably the Fourth Pythian… Ironically perhaps, although Pindar appears in Pythian 4 ostensibly as the advocate for Demophilus, the success of whose case is a foregone conclusion, he is in fact pleading for Arcesilaus."[151]

On this reading, the *P*.4 is simply political propaganda that ingratiates the exile to the king who exiled him. The disparate sections each serve a separate function, vacillating between praising the king, his victory, and rule, and celebrating his dynasty. Moreover, the pre-arranged aspect of the repatriation deal and the composition of the ode ensure that all content is met with the king's greatest approbation. Where other scholars had seen disunity and conflicting messages, Braswell saw the ode as a strikingly unified in its encomiastic mission.[152] This is especially true in Braswell's reading of the myth.

The Myth

---

[151] Braswell 1988, 5-6.

[152] Lattmann 2010, 184-258 sees the poem's metaphors of victory as its uniting factor, sustaining its encomiastic epinician purpose. For the problems with this interpretations and strain placed on the evidence, see Agoçs 2013.

Between the initial 1st person prophecy of Medea and the continuous narrative of the Argonautic expedition, the myth occupies 254 lines of 299—the vast majority of the ode. Compared with other epinicia, this is a disproportionately large percent of the composition. As we have seen, for Gildersleeve this was an indication of nothing more than elaborate embellishment designed to illustrate the expense of the ode.[153]

To expand on this point, it is worth re-examining Braswell's view that "Pindar's primary aim was to show that the Euphemids were divinely chosen to become kings in Cyrene and that their rule is in accord with the will of the gods. The means which Pindar uses to demonstrate this is the narration of the Argonautic myth suitably adapted to reveal Euphemus' divine mission."[154] Braswell's reading effectively answers why the ode would be a valuable recompense for the exile's repatriation. The myth recalls the importance of the divine land grant and highlights the transition of power through subsequent generations. In doing so, the myth effects a positive view of Battiad kingship and casts the monarchy as perennially stable; a quality it lacked in Pindar's time. Additionally, the choice of the Argonautic campaign as the primary subject of the narrated myth roots the divine right of the Battiads to rule in a famous Pan-Hellenic exploit, thereby emphasizing the dynasty's Hellenic credentials in an era where the monarchy's submission to Persian rule must have made them suspicious to mainland Greece. This reading of the myth also accords with Braswell's notion that Demophilus commissioned the ode. By crafting a mythic narrative that casts the ruling dynasty in a positive light, Pindar further makes the case for Demophilus' respect for the ruling dynast.

Limitations on Current Models

---

[153] Gildersleeve 1885, 280, quoted above.

[154] Braswell 1988, 23.

Although scholarship has remained committed to the idea that *P*. 4 is essentially an expanded epinician, the solutions to the problems cited above are not without their own limitiations.

Is *P*.4 an Epinician?

Is *P*.4 an epinician if there is only a single reference to Arcesilaus' chariot victory? Based on our current models, the answer is yes.[155] However, the solution seems unsatisfactory and legitimate questions about the ode's classification are too easily brushed aside. Exploring the problems with the ode's classification reveals how unconvincing Braswell's reason for viewing the ode as an epinican is.

In his influential article, "The Classification of Greek Lyric," A.E. Harvey rejected *P*.4's epinician credentials; "We possess four books of epinicia by Pindar, and it is perfectly clear from these that the editors were not always scrupulous in observing the qualifications of certain poems to belong to certain categories. *Pythians 3* and 4, for example are certainly not epinicia, if by 'epinikion' is meant a composition to be sung soon after an athletic victory in honour of the victor: they are both a kind of poetic epistle. Similarly, the ancients themselves were aware that the last three Nemaeans were only placed in that position for convenience."[156] Harvey's suggestion that *P*.4 was not an epinician but rather a poetic epistle—more in line with *P*. 3—should encourage us to reconsider its merits as an epinician. To do so, it is worth asking what 'epinician' meant for an ancient audience.

---

[155] Braswell 1988, Lattmann 2010, 184-6.

[156] Harvey 1955, 160.

It is clear from sources contemporary with Pindar that the term ‘epinikion’ was not used to describe an ode that commemorated an athletic event. Aristophanes casually refers to what we would call an epinician as an ‘encomium’:

> χλανίδ' ἐχρῆν λευκὴν λαβεῖν· εἶτ' Ἰσθμιακὰ
> λαβόντες ὥσπερ οἱ χοροὶ ᾄδωμεν εἰς τὸν
> δεσπότην ἐγκώμιον.
>
> We ought to don our white clothes, then taking Isthmian crowns just like choruses, let’s sing a song of praise for the master.
>
> (Trans Henderson).[157]

Moreover, Pindar himself uses the term ‘encomium’ to describe his victory poetry:

> ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντα ῥίζαν πρέπει 46
> τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου
> ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν
>
> It is fitting that the son of Ainesidamos, whose roots spring from that seed, should meet with victory songs and lyre.
>
> (*Olympian 2*, 46-8. Trans. Race)

The language describing victory songs in the era before the Alexandrian classification of ‘epinician’ suggests that any song of praise, celebration, or conviviality was simply thought of as an encomium.[158] The separation of the corpus of encomiastic poetry into disparate genres of encomia, skolia, and epinicia was an innovation that attempted to format the odes into manageable book lengths. As Harvey noted, the classification was less rigorous and theoretical than it was practical and transmits odes that were clearly not epinicia in the epinician corpus.[159] The Alexandrian classification of praise poetry also belies the complexity of ancient victory celebrations themselves. Should we believe that triumphal festivities—especially those hosted by a victorious tyrant—only offered songs that celebrated the victory? Could they not have featured odes of different classes at the same event? And if these odes mentioned the victory that is the ostensible reason for gathering, although the ode was designed for a different purpose, does this make them epinicians?

---

[157] Aristophanes, *Tagenistae* (Frg. 505 K-A).

[158] See Carey 2009 for a recent discussion of the problem of genre in Greek lyric, where he trenchantly argues that we should see how “Literary genres are best seen as not fixed categories but as tendencies, firm enough to allow affinities and influences to be discernable and to generate a set of audience expectations, but sufficiently flexible to allow and even tacitly invite frustration and redefinition of those expectations. For a discussion of the problem of the classification of Pindaric poetry and the epinicia in particular, see Negri 2004, 119-29; Lowe 2007; Maslov 2015, 62-77; Phillips 2016, 53-63. For genre problems in Pindaric lyric generally and Paeans specifically, see Rutherford 2001, 3-17.

Ancient scholars seem to have had an equally difficult time answering these questions. Indeed, *P.*4's classification as an epinician also caused them considerable trouble. One ancient scholiast records:

> τάττεται ἡ ᾠδὴ εἰς τοὺς ἐπινίκους, μεῖζόν τι ἢ κατὰ ἐπίνικον
> οὖσα διὰ τὸ μεμηκύνθαι καὶ πραγμάτων ἔχειν ἀφήγησιν
> ἐντοπίων, τὸ δὲ ἀνωτάτω καταλλαγὴν φυγάδος Δαμοφίλου τινός.

> The ode is placed among the epinicians, although it is something more than corresponds to epinician on account of its size, narration of local history, and the final section's reconciliation of the exile, a certain Demophilus.[160]

Another Scholiast, recognizing the oddity of *P.*4, invented an answer to why there were two odes of exceptional length for the same victory:

> Γέγραπται καὶ αὕτη ἡ ᾠδὴ νικήσαντι τῷ Ἀρκεσιλάῳ ἅρματι τὴν
> Πυθιάδα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ διήγημα ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ μᾶλλον ἐπινίκῳ ἤπερ
> ἐγκώμιον πεποίηται τῷ Πινδάρῳ καὶ παρέκβασις διηγηματικὴ
> τῶν κατὰ Ἰάσονα, ἐδέησεν αὐτῷ καὶ δεύτερον γράψαι ἐπίνικον.

---

[159] *Nemean* 11, for example, is an undisputed non-epinician whose classification among the epinicia seems predicated on the counter-factual assertion that if the honorand, Aristagoras of Tenedos, had participated in athletic contests he would have won (*N.*9.22-9). In actual fact the ode is an encomium to celebrate Aristagoras' election to his city's prytany. The scholiastic comments on the ode offer an insightful view on the problems of genre and classification Alexandrian scholars faced, on which see Drachmann 1927, 18-25.

[160] Scholiast 1a to *P.*4, Drachmann 1910, 93-4.

> This ode (*Pythian 5*) was written for Arcesilaus winning in the chariot race in the Pythiaid. Since the proceedings and the digressive narrative of events concerning Jason were written in the first (*P*.4) by Pindar more as an epincian than encomium, he enjoined him (Pindar) to write a second epinician.[161]

If the generic irregularities of *P*.4 troubled the ancient scholars who arranged our text, they demand greater attention than they have been given in modern scholarship. First, we may ask if there are indications that multiple poems of different genres were performed for the same victory event.[162]

Pindar's close contemporary and fellow epinician poet, Bacchylides, offers valuable insight. Composing odes for many of the same men as Pindar, Bacchylides seems to have traveled in the same intellectual circles and his work shares substantial overlap with Pindar's own compositions. One surviving fragment of an encomium written for the Syracusan tyrant, Hieron I, is particularly interested in the king's athletic achievements:

Μήπω λιγυαχ[έα—]
βάρβιτον· μέλλ[ω π]ολ̣[υ—□—]
ἄνθεμον Μουσᾶ[ν Ἱ]έρων[ι□–] ξαν-
θαῖσιν ἵπποις
[ἱμ]ερόεν τελέσας [κα]ὶ
συμπόταις ἄνδρεσσι π[έμπειν
Αἴ]τναν ἐς ἐύκτιτον, εἰ κ[αὶ
πρ]όσθεν ὑμνήσας τὸν [——□—
πο]σσὶ λαιψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς Φερ[ένικον ἐπ' Ἀ]λφ[ει]-
ῷ τε ν[ί]καν
ἀν[δ]ρ[ὶ χ]αριζόμενος

"Do not … the sharp pealing lyre yet. Having finished a … blossom of the much… muses, a glorious thing, I intend to send it to Hieron… golden horses and his drinking companions at well founded Aitna, if ever before, singing about Pherenicus… victorious in his light feet beside the Alpheus, I pleased the man…"

(Bacchylides, Frg. 20C)

---

[161] Scholia Insc. *P*.5. Drachmann 1910, 171-2.

[162] The scholiasts to *P*.2 line 68 (Drachmann 1910, 52), at least, thought there were, claiming the poem references a Hyporchema. This is not an unproblematic passage in itself; however, it illustrates that the option was open to Alexandrian scholars.

Unfortunately, key pieces of the text are lacunose, making it impossible to determine whether the victories mentioned were recent or in the distant past. Given what survives, the prominent foregrounding of the king's athletic victories suggests that epinician themes could figure largely in compositions that ancient scholars classed as non-epinicians.[163] Perhaps this is unsurprising given how momentous an occasion a Pan-Hellenic victory would have been, but the possibility that multiple poems with different purposes were composed for the same victory makes establishing rigid generic expectations for occasional poetry a problematic approach.[164] Moreover, since we have an ode classified as an encomium with substantially more epinician content than *P*.4, we may wonder how serious the classification of these odes was in the first place. On this point, perhaps Harvey was right in believing that the production of editions superseded rigorous generic differentiation.[165]

Returning to the contemporary consensus that the ode is an as epinician, better evidence than the single mention of Arcesilaus' victory must be given to justify reading it as a victory ode. As we have seen, the boundaries between genres were porous, the compositions shared a considerable number of features, and interest in athletic victories was not exclusive to epinicia. In view of these findings, I suggest the failure of scholars to apply a more nuanced approach utilizing compositions of other genres to *P*.4 has perpetuated a mistaken conviction in the ode's epincian status.

---

[163] Budelmann 2012 explores the overlap in sympotic performance culture between encomia and epinicia. See also Cingano 2003, 37-40, 42-4 who warns against procrustean performance and genre restrictions in the study of the encomia. Cf. Morgan 2015, 113. The example of O.2/3 has long been viewed as the combination of a victory ode and festival song, see Krumman 2014 for the possible interrelationship of Pindaric poetry and cult.

[164] See Carey 2009, quoted in note 27 above.

[165] Note 138 supra.

Who Commissioned Pythian Four? Myth and the Suppression of Parallels

As we have seen, Gildersleeve—and nearly all scholars in his wake—accepted Demophilus at the commissioner of *P.4*. The choice to do so, however, demonstrates how in the dark we are on the problem of commission.

For no other ode is someone—let alone someone assumed to have been exiled by the man celebrated in the song—outside of the victor's family thought of as being the possible commissioner. Here we have already strained our traditional understanding of the commission model to its limits. This extension of commission's boundaries has been admitted on the grounds that so many features of *P*.4 are irregular and the plea is made for Demophilus. The only other option the traditional commission model has put forward, Arcesilaus, has failed to entice scholars since the concluding plea would be an odd feature for him to advocate, and the king had already apparently commissioned *Pythian* 5—a normal- to long-sized epincian.

While the double commission model does have a parallel in *Olympian* 2 and 3, which celebrate Theron the tyrant of Acragas, there is no denying that the ode takes an especially strong interest in the exiled Demophilus, and shows substantially less in the victory. Moreover, seeing Arecesilaus as commissioner weakens the force of the praise of his own dynasty and effectively nullifies its propagandistic value. As P.J. Finglass has trenchantly observed in the case of *Pythian* 11 "it would be fatal to [Pindar's] encomiastic intention to state or imply that his praises were insincere or untrue."[166] The same is true of propaganda. If Arcesilaus' subjects knew he had paid Pindar to write a song in praise of his rule, what propagandistic power would the ode have? Praise used as propaganda must at least appear to be sincere. So, then, of the two possible commissioners, Demophilus is the stronger choice.

---

[166] Finglass 2007, 113.

More problematic than the lack of parallels, the choice of having Demophilus as commissioner suppresses important features of the ode for the assumed conciliatory message to succeed. As we have seen, both Gildersleeve and Braswell categorically deny the notion that a parallel exists between the historical figures Demophilus and Arcesilaus and Jason and Pelias, the central characters of its myth. For these two scholars, the myth is designed purely to celebrate the Battiad kingship. Indeed, some scholars have even suggested that there is a parallel between Arcesilaus and Jason in Jason's exemplary virtue.[167] Reduced to its basic facts, the suggestiveness of the myth is difficult to deny. The narrative begins with the return of an exile to his home city, where the king that exiled him reigns (71-94). The exile's engagements with the king occupy the next 75 lines (94-169). An agreement is struck that offers the exile a nostos for his recovery of a fabled object in a distant land (150-169). The exile succeeds at the task through his virtue, cunning, and persuasive speech. The feat of recovering the object is largely glossed over and the narrative concludes with an apostrophe to the historical king, emphasizing how the exile brought back with him a partner who killed the king that exiled him (250).

Stripped of their flesh, the narrative's bones illustrate how difficult it is to retain the view that there is *no* parallel between the myth and historical circumstances in which they were narrated. While Gildersleeve was certainly right to reject Boeckh's suggestion that the ode was commenting directly on the events that transpired between the exile and the king, how reasonable is it to believe that no one in the audience, particularly the king, would pick up on the parallels in the story and have been especially jarred when Arcesilaus is called by name only to be reminded that Jason brought with him Medea, the slayer of Pelias?[168] ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτᾷ, τὰν Πελίαο φονόν (*P*.4.250). This hardly seems an effective way of encouraging the king to return the exile to his home land.

---

[167] On this view, see especially Robbins 1975 who attempts to connect the alleged etymology of the name Jason to Pindar's appeal for Arcesilaus to be a healer in line 271-2. The argument fails, however, to convincingly demonstrate how Jason is to be seen as a healer in the case of *P*.4 and does little to draw any convincing parallels between Jason and Arcesilaus beyond what Robbins thinks Pindar implies about Arcesilaus. More convincing attempts suggest Pindar's characterization represents a positive model for Arcesilaus to follow. See Giannini 1995. While this might generally be true, at each stage we see Jason's character emerge in his polite deference to more powerful rulers. It is hard to imagine how this would be an especially powerful illustration of proper behavior to the king of Cyrene, unless we assume that Pindar is alluding to the Battiads' submission to the Persian king. More likely no parallel to himself is to be seen in Arcesilaus' view of Jason.

We must admit that something more complex is transpiring here. Indeed, if, as is traditionally assumed, the commissioner had significant control over the creation of the ode, why would an exile hoping to curry favor with the king allow Pindar to compose an ode that dwells so extensively on Jason's engagements with Pelias at all—let alone remind him in an apostrophe that the returning exile brought with him the instrument of the king's death? Conversely, if the myth were Pindar's choice was he too blind to recognize that the narrative might discomfort the king and run the risk of destabilizing the repatriation plea? Surely a more flattering or, at least, less charged story could have been chosen if the ode were simply designed to recover the king's favor and flatter the dynasty.

What do We Know About the Ode's Historical Frame?

These problematic features of prevailing models on the ode should encourage us to reassess the historical evidence for the ode's composition. Simply put, what do we know for certain about the historical content of *P*.4?

---

[168] Fennell 1893, 185 believed: "Pindar must have felt confident that Arcesilaus' vanity would keep him blind to such an unflattering comparison." Though amusing, it is unlikely that anything approaching criticism would escape the notice of the king, particularly so when he is called by name in 250.

Despite prodigious efforts by modern scholars to attenuate the academic reliance on ancient biographies of the Greek poets, the often blatantly fabricated stories retain a surprisingly strong grasp on the scholarly imagination.[169] This is especially problematic in the case of Pindar, Simonides, and Bacchylides who stand in the wake of 23 centuries—or more—of conviction that they were greedy, mercenary poets. In the last section we saw how scholarly orthodoxy on *P*.4 is still dominated by these problematic scholiastic constructions. With an overview of the positive evidence, we will see how little outside of the poem we possess.

Pindar's Commission

As we have seen from our analysis of the commission model in *P*.4, there is no positive evidence for who commissioned the ode. On this issue we are completely in the dark. Assumptions of commission in *P*.4 stem from scholiast to line 467 (Heyne):

> ἀξιοῖ τὸν Πίνδαρον (τινὲς δὲ, ὅτι καὶ τὸν μισθὸν τοῦ ἐπινίκου δίδωσι τῷ Πινδάρῳ αὐτός) ὥστε τῇ τοῦ ἐπινίκου γραφῇ διαλλάξαι αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀρκεσίλαον.
>
> He (Demophilus) thought Pindar fitting (some say he himself supplied the commission to Pindar for the epinician) so as to reconcile himself to Arcesilaus through the composition of the epinician.

The parenthetical comment suggests that there was already disagreement in Alexandria over whether Demophilus commissioned the ode and emphatically reveals that there was no positive evidence for the state of *P*.4*'s* commission in antiquity. Moreover, the comment's lack of evidence for commission implies that ancient scholars simply assumed the poems were commissioned without having any independent evidence for it. This is deeply unsettling given the amount of scholarly energy that has been exerted to justify the view that Demophilus was commissioner of the ode. Perhaps more productively, we may question why we should retain a model for which there is so little evidence, and which may constrict the range of interpretations of *P*.4.

---

[169] The comically absurd inventions of ancient scholiasts are numerous. The passage quoted in note above offers a glimpse into the scenarios Alexandrians imagined lurking behind the odes, but emphatically illustrates how little information they had on the historical composition or social contexts of archaic poetry. See Lefkowitz 2012, 1-5 for an updated survey of the problem and its recent scholarly debate.

Demophilus the Exile

The only direct evidence we have for the relationship between Demophilus and Arcesilaus is what we see in *P*.4. The facts we glean from the ode tell us that the young man is in exile on mainland Greece and Arcesilaus has the power to restore him to his home. This minimalistic reading of the relationship is valuable to help challenge assumptions that are often taken as fact. Among these—and perhaps most influential—is the notion that Demophilus was exiled for participating in an aristocratic revolt against Arcesilaus. A scholiast provides us with the following details:

> ἐστασίασάν τινες ἐν τῇ Κυρήνῃ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀρκεσιλάου, βουλόμενοι αὐτὸν μεταστῆσαι τῆς ἀρχῆς· ὁ δὲ ἐπικρατέστερος αὐτῶν γενόμενος ἐφυγάδευσεν αὐτοὺς τῆς πατρίδος. ἐν τοῖς οὖν στασιώταις ἦν καὶ ὁ Δημόφιλος, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνάστατος γέγονε τῆς πατρίδος.[170]

> Certain men revolted in Cyrene during the reign of Arcesilaus hoping to overthrow the kingship. But he (Arcesilaus), gaining the upper hand over them, banished them from their homeland. Among these partisans was Demophilus, who himself became an exile.

While undeniably a possibility for how the youth found himself in exile, it is imperative for us to realize that there is no independent evidence to validate this claim. The scholiast references no ancient historian, nor any inscription or text, and appears to do little more than create a plausible backstory for the information in the ode. Despite its apparent virtues, without independent evidence, we should consider the possibility that the story is no less fictional than the patently false tales the scholia abound in. To be sure, given the limits on our knowledge we may be certain that we have fallen victim to plausible fictions in the scholia; we simply lack the data to falsify them.[171]

---

[170] Drachmann 1910, 162.

To explore an alternative illustrates the point. Given Pindar's description of Demophilus as a "youth among men" (*P.*4, 287), we may wonder how long he has been in exile. The impression we gather from Pindar is that Demophilus is no more than in his early twenties. If we are expected to think that he has been away long enough for the divisions to have healed, it would make Demophilus improbably young to have been an active partisan who posed a real threat to Arcesilaus at the time of his exile. Here we may easily imagine, for instance, that not Demophilus, but his father had been sent into exile along with his family. This would explain the king's possible receptiveness of the claim for repatriation if the request were not pre-arranged and offer a less dangerous opportunity for the king to illustrate his clemency than allowing an openly seditious partisan to return. In truth, we cannot know exactly how Demophilus found himself in exile. We should therefore not exclude any possibility too rashly nor accept any explanation too easily.

Demophilus and Pindar

We are on firmer ground believing that there was a significant connection between Demophilus and Pindar. Once again, the poem itself offers us the best evidence. Lines 277-97 and especially the closing sphragis 298-9 are exceptional in Pindaric poetry. The extended praise of the exile's character coupled with the comment in the closing lines that Pindar recently hosted Demophilus in Thebes are salient features of the narrative (297-9):

---

[171] W.S. Barrett sets the problem out well: "Apparent difficulties in Pindar lie often enough, as I have said, at the door not of Pindar himself but of our own ignorance: there is some fact, familiar to Pindar himself and his audience which has perished from human knowledge and without that fact in our minds, something simple and straightforward has become a mystery." Barrett 2007, 64-5.

> καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
> εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων,
> πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς. 299

> And he would tell, Arcesilaus, what a spring of ambrosial verses he found,
> recently hosted in Thebes.

The closing lines of the ode seem to offer us one of very few biographical details in the ancient poet's surviving work. While intra-poetic readings have recently challenged whether the passage contains any biographical information[172]—a possibility we must entertain—the uniqueness of the closing lines in the surviving corpus lends support for conviction in the sincerity of the passage. We will return to the intra-poetic reading later, but for the time being we may feel comfortable saying that a significant connection between Pindar and Demophilus existed; guest-friendship or otherwise.

This brief discussion has detailed what little we know for certain about events and relationships surrounding *P.*4. For a comprehensive reconstruction of the ode's historical background it is not encouraging. Indeed, to judge from the scholiastic comments we have explored, little evidence for the historical circumstances of the ode existed in Hellenistic antiquity beyond Arcesilaus' two surviving odes. This realization is simultaneously terrifying and liberating. To be sure, there is an alarmingly strong possibility that we have been misreading the ode. However, a positive outcome of this skepticism is that by attending to the paucity of evidence we possess we should feel encouraged to re-examine *P*.4 with fresh eyes, unfettered by long-standing assumptions.

---

[172] Sigelman 2016, 75 argues that the Thebes in the ode should be understood strictly as a metaphor for epinician poetry itself and has nothing to do with the geographical home of Pindar. She, however, provides no reasons to justify her position that: "It is highly doubtful—almost certainly impossible—that the historic Pindar was visited by the powerful noble Damophilos at Thebes."

Poetic Autonomy in *P*.4

As we have seen, Alexandrians were as nonplussed by the apparent aberration of *P*.4 in the epinician corpus as we are. Perhaps the perennial scholarly aporia toward the poem is a reflex of the commission model itself. What advantages to do we acquire by removing the commission model from *P*.4? What new views on the ode does this afford us?

Pindar the Peacemaker?

Freeing the poet from the shackles of the epinician commission model opens an astonishing range of possibilities for why the ode was composed. While financial gain is undeniably an incentive to perform any task, we may ask if Pindar were not paid, why would he compose the ode?

In an article discussing the politics and sociology of Greek lyric, Simon Hornblower explored a bevy of alternative motivations for poetic composition beyond the hope for pay. He trenchantly observes: "But if most known poets were members of the elite, the real distinction will not be between poets who needed money and those who did not. It will be that between poetry produced 'spontaneously' or on the poet's own initiative, and that commissioned by others. We also need to bear in mind such personal motives as friendship."[173] Following this line of thinking, Hornblower examines under-explored alternatives for poetic motivation such as political interest, patriotism, and friendship. To be sure, few would deny Pindar's elite status. By

---

[173] Hornblower 2007, 40-1.

Hornblower's logic, then, there is no reason we should exclude the possibility of "spontaneous" compositions by him. Even if we grant that some, or, indeed, most of the odes were commissioned for financial gain, nothing precludes the possibility that we possess 'spontaneous' compositions by a poet of the social and cultural status of Pindar.[174] Considering Hornblower's list of alternative incentives to compose, we may wonder whether any of these options resonate with what we have observed in the ode?

In the previous section we noted how the concluding plea of *P.*4 offers unparalleled advocacy for a figure external to the ambit of the victor's athletic triumph. This has encouraged generations of scholars to believe that Demophilus commissioned the ode. What if scholars were right in their detection of a special connection to the figure of Demophilus, but only mistaken in the assumption of commission? Could Pindar's relationship with Demophilus suggest an answer for why he composed the ode?

One of the aspects of seeing Demophilus as commissioner that has frustrated interpreters of the ode is the status of the concluding plea. This is especially problematic from an economic perspective. Thomas Cole calls attention to the point in his book on the komastic aspects of Pindaric poetry: "The commissioning of a work as elaborate and costly as *Pythian* Four becomes difficult to explain. It was either a very risky expense (if there were no guarantee that the plea would be successful) or a largely unnecessary one, if, as Gildersleeve and others have argued, the granting of Damophilus' request was already prearranged by the time of the poem's performance)."[175] Considering the weight placed on the expense of the ode by scholars like

---

[174] On this point, Herodotus 7. 228 offers valuable insight. The passage records an epitaph for the seer Megistias, which Herodotus claims the traditionally avaricious poet Simonides personally paid for because of his close friendship with the fallen soldier.

[175] Cole 1992, 125, n.18.

Gildersleeve and Braswell, Cole's observation is particularly challenging.

Seeing the ode as the creation of an autonomous poet, or a "spontaneous' composition as Hornblower would have it, alleviates this conflict. If Pindar were motivated to compose the exceptionally long ode *pro bono* for the betterment of a friend, Demophilus would run no financial risk if the request failed, and Pindar would have no expectations of payment. This view also offers the additional benefit that if the plea were successful, it would not be unthinkable that the exile might reward him for his good faith and generosity. This may provide additional incentive to advocate for his friend.

The opposite view is harder to imagine. If the repatriation deal were pre-arranged as Braswell and Gildersleeve posit, Pindar's interest in the situation is difficult to explain without financial incentive; especially since, as we have seen, the commission model is essential to explain the length of the ode in Braswell and Gildsersleeve's hypothesis of a pre-arranged repatriation deal. On this view, the price is meant to please the king through the exile's lavish spending. Of the two options, an unexpected plea for repatriation works better in the "spontaneous" composition model than the pre-arrangement hypothesis. Continuing this line of thought, does the ode offer additional support for the notion of an active repatriation plea?

A Structured Argument?

Wilamowitz's puzzlement at the structure of *P.4* as a "seltsames Gebilde, chimaerahaft"[176] is among the most quoted passages in scholarship on the ode. Indeed, the scholarly conviction that Pythian Four features the most disjointed content of any surviving ode is among the few points on which most scholars concur. While there are patently differences in the ode's contents, is it possible to see these seemingly disparate pieces as forming a more cogent whole? Specifically, if the ode is making an authentic plea for the repatriation of the exile can we view the other sections as supporting the final proposition?

---

[176] Wilamowitz 1922, 392.

The first roughly seventy lines of *P*.4 offer the easiest material to interpret and form a clear unit. The content of the first section is undeniably propagandistic for the ruling dynasty, but, beyond the general agreement on its content, few scholars have questioned what purpose the propaganda serves in the broader context of the ode. To better appreciate this problem, an overview of the passage is in order. After an exceptionally brief exordium, with remarkable alacrity, the poet transports his narrative backwards in time through the landmark events of the dynasty's foundation until he reaches a first-person prophecy set in the heroic age, narrated by Medea on the Argo's return journey from Colchis. Medea's narrative foretells the foundation of the Battiad house by way of the colonization of Thera and roots the events in an—until then— unappreciated prophetic land-grant between a mysterious divinity and the Argonaut Euphemus, the founder of the Battiad line. In an astonishingly precise ring structure we see how past events presage later events and later events confirm the past.

In no other royal ode do we see the poet exerting such remarkable interest in conferring legitimacy on the ruling house. To be sure, a standard feature of epinician or encomium generally is to acknowledge the virtue and dignity of the victor or celebrant, but the extent to which the poet actively engages in legitimating Battiad rule through divine sanction is unprecedented and problematic. What purpose could this serve in a poem designed to secure an exile's return?

Looking to the concluding plea affords us a possibility. If Demophilus found himself in exile for defiance of the king—and especially so if he actively participated in an open revolt against him—the legitimacy of the dynasty to rule would have been at the heart of the conflict. By exerting such emphatic support for the ruling house in an ode that will end with a request for the exile's return, Pindar effaces a key reason for denying the exile's homecoming. On this view, Pindar—and by extension Demophilus—asserts the legitimacy of the Battiad kingship to quell the potential challenge that the exile is still openly seditious. In Pindar's narration, the Battiads rule in Cyrene by divine favor. This is a point that is confirmed from the heroic period, down through the foundation of the city, and in turn this support continues to the time of the performance in the realization of Arcesilaus' Pythian chariot victory. Therefore, aside from the political consequences, to resist the Euphemids would be an unwise affront to divine will—a point the exile has learned through his suffering. Indeed, as Richmond Lattimore has observed of the poem's conclusion: "In their quarrel the power lay with Arcesilas, but perhaps not the right. His very virtues might lead him astray, since new glories lift a man's hopes to dare beyond his strength. Arcesilas must prove that his undoubted splendors were more than show; he must realize mature judgment in healing the city and above all, since the danger was imminent and deadly, he must not give way to the procrastination that haunted the destiny of Cyrene. There is an undertone of terrible urgency near the close. But Pindar must not argue too much; and before he comes to that at the end, he can set the example of wisdom and temperance, together with reckless valor, before his listeners through the shining myth of Jason."[177] In other words, for Lattimore, at least, the poem builds its case to capitalize on its central themes in its concluding plea. There was, however, no guarantee the king would accept it. Turning next to the myth, can we detect messages that alter the reception of the plea?

---

[177] Lattimore 1948, 23.

Beyond Nostos: Parallels and Paraenesis

As we have seen, the advocacy of Demophilus as commissioner required us to ignore prima facie parallels between the myth and historical figures. Can we keep these parallels without them being an openly insulting insinuation for the king? Readers of royal odes have long noted the strikingly negative myths they contain.[178] This is an especially pointed comparison when tyrannical myths are viewed against the myths in, for instance, epinicia for Aeginetan youths. Thomas Cole's observation that "The typical "royal" myth concentrates attention on the point or moment of greatest challenge to the monarchy and in the event the challenge is successfully resisted, greatest opportunity as well"[179] is instructive for rethinking the way myth in royal compositions functioned. For kings, at least, the poet assumes a more actively admonitory persona. Kathryn Morgan has recently expanded on Cole's view in her study of Pindar's odes for Hieron: "In all the odes the monarch's good fortune is counterbalanced by the potential for spectacular disaster, a threat that is expressed in a 'tyrannical mythology' whereby a hero (or heroine) from the past enjoys unusual closeness with a god or gods, only to bring ruin on himself or herself by failing to manage that closeness appropriately. These negative exemplars emphasize the dangers against which Hieron must protect himself by self-knowledge and prudent counsel."[180] This view offers manifold opportunities for alternative readings of *P.4*'s Argonautic myth.

---

[178] Tantalos' transgressions and punishment in *O.*1, Typhon in *P.*1, and Ixion in *P.*2 are the most conspicuous villains in royal ode. The negative exemplum of Ixion in particular is a point of special emphasis in the narrative of *P.*2.21-5. Some scholars include *P.* 3's representation of Koronis in this list; however, the precise sin she commits–having sex with a mortal while pregnant with Asclepius—seems an odd transgression to put on par with the others—especially so when her pregnancy was conceived in Apollo's rape of her. Bacchylides' myths in royal odes offer a somewhat more problematic situation. Certainly, Croesus's situation in Bacchylides 3 must have been somewhat alarming to a tyrant like Hieron, but the emphatic statement that Croesus's kindness and gentle nature procured his salvation offsets whatever discomforts the king's fall created. Similarly, while the myth of ode 5 is not openly negative, the insinuation that Heracles' encounter with Meleager in the underworld will bring about his own death is heavily suggested in the closing lines.

[179] Cole 1992, 127.

Despite Gildersleeve's objections to Boeckh's simple parallels between the myth and historical circumstances, is it possible to respect the obvious parallelism without seeing an implied threat or insult to the king? Read as a paraenetic exemplum of a failure in kingship, the poet's exceptional interest in exchanges between the exiled Jason and ruling king Pelias (occupying roughly 100 lines of the narrative) and comparative brevity in detailing the major events of the Argonautic adventure make better sense. It is the way Pelias handles the return of the exile that is of interest to the ruling king of Cyrene. If his decision on repatriation was not pre-arranged, or at least not concluded, Arcesilaus was in a parallel crisis of kingship to the one Pelias finds himself in at the beginning of the myth— a man is requesting a return whom the king had forced out of the country. Pelias' decision is to send him on a seemingly impossible mission from which the king clearly expects the exiled Jason will not return. Jason, however, is successful. Pindar emphasizes that Jason's virtue has secured the favor of the gods, and through their advocacy and support he is able to succeed and return again to Iolcus. Unsurprisingly, Pindar offers few details on Medea's regicide of Pelias, but Pindar's apostrophe to the king at line 250 strongly insinuates that the king's downfall comes as a direct consequence of his scheme to defer Jason's return. On this reading, it is important for the king to recognize that Pelias has made the wrong choice. If Arcesilaus is actively considering Demophilus' recall, the myth emphatically urges him to not prolong the exile's suffering but welcome him home under his own terms lest the exile find a nostos under different circumstances.[181]

Pleading for Demophilus

---

[180] Morgan 2015, 2.

[181] Cf. Lattimore 1948.

Having explored the major themes of the ode under the hypothesis that Pindar composed *P*.4 by his own initiative, we may now ask how we should read the concluding plea for Demophilus if it is not simply cloaked praise of the Battiads?

The parallelism between earlier sections of the ode and its concluding plea have largely gone unnoticed. Lines 256-62 tie the myth with the opening section's prophecy of Medea. Indeed, if we were to place Medea's dramatic speech in the myth's narration it would fall in this section. The theme of the passage, too, recalls the earlier passage by again emphasizing the Battiads' descent from the Argonautic mission.

The following passage offering the king a riddle (263-9) shares points of interest with Jason's status in the Argonautic myth (263-9):

γάρ τις ὄζους ὀξυτόμῳ πελέκειἐξ
ερείψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύ
νοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος,
καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ' αὐτᾶς, 265
εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται λοίσθιον,
ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κιόνεσσιν
δεσποσύναισιν ἐρειδομένα
μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφέπει δύστανον ἐν τείχεσιν,
ἑὸν ἐρημώσαισα χῶρον.

But if someone with a sharp bladed axe should strip the boughs from a great oak tree and ruin its splendid appearance, although it cannot bear foliage it gives an account of itself if ever it comes at last to a winter's fire, or if, supported by upright columns belonging to a master, it performs a wretched labor within alien walls, having left its own place desolate.
(Trans. Race)

Ancient scholiasts noted that the oak of the parable is meant to correspond with Demophilus.[182] The severed oak, removed from its home is either destroyed (burned), or finds a wretched service under a new master's authority. Braswell offers interesting insight on the riddle: "Those who enjoy speculation are free to see in the parable Demophilus' having taken employment in the service of another ruler as, e.g. a mercenary subaltern, an assumption which could be made to fit vv. 265 and 267. I merely mention this in the hope that no one may be tempted to propose it as his latest discovery."[183] Braswell's criticism of speculation on the historical circumstances may overlook a more convincing possibility. Seen not as a comment on Demophilus' historical actions, but instead as a range of possibilities for a man in exile, the passage dovetails with the myth. On this reading, the suggestion that a man remaining in exile too long may find himself in the service of another suggests Jason's toils for Aeëtes. The completion of these tasks ultimately allows Jason to return to Iolcus successfully where he will bring about Pelias' death through his foreign marriage to Medea. If Braswell is right in detecting mercenary service in the riddle, it is not unthinkable that the suggestion takes on a dark shading in the wake of the myth's conclusion.

The following passage, however, straightforwardly rejects this dark alternative by cajoling the king to act as a healer to a wounded city and recognizing that it is easier to disrupt a city than it is to repair one. Pindar then quickly segues to his plea for the exile. In Pindar's characterization, like Jason, Demophilus is a virtuous, well spoken, and well-tempered youth. He would be a credit to his city. Neither harming anyone or causing trouble, he would participate in Cyrenaean symposia and sing songs he had learned in Thebes. Seen as a tightly constructed argument, the conclusion capitalizes on the major themes of the ode and paints the exile as a benign figure in his home city; more likely to be harmed than cause harm to anyone.

---

[182] Drachmann 1910, 163.

[183] Braswell 1988, 361.

Intentional and Unintentional Uncertainties

Even with this alternative reading, we must concede that many aspects of the ode's composition will forever remain obscured by the passage of time. As we have seen, the text provides us with the best information for what transpired between the poet, the king, and the exile, but the immediacy of the concerns it addresses assumes a familiarity with the circumstances that scholars observing the ode at such a vast distance in time simply cannot reconstruct. On this view, we must be especially cautious and open about where we are forced to reconstruct the historical background and how this effects our interpretations.

Contexts of Composition and Performance

As we have seen from our discussion of the historical facts, no direct evidence exists for how the ode came to exist. As such, while prevailing theories on commission and the social dynamic between poet and patron have been used to fill the gaps in our knowledge, these assumptions have often completely rejected the possibility that any motivation beyond financial gain could have compelled an epinician poet to compose poetry for athletic victors. This is a problematically monolithic approach to such a complicated corpus of poems.

Employing a modern analogy may help illustrate the potential fallacy behind this assumption. In American culture, at least, attorneys—and especially defense attorneys—are commonly characterized in a similarly greedy, self-interested way to how the ancients represented the epinician poets. The reductionist view that all lawyers are only working for profit belies the complexities of the actual motivations for which an attorney advocates a case. Personal interest either in the client or the legal stakes of the client's case may inspire a lawyer or firm to work *pro bono*. A friend, or friend of a friend, may ask the attorney a favor to plead a case. A firm may be kept on retainer for a high-powered client. A lawyer may serve as a court appointed assigned council. Or, indeed, some lawyers may be simply plying their trade for personal financial gain. If in the future the circumstances of how a lawyer took a case were lost, and only the contemporary cultural representations of them survived, we may well expect that the assumption of greed and financial motivation would be applied to answer how cases were contracted, but this assumption would be mistaken in many instances.

This is precisely the mistake we may be making with our understanding of epinician poets. To be sure, there is *a possibility* that the ode was commissioned for a profit, as Gildersleeve suggested—it is not inevitable from our information about it. Moreover, this possibility does not demand that there was no other mechanism by which an ode came into being. To deny the possibility entirely ensures that we fall victim, at least some of the time, to the all lawyers/poets are greedy syllogism fallacy.

The status of the repatriation plea, too, has suffered from a similar series of assumptions about the authority of epinician poets. We have observed how the common view has divested the poet of independent authority. This position is not entirely consistent with the ancient representation of Pindar. Indeed, to judge from ancient testimonia and quotations of his work, Pindar enjoyed not only a privileged cultural status, but was also revered as an intellectual authority in the generations after his death.[184] This may suggest that the poet wielded more power than traditionally assumed. To treat the poet's servility as a fact—when it is anything but—suppresses this complex tradition. Here again, we are pressed against the limits of our knowledge: a staggeringly broad range of possibilities exists between propagandist and political partisan.[185]

---

[184] Herodotus 3.38, for example, uses a Pindaric fragment as an authority for the concept of cultural relativity. Plato, too, frequently quotes Pindar as a source for intellectual concepts—especially for views on kingship and good rule; for which, see Hornblower 2006, 160-2.

Similar caution is required in the analyses of *P*.4's myth. We cannot know what Pindar crafted the myth to accomplish. In the case of generically uncomplicated epinicia—which *P*.4 is not—the myth features a positive narrative to illustrate mythical successes, virtues, or exempla.[186] Yet, these too commonly include somber warnings to the victorious athlete. While the content of these admonishments is often dismissed as generic filler, to deny the possibility that the poet can seriously apply admonishment, paraenesis, or warnings runs the risk of oversimplifying the rhetorical force of these devices and simultaneously ignoring the poet's cultural authority. Although these messages may look like hackneyed adages to our eyes—and often they are—we may observe that a surprising number of people in our own cultural milieu find resonance in platitudes. Why should Pindar's audience not have felt the same way?

This is important for our reading of the myth since from Gildersleeve on there has been a strong impetus to reject parallels between the myth and historical circumstances of *P*.4 on the grounds that a challenging message in the myth was beyond the purview of an epinician poet. Yet, seen not as an entirely unique phenomenon, but instead as a mythic instantiation of admonishment, we may be encouraged to appreciate these parallels less as 'monsterous' insinuation and more as a valid warning. Given the limited information we possess, both readings are permissible. Therefore, by realizing how much knowledge we have lost about every stage of the production of a Pindaric ode, we should be encouraged to explore a range of possibilities for the problems we face in the interpretation of the poem rather than suppress valid alternatives.

---

[185] Cole 1992, 134 sets out the problem in the following terms: "Pessimism applies not only to the content of Pindaric messages, but to their provenance as well. It is virtually impossible to know, in any given situation, how far Pindar was working on his own initiative and how far he was simply a spokesman for his patrons. The spectrum of possibilities here is discouragingly large."

[186] For the complex engagements between Pindaric myths and their social contexts, see Köhnken 1971.

Intentional Ambiguities?

The uncertainties surrounding the historical performance of the ode alert us to another important possibility. While we may observe the formal features of any given ode and the language and rhetoric the poet employs, we cannot know their intended force. Specifically, we cannot know which ambiguities in the text stem from the loss of relevant historical data and which were designed to be intentionally provocative and ambiguous. Indeed, deliberate application of ambiguity in speech is specifically cited by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* as a potent tool at the rhetorician's disposal. Aristotle says this is especially true of the deployment of fables and myth: "Fables are useful for public speaking, and they have this advantage that, while it is difficult to find things that have really happened in the past, it is easier to invent fables; for they must be invented like comparisons if a man is capable of seizing the analogy."[187]

The capacity of individuals to grasp the content of material seems to figure largely in lyric rhetoric. Concluding an ode to Hieron, Bacchylides calls attention to the rift between understanding and ignorance proclaiming Φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω, "I sing things comprehensible to a thinking man" (Bacch. 3.85).[188] In Jason's second address to Pelias, the exiled hero uses a strikingly similar formulation, εἰδότι τοι ἐρέω, (*P*.4.143) "I'm speaking to you as someone who understands." Given the phrase's common use in epinician outside of mythic content, it is possible that Pindar designed this line, which is followed by Jason's terms for his return, to cut through the mythic veil and resonate with the audience hearing it. However, our ignorance of so many details obfuscates the full force of the line and its reception. It may well be that the reception was designed to be ambiguous, so as to avoid pressing the parallel with Pelias too hard and embedding a certain distance and deniability for the poet. Similarly, if the arrangement were already agreed upon as Gildersleeve and Braswell contended, the line may simply offer a wink to the audience about what is going on. The full impact of the line cannot be known, but we should be sensitive to the possibility that poet uses and exploits ambiguities in narrative and context to suit his personal interests.

---

[187] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.20.7.

[188] See Braswell 1988, 227 for a survey of the uses of the phrase. Cf. *P*.5.108, and Bacch. 3.85 quoted above.

*

Having explored the prevailing views on *P*.4 and their limitations in solving longstanding problems, it should be clear that the constricting opinions of some scholars too easily reject alternative possibilities for the composition and content of *P*.4 while unsatisfactorily explaining important features of the ode. To be sure, while prevailing opinions remain a potent possibility for interpretation, I have argued that we should not be too wedded to dogmatic assumptions; especially when they are often predicated on scholiastic material of dubious reliability. Additionally, I have briefly sketched out possible explanations and advantages of the hypothesis that Pindar was operating on his own volition. Considering 'spontaneous' composition of *P*.4 as a serious explanation of its irregularity, I would now like to flesh out how this reading works on different narrative levels of the ode.

III

SPEAKING TO THE POWERFUL: THE POET'S VOICE

In the last chapter we explored the interpretive challenges facing traditional readings of *P*.4. Through our examination, we saw how the imposition of generic models may constrict or even distort our understanding of the poem. This led us to entertain the previously unexamined hypothesis that Pindar composed the poem independent of the constraints of commission. Initially, we saw how this new reading offered us some potential solutions to long-standing problems, but we also acknowledge that it is was not without its own challenges. Chief among which is the question of authority. We may wonder how Pindar, a Theban poet, could address politically powerful individuals from all over the Greek world in an independent, assertive tone without fearing reprisal or alienation from the inter-polital community of elites. To examine the strategies Pindar employs in *P*.4 to confront potential challenges to his own authority, we may first ask how Greek poets of the archaic and early classical period accomplished this task more generally. What tools were at the poet's disposal to assert their views?

Inherited Poetics of Authority

Independent, politically-minded Greek poets are well represented in the surviving corpus of archaic poetry. While the extant poems and fragments offer a wide array of options for how Greek poets represented themselves and their poetic projects to the larger community, I would like to narrow our discussion to those with the strongest parallels to *P*.4.

Elegaic exhortation offers us one possibility for poetic authority. From the surviving corpus of Tyrtaeus and Callinus we can observe that, like gods addressing mortals in epic, exhortationists commonly appear to castigate their audience. So Callinus 1 (1-4):

μέχρις τέο κατάκεισθε; κότ' ἄλκιμον ἕξετε θυμόν, 1
ὦ νέοι; οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας
ὧδε λίην μεθιέντες; ἐν εἰρήνηι δὲ δοκεῖτε
ἧσθαι, ἀτὰρ πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει

> How long are you going to sit there? When will you take hold of a brave heart, young men? Do you not feel shame before your neighbors, being so dismissive as you are? You think you are relaxing in peace, but war seizes hold on the entire land.[189]

The ideological appropriation of exhortation elegy has been well explored.[190] On traditional views, the poet issues his dicta from a position of authority, occupying either a superior military post, as was claimed for Tyrtaeus, or a powerful political position. Challenging traditional readings that martial elegy is inextricably bound to the battlefield, Ewen Bowie has emphasized the role martial poetry played in constructing a sympotic environment which promoted bravery in symposiasts through martial themes.[191]

The adjustment shifts our view on the relationship between the poet and his addressees. Instead of being the harsh imperatives of a social superior, the poems instead may represent the forceful exertions of a sympotic equal, who, although assuming an imperious tone, may be included in the group exhorted.[192] In this way, it was the context of the performance vests in the poet the authority to assume a superior persona, not his social standing.[193] While we should not rule out the possibility that some poets were, in fact, social superiors to their intended audience, this need not be a requirement for the use of the aggressive exhortatative persona. Bowie's observation offers us a valuable alternative considering the uncertainty about the biographies of early poets.[194] Removing the need for biographical reconstructions of the early exhortationists, we may see our first possibility for how a poet addresses the powerful: the social context is constitutive of poetic authority.

---

[189] Text numerations are based on West's edition of the fragments of elegy and iambic.

[190] See Latacz 1977, 1-20 for a discussion of exhortation elegy, its battlefield applications, and relationship to epic. Nagy 1990a, 270 emphasizes the pan-Hellenism inherent in many of the surviving odes of Tyrtaeus. Traditional readings have seen an inherent tension between 'elite' and 'middling' authors, arguing that poetry like Tyrtaeus' was that of the rank and file which helped create an egalitarian environment which would eventually culminate in democracy, while the Homeric heroes embodied the receding elite mentality (especially Nagy 1990a, Morris 1996, 30). This view, however, is challenged by Irwin 2005 (especially 57-62), who casts doubt on the co-extensivity of the development of the polis and emergence of exhortation elegy.

[191] Bowie 1990, 221-30.

The reception of exhortation rhetoric in the surviving poetry of the 6th century Athenian statesman Solon affords us further evidence for how poets crafted their authority. Recently, Elizabeth Irwin has argued that Solon appropriated elements of exhortation elegy in his *Eunomia*

---

[192] Externalization of internal thought seems to have been a commonplace in Homeric poetry. Snell 1953 argued that the Homeric Greeks lacked the concept of self entirely from the lack of vocabulary for "self" in Homer. See Pelliccia 1995, 17. n.19, for an analysis of Snell's view and weakenss of of it, and 136-46 for an overview of the speech capacities of the organs. Fränkel 1975, 75-85 sees the 1st person as representative of the cloven Homeric self, followed and elaborated on by Slings, 1990. Though not an exact parallel, it may offer a conceptual frame-work for how the speaker may be included in the group of addressees and blunt some of the force of the censure. Along these lines, Irwin 2005, 35-62 has argued that the poetry played an important role in creating a cohesive group identity for elites by casting sympotiasts as Homeric heroes through the use of exhortation formed especially on Iliadic models.

[193] The source of authority for exhortation elegy seems to have been a problem for the ancients. This is especially clear in the case of Tyrtaeus. Plato, *Laws*, 1.629a-b, scholiast ad loc Lycurg. *In Leoc*. 106, Diod. Sic. 8.27.1-2 offer the story of Tyrtaeus the hobbled Athenian school teacher, sought out and made a general by the Spartans at the behest of the Delphic oracle. While this tradition resolves questions about how the poet might speak to Spartan soldiers forcefully, there is ample reason to be suspicious. As Lefkowitz 2012, 40 has shown, the story seems largely designed to write the Athenians into the early Spartan tradition, or even allow them to claim some responsibility for Spartan military success. Moreover, Spartans of the classical period seem to have been allergic to the notion that Sparta was a place of artistic culture in earlier periods. (See Cartledge 2001, 42-4, and Cartledge 2002, 88-112 who discusses the archaeological evidence for Sparta' early investment in the arts. He attributes the re-working of archaic Spartan history in the Classical period to the "Spartan Mirage", or notion that Sparta was historically unchanged from the earliest period down to the Classical.) In a similar vein to Tyrtaeus, traditions developed about the poet Alcman claiming he was a Lydian based on a single fragment despite a total lack of evidence otherwise (Lefkowitz 2012, 38-9).

[194] Lefkowitz 2012, 2-5 on the problems of biographical reconstructions stemming from scholiastic comments on the lives of ancient Greek poets.

(frg.4).[195] Relying in part on the inherited generic authority of exhortation, Solon asserts his role as educator to the city (frg.4.30-9):

ταῦτα διδάξαι θυμὸς Ἀθηναίους με κελεύει,
    ὡς κακὰ πλεῖστα πόλει Δυσνομίη παρέχει·
Εὐνομίη δ' εὔκοσμα καὶ ἄρτια πάντ' ἀποφαίνει,
    καὶ θαμὰ τοῖς ἀδίκοις ἀμφιτίθησι πέδας·
τραχέα λειαίνει, παύει κόρον, ὕβριν ἀμαυροῖ,
    αὑαίνει δ' ἄτης ἄνθεα φυόμενα,
εὐθύνει δὲ δίκας σκολιάς, ὑπερήφανά τ' ἔργα
    πραΰνει· παύει δ' ἔργα διχοστασίης,
παύει δ' ἀργαλέης ἔριδος χόλον, ἔστι δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς
    πάντα κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἄρτια καὶ πινυτά.

> My heart commands me to teach the Athenians these things: that Bad Rule supplies the greatest evils to a city, while Good Rule reveals order and all things perfectly fitting, and it often girds shackles around the unjust, polishes off harshness, ends excess, shades arrogance, withers growing sprouts of confusion, straightens crooked judgments, mitigates arrogant deeds; it ends deeds of dissension, and ends the anger of vexatious strife. It is under her that all things are fitting and wise among men.

Solon's statement that his "heart compels him to instruct the Athenians" at line 30 is of special importance.[196] Solon was famous in antiquity for being one of the canonical "Seven Sages."[197] To judge from the paltry fragments of this variously comprised group of archaic wise men, their work circulated primarily as poetic gnomai.[198] Solon is the only figure consistently named among the Seven who left a substantial corpus of poetry, and he may have served as the archetype for later development of the group's mythos. While we may expect Solon's poetic authority to stem from his political position, it is worth considering that Solon chose to engage in Athenian politics through poetry because of its inherited authority. On this view, Plato's account of Solon's poetic skill, emphasizing how his political activity was a detriment to his poetic output, is insightful (*Tim.*21B1- 21D3):

---

[195] Irwin 2005, 57-66.

[196] For discussion of the poem in relation to Solon's political career, see Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010, 220-1. Lloyd-Jones 1983, 44, and Mülke 2002, 243, have argued that the poet's authority in this passage stems from the Muse's inspiration. Nousia-Fantuzzi, however, contends that the poem's representation of the city's Dysnomia is not intended to be an excoriation in the same way early exhortation rhetoric frames similar content, but instead should be viewed as a confession framed around the poet's *thumos* compelling him to speak on behalf of Eunomia. While I agree that the rhetoric does effectively cast the material as a confession, I find the implicit assumption that Solon's political position is the source of his authority to speak problematic, since we do not know what period of the author's life the fragment comes from: Solon may very well have composed poetry before he engaged in politics, and drawn on multiple sources of authority to convey his point.

[197] Plato's *Protagoras* 342e–343b is the locus classicus for the Seven Sages and shapes the reception of the figures around their gnomological output. The historisticy of the Seven Sages is a deeply problematic issue. For a skeptical view, see Fehling 1985, who believed the group to be an invention of Plato's. Herodotus' reticence on the Seven Sages as a collective suggests that they may not have been thought of as a unit at his time, though many are peppered throughout his text. See Kurke 2011, 95-124, however for the alternate view that the Seven Sages were an example of the wisdom culture before philosophy.

> "Now the day was that of the Apaturia which is called the Registration of Youth, at which, according to custom, our parents gave prizes for recitations, and the poems of several poets were recited by us boys, and many of us sang the poems of Solon, which at that time had not gone out of fashion. One of our tribe, either because he thought so or to please Critias, said that in his judgment Solon was not only the wisest of men, but also the noblest of poets. The old man, as I very well remember, brightened up at hearing this and said, smiling: Yes, Amynander, if Solon had only, like other poets, made poetry the business of his life, and had completed the tale which he brought with him from Egypt, and had not been compelled, by reason of the factions and troubles which he found stirring in his own country when he came home, to attend to other matters, in my opinion he would have been as famous as Homer or Hesiod, or any poet."[199]

Plato's representation of the status of Solon's poetry alerts us to a significant shift of perspective. As Critias' kinsman,[200] we may expect Plato is having his character exalt the poetry of the Athenian statesman from personal interest, yet frequent allusions and quotations of the author in 4th century literature suggest that Solon was still actively read and admired in Plato's lifetime.[201] Though the importance of Solon’s works to the cultural identity of the Athenian Democracy—especially after its restoration following the tyranny of the 30—must partly explain his poetry’s survival, its literary merits must have played a considerable part in its continued popularity also.[202] Indeed, this is the point Critias emphasizes; if Solon had been more interested in an *ars gratia artis* approach to poetry, his works would be as famous as the greatest Greek poets. Considering the implications of the fact that Solon’s poetry was enjoyed and appreciated as poetry, it may be possible to shift our view on his literary output; perhaps we may view him as a cultured elite poet who was also involved in politics and used his skill to political ends.[203] This vantage point helps demonstrate the special importance of Solon’s didactic self-representation.

---

[198] Diogenes Laertius offers the fullest treatment of the group from antiquity, though he wrote at a distance of over 500 years from the archaic wise-men.

[199] Trans. Jowett with modification.

[200] There is an important additional layer of meaning in this passage. Not only was Critias an admirer of his ancestor's poetry, but he was himself a poet. From the surviving fragements of his elegies, he exhibits a clear preference for the Spartan sympotic culture of the *syssitia,* and the Spartan ethos generally. For the connections between Critias' poetry and poltical program, see Iannucci 2002, who believes Critias' brutal involvement in the tyranny of the Thirty at Athens influenced an ancient and modern scholarly neglect of his poetry. His poetry was not limited to elegy. Centanni 1997 collects Critias' tragic fragements and offers a compelling case for seeing his tragedies as politically motivated. Bultrighini 1999 offers further support for the political reading of the poems and contextulizes Critias' work and thought in late 5th century anti-democratic reactionary thought.

Looking to the fragments of the pre-Socratics, we see how their intellectual self-representation is formed along similar lines. Xenophanes, for example, claims his poetic edification offers the community a public good vastly outstripping the contributions of athletes or other public heroes:

ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν νίκην τις ἄροιτο
    ἢ πενταθλεύων, ἔνθα Διὸς τέμενος
πὰρ Πίσαο ῥοῇς ἐν Ὀλυμπίηι, εἴτε παλαίων
    ἢ καὶ πυκτοσύνην ἀλγινόεσσαν ἔχων
εἴτε τὸ δεινὸν ἄεθλον ὃ παγκράτιον καλέουσιν,
    ἀστοῖσίν κ' εἴη κυδρότερος προσορᾶν,
καί κε προεδρίην φανερὴν ἐν ἀγῶσιν ἄροιτο,
    καί κεν σῖτ' εἴη δημοσίων κτεάνων
ἐκ πόλεως, καὶ δῶρον ὅ οἱ κειμήλιον εἴη –

---

[201] In fact, most of our fragments of Solon’s poetry come from quotations of his work imbedded in texts from the 4th century. Our extended fragment of the *Eunomia*, cited above, is among these. This text is imbedded in Demosthenes’ *On the Embassy*, and as some scholars have noted the incomplete quotation of the work in Demonsthenes’ speech suggests that the text was well enough known to his audience that they would have known the parts he omits.

[202] For his continued importance and reception, see Aloni and Iannucci, 2016.

[203] While this approach has been a commonplace in studies on other archaic poets for generations, the biographical tradition of Solon, making him a proto-democrat and paving the way for Athenian democracy has obscured or even eclipsed the fact that he was a poet of any merit. The problems with this tradition are manifold, see Mülke 2002, 9-22, Irwin 2005, Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010, Lekowitz 2012. The works of Alceaus offer us a close parallel for the elite citizen choosing to engage in politics through poetry. See Page 1959, 149-242 and Rösler 1982, 26-37.

εἴτε καὶ ἵπποισιν· ταῦτά κε πάντα λάχοι,
οὐκ ἐὼν ἄξιος ὥσπερ ἐγώ· ῥώμης γὰρ ἀμείνων
ἀνδρῶν ἠδ' ἵππων ἡμετέρη σοφίη.
ἀλλ' εἰκῆι μάλα τοῦτο νομίζεται, οὐδὲ δίκαιον
προκρίνειν ῥώμην τῆς ἀγαθῆς σοφίης·
οὔτε γὰρ εἰ πύκτης ἀγαθὸς λαοῖσι μετείη
οὔτ' εἰ πενταθλεῖν οὔτε παλαισμοσύνην,
οὐδὲ μὲν εἰ ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν, τόπερ ἐστὶ πρότιμον,
ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει,
τούνεκεν ἂν δὴ μᾶλλον ἐν εὐνομίηι πόλις εἴη·
σμικρὸν δ' ἄν τι πόλει χάρμα γένοιτ' ἐπὶ τῶι,
εἴ τις ἀεθλεύων νικῶι Πίσαο παρ' ὄχθας·
οὐ γὰρ πιαίνει ταῦτα μυχοὺς πόλεως.

> But if someone were to gain a victory by the swiftness of his feet or in the pentathlon where there is the precinct of Zeus by Pisa’s stream in Olympia, or in wrestling or engaging in painful boxing or in that contest which they call the pankration, he would have greater renown (than others) in the eyes of his townsmen, he would gain a conspicuous front seat at the games, he would have food from the public store granted by the city, and a gift which would be a treasure for him—or if (he were to gain a victory) even with his horses, he would obtain all these although he is not as deserving as I. For my expertise is better than the strength of men or horses. But this custom is quite irrational and it not right to give strength precedence over good expertise. For neither if there were a good boxer among the people nor one good at the pentathlon in wrestling or again in the swiftness of his feet, the most honored of the deeds of human strength I the contest, would there for that reason be better order in the city. Little would be the city‘s joy, if one were to win while contending by the banks of Pisa; for this does not fatten the city’s treasury.[204]

The Colophonian poet demonstrates how athletes receive public acclaim, praise, and other benefits for their success despite the fact that their accomplishments are egocentric. Their successes fail to improve their city or the people living in it, and may even inspire hubris in those flushed with success. Wise poets, by contrast, actively work to improve their city and its citizens. In Xenophanes’ representation, poetry’s capacity to edify and inculcate civic virtue is key to the aim:[205] it can shape good citizens like nothing else. While our fragment leaves the question of how the poet himself becomes wise unanswered, the general undervaluation of the poetic contribution Xenophanes perceives justifies his frustrated and aggressive tone: he offers the community a good they are unable or unwilling to appreciate.

---

[204] Trans. Gerber.

[205] Marcovich 1978, 19; Adkins 1985, 198; and Lesher 1992, 56-8.

Xenophanes' polemic was not restricted to athletes. The irresponsible representations of the gods by culturally enshrined poets like Homer and Hesiod was perhaps even more problematic for him. In one fragment, Xenophanes cites the ubiquity of the Homeric poems in education (frg.9): ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ' Ὅμηρον, ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκασι πάντες. "since, from the beginning, everyone has learned according to Homer..." The problem with the use of these poems for instruction is made explicit in our next fragment (frg.10):

> πάντα θεοῖσ' ἀνέθηκαν Ὅμηρός θ' Ἡσίοδός τε,
> ὅσσα παρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀνείδεα καὶ ψόγος ἐστίν,
> κλέπτειν μοιχεύειν τε καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπατεύειν.

> Homer and Hesiod attributed everything to the gods that is reproachable and blameworthy among men; to steal, to seduce, and to deceive one another.

In these fragments, Xenophanes exerts authority through his corrective on traditional Homeric theology. Taken in tandem with frg.2, the civic good of his civic re-education justifies his claim to offer his city a contribution superior to athletes. His poetry's ethical interests were aimed at inspiring better citizens, freed from, among other things, the immortality of self-serving gods of Homer and Hesiod. In this way, his task was not unlike the ideological aims of exhortation poetry. The primary difference is that Xenophanes chose to castigate the figures he believed responsible for the cultural degeneracy he bemoans instead of directing his salvos at citizens themselves. While we may be tempted to dismiss the strong claims of public education through poetry asserted in these lines as polemical flourish or self-importance, it is worth remembering Plato’s representation of the bard Ion draws on many of these same points.[206] To be sure, though Plato’s facetious depiction of the seemingly vapid bard is designed to undermine the position, the powerful assertion of this claim by Athenian poets like Aristophanes suggests that the role of poet as educator was taken seriously well into the 5th century.[207]

Returning to Solon, we may now better appreciate the rhetoric of instruction employed in our fragment from the *Eunomia*. The structure of the text is important. In the broader context of the poem, Solon begins by railing against the conduct of his fellow Athenians. For nearly 30 lines he bemoans the degeneracy, selfishness, and stupidity of the Athenian citizens. The social dysfunction Solon develops foregrounds his advocacy for Eunomia.

In lines 31-2 Solon describes good and bad rule: ὡς κακὰ πλεῖστα πόλει Δυσνομίη παρέχει· Εὐνομίη δ' εὔκοσμα καὶ ἄρτια πάντ' ἀποφαίνει. As many scholars have noted, the choice of the noun Εὐνομίη to describe his political instruction suggests parallels with the Spartan system of government.[208] Tyrtaeus famously described the Spartan government in the same terms in one of his own composition and the phrase Εὐνομίη (lit. Good law) remained the term for the Spartan government beyond the Classical period.[209]

---

[206] See Murray 1996, 14-19 for a discussion of the stakes of Plato’s representation of Ion and the contested grounds in education between poetry and philosophy. Murray suggests Plato’s representation of Ion may be so harsh precisely because figures like Ion still enjoyed tremendous clout in education during Plato’s time.

[207] Aristophanes’ famous *parabasis* in the *Acharnians* claiming the Persian king admired his abuse of the Athenians (Ar. *Ach*. 645-50) is a conspicuous example. In this passage, Aristophanes develops the idea that the harsh truths he presents to the Athenians are important for them to hear and will make them better. Olson 2002, 242-4 takes Aristophanes’ representation of his own bluntness and venom as an implied contrast with the blandishments and dishonesty of the demagogue Cleon, which he argues are injuring the city. *Frogs*, 1009-10 more explicitly emphasizes the importance of poets making their listeners better, and Aristophanes has Aeschylus claim (*Frogs*, 1054-6) children learn through a teacher, while poets serve as teachers for adults. Dover 1993, 12-16 offers a valuable discussion of the passage’s language and the terms Aristophanes employs to express wisdom and learning through poetry. For the poet as teacher, see Harriott 1969, 105-6 and Tam-Sears 2013.

[208] van Wees 1999 argues that *eunomia* and the Spartan government arising from the “great rhetra” are to be interpreted as separate phenomena. Nousia-Fantouzzi 2010, 259-61 discusses the political nature of the *Eunomia* in the passage and connects the text with the Tyrtaean poem of the same title. Mülke 2002, 154, however, sees Solon as drawing strictly from Hesiod’s personification of the same name. Irwin 2005, 190 calls attention to the possible parallels with Hesiod, but convincingly argues that Solon’s representation should be seen more as an abstraction than a strict continuation of the earlier personification. As such, the representation is more in line with Tyrtaeus than Hesiod.

The carefully crafted rhetoric Solon deploys in his *Eunomia* alerts us to his aptitude as a poet. The poet's use of divine inspiration may be suggested in a fragment of his poetry coming from a story in Plutarch's *Life of Solon*: "Solon found the disgrace (of losing Salamis) hard to bear and when he saw that many of the young men wanted to renew the war, but lacked the courage to do so themselves because of the law, he pretended to be out of his mind and word was from his household to the city that he showed signs of madness. He secretly composed elegiac verses and after practicing so as to recite them from memory, he suddenly rushed into the marketplace, wearing a little felt cap. When a large crowd had assembled, he mounted a stone and recited the elegy which begins: 'I, myself, have come as a herald from lovely Salamis, composing song, an arrangement of words, instead of speech.'"[210]

The first two lines of Solon's *Salamis* poem provide valuable evidence for how the Athenian used poetic authority as a political tool. In the first line, Solon describes himself as a herald: αὐτὸς κῆρυξ ἦλθον ἀφ' ἱμερτῆς Σαλαμῖνος. We may wonder whose herald Solon claims to be? The second line offers some possibilities: κόσμον ἐπέων †ᾠιδὴν ἀντ' ἀγορῆς θέμενος. (Solon, frg 1.). Solon's choice of words is significant. The Pre-Socratic philosopher Democritus uses the same expression when he said of Homer (frg. 21. D-K): Ὅμηρος φύσεως λαχὼν θεαζούσης ἐπέων κόσμον ἐτεκτήνατο παντοίων, "Homer, possessed of a divine nature, assembled the arrangement of all sorts of words.” Democritus’ use of the phrase, ἐπέων κόσμον, implies a close relationship between composition and inspiration.[211] Parmenides also uses the expression coupling inspiration with learning in his injunction to his audience to learn from his poetry: δόξας δ' ἀπὸ τοῦδε βροτείας μάνθανε κόσμον ἐμῶν ἐπέων ἀπατηλὸν ἀκούων, “learn from this mortal opinion, hearing the seductive arrangement of my words.” While Parmenides complicates the meaning of the phrase, the relationship to inspiration remains intact. So, whose herald does Solon represent himself as?

---

[209] For a discussion of the possible role of Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia* poem in creation of the "great rhetra" which established the tripartite Spartan government familiar to us from classical sources, see Kennel 2009, 43-5 who traces out the available evidence and scholarship on the issue. Kennel also provides a useful discussion of what the term came to mean outside of Sparta and how it was used by the "lakonianizers" of the late 5th and early 4th century. For the opposite view, see van Wees 1999.

[210] Plut. *Solon*. 8.2.

A passage from a Pindaric dithyramb may help us answer the question. Pindar’s self-representation in the passage is strikingly similar (frg.70B, 23-6):

ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαίρετο[ν
κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων
Μοῖσ' ἀνέστασ' Ἑλλάδι κα[λ]λ̣[ιχόρῳ 25
εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοις ο̣[–□ Θήβαις

> And the Muse elevated me as her chosen herald of wise words in beautifully chorused Greece, praying for chariot-pressing Thebes.

van der Weiden’s observations on the passage are instructive: “It is common for poets to call themselves heralds, prophets and servants of the Muses; for heralds cf. Pi. *N*. 4, 74, B13.230-1… It may be significant that Pindar himself does not use the word *therapon*, perhaps because the term does not give enough credit to the poet’s active role. A herald is under divine protection and therefore has a higher status than a mere *therapon*. From the beginning of Greek literature both heralds and bards are considered *theios*, because they have a similar relationship with the gods: cf. *Il*. 4,192, *Od*. 4,17.”[212] While Solon never expressly states that he is acting as the

---

[211] See Mansfeld 2004 for a consideration of the relationship between divine inspiration and Democritus’ philosophical project in these lines.

[212] van der Weiden 1991, 79.

Muse's herald in this passage, the close connection to the Muses he espouses in the opening lines of his *Hymn to the Muses* suggests he represented himself as a poet-politician.[213]

Looking to Plutarch's claim of Solon's feigned madness, we find further support for the position. Madness and divine inspiration had a strong connection in the Greek imagination.[214] In Plutarch's representation, Solon sought to manipulate this association in his performance. Coupled with his choice to memorize his Salamis poem, Solon's performed madness would suggest to his audience that the poem was the product of automatic composition.[215] This common poetic device casts the speaker as the vessel through which a higher power was speaking. The rhetorical tool has important consequences. Plutarch tells how Solon's greatest obstacle to acquiring Salamis was a law prohibiting a war for it. As Plutarch points out, his "madness" would provide an excuse. To be sure, the story elaborated by Plutarch is most likely a late fabrication. However, if the story arose as a result of the poetic self-representation in Solon's

---

[213] See the discussion of the passage in Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010, 127-9. The interpretations of the opening lines of the hymn are manifold and problematic. Anhalt 1993, 12 treats the opening as an emphasis by Solon on the commemorative power of the Muses to acquire lasting fame for justice and propriety. Loeffler 1993, 26, n.7 contends that the poem serves as prayer by the narrator to be granted poetic authority by the Muses. Stoddard 2002, 152 reads the introduction to the hymn as ironic. I cannot agree on this point. An ironic reading would erode the poetic authority Solon enjoys elsewhere. In conjunction with Martin 2006, who offers anthropological evidence to support Solon acting as a poet-politician, Loeffler's reading suggests a coherent message. Solon predicates his request for poetic authority from the Muses on the piety of his open prayer. If the goal of this authority is poetic political engagement, as Martin suggests, Solon's worthiness to wield the power responsibly in its deployment become central to the larger mission: he is not looking to abuse people through the poetic gift the Muses bestow nor speak lies. He is a worthy recipient of their gift.

[214] Teigerstedt 1970 collects the evidence for the close connections between the two prior to the 5th century. See also Duchemen 1955, Murray 1981, and Mackie 2003, 39-76.

[215] The most famous of which were the Delphic oracles. These were allegedly spoken by the Pythia in an ecstatic state as if the direct pronouncements of Apollo. Fontenrose 1978 believes all of the verse oracles we possess were literary fabrications. For further discussion of the Pythia's inspiration and the "automatic" responses, see Scott 2014, 20-4.

Salamis poem, we are given a possible gimpse at the power imagined for the poet-politician and engendered by his poetic skill.[216]

Pindaric Authority

The "inspired" source of poetic authority is especially important for the study of Pindar. Generations of scholars framed Pindar's rhetoric of divine inspiration as one of the poet's defining characteristics. Ancient scholars took Pindar's connection to inspired poetics as a given, and even attempted to explain his robust use of the rhetoric through stories of divine epiphany.[217] As recently as C.M. Bowra, Pindar's inspired self-representation remained an important feature for understanding his poetic mission: "Pindar regards himself as 'the prophet of the Muses in song', and claims that they give him a message which he interprets, puts into shape, and conveys? to men. This is a more precise and more advanced notion than Homer's when he relies on the Muse to sing of the wrath of Achilles or to tell of the man of many wiles; for, while Homer regards the Muse as the source both of information and of words, Pindar distinguishes between what the Muse gives him and what he has to do with it…. This was certainly akin to prophecy, and Pindar has picked it up, made it his own, and greatly enlarged its meaning."[218] For

---

[216] Although the story is likely a later fabrication, the use of culturally significant iconography by politicians does seem to have been a political tool in the archaic period. The most famous example is Herodotus' story involving Peisistratus and the Attic girl Phye, for the policitical significance of which, see Connor 1987, who argues that Peisistratus' show served as a demonstration of his capacity to organize festivals and therefore his aptitude for serving as tyrant. For the late 6th- early 5th century athlete Milo of Croton's use of Heracles' iconography, see Nicholson 2016, 21-46, the evidence for which is also late.

[217] The *Vita Thomana* (Drachmann 1903, 5) recalls the cult offerings the poet was given in Delphi for his privileged relationship to Apollo; Pausianas 10.24.5 expands on the story detailing how Pindar's iron chair became a regular fixture in the temple of Apollo at Delphi. For the subsequent bestowal of cult honors on Pindar, see Clay 2004, 76-7, 147-9, Currie, 2005, 159, 302, Kimmel-Clauzet 2013, 23-41, and Philips 2015, 98-102, especially n. 37. For Pindar's special relationship with Delphi, see Daude et al. 2013, 112-3. The *Vita Ambrosiana* (Drachmann 1903, 2) of Pindar also records epiphanies from Pan and Demeter. See Daude et al. 2013, 87-90 for a discussion of the frequent inclusion of epiphanies in the lives of Pindar.

[218] Bowra 1964, 3-4.

Bowra, Pindar does not merely claim to be the Muses' vessel, but effectively their exegete, functioning as an intermediary between the human and divine worlds. Bowra's close reading of Pindar's lanuage offers us a valuable tool for thinking about the ways Pindar presents divinity as the source of his poetry.

Recent models of Pindaric composition have, however, down-played the earnestness of the poet's claims to inspiration. While scholars had always seen Pindar's epinicia as the work of a commissioned artist, his appeals to higher authority had suggested some degree of freedom from his commissioners and power independent of them. Indeed, while scholars like Wilamowitz unquestioningly accepted the role of commission in the creation of the epinicia, dependence on patrons had little to no impact on his approach to the poems.[219] To a great extent, Bruno Gentili radically reshaped our understanding of Pindar and later lyric poets. He saw a linear progression, or even degeneration, from inspired poets to paid hirelings: "In breaking away from the traditional mold of the inspired poet and model of the poet as master of truth, Simonides inaugurates a process of secularization that replaces a special, privileged type of knowledge with what is essentially a lay person's knowledge, more accessible and political."[220] By making the economic interests of the poets the central tool for understanding their poetry, Gentili's model has Simonides, and Pindar after him, reject the long-standing role of the inspired poet to pursue a more catholic appeal. Similarities to earlier poets represent not a continuation of the inspired tradition, but cynical manipulation of it to conceal their real goals—pay. But was it the poets who broke from the tradition, or *we* who have broken them from it? A consideration of Pindar's larger corpus suggests some possibilities.

---

[219] For his general views on Pindaric poetics, see Wilamowitz 1922, 1-11.

[220] Gentili 1987, 162.

We know from ancient testimony that the Alexandrians possessed a total of 17 books of Pindar's poetry.[221] The exclusive survival of Pindar's epinicia through a continuous transmission from antiquity has created a deceptively secular impression of his poetic activity. Yet, Pindar's poetic persona in these odes looks very much like that which we see in the epinicia. So, in the *Sixth Paean*, he opens (1-11):

Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διός σε, χρυ[σέ]α
κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ,
ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ
ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν·
ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
ψόφον ἀϊὼν Κασταλίας
ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ̣[λ]έξων
τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ̣[α]ῖς·

> In the name of Olympian Zeus, I beseech you, golden Pytho famous for seers, with the Graces and Aphrodite, receive me in this holy time, the singing prophet of the Pierians. For having heard, by the water from the bronze gates, the murmur of the Kastalia bereft of the dancing of men, I have come to ward off helplessness from your kinsmen and my honors.[222]

The opening lines, likely the source for many of the later stories involving Pindar's privileged relationship with Apollo, cast the poet as a bardic prophet.[223] This is significant given the performance context was Delphi, the prophetic center of the Greek world. While the poet may have claimed prophetic poetic inspiration in private settings without suspicion, in a prophetic center like Delphi the stakes were considerably higher.

---

[221] The V*ita Ambrosiana* (Drachmann 1903, 3) records them, ordered by length, as 1 of encomia, 1 of hymns, 1 of paeans, 1 of threnoi, 2 of dithyrambs, 2 of hyporchemata, 2 of prosodia, 3 of parthenia, and 4 of epinicia, which was based on the recension of Aristophanes of Byzantium. Cf. Willcock 1995, 3 who provides a brief description of each genre as well.

[222] Trans. Race with modification.

[223] The poem, which later develops the context of the Theoxenia, offers many features which later scholiasts likely read as literal. So, the details of Pindar dining at Apollo's table from the *Vita Thomana* would fit perfectly with the ritual conception of the Theoxenia, for which see Rutherford 2001, 308-10.

In a passage from the *Ninth Paean*, written ostensibly to appease the gods at the appearance of an eclipse, Pindar develops his mantic function further (34-40):

ἐκράνθην ὑπὸ δαιμονίῳ τινί
λέχει πέλας ἀμβροσίῳ Μελίας
ἀγαυὸν καλάμῳ συνάγεν θρόον
μήδεσί τε φρενὸς ὑμ[ε]τ̣έραν χάριν.
λιτανεύω, ἑκαβόλε,
Μοισαίαις ἀν[α]τιθεὶς τέχνα[ι]σ̣ι̣
χρηστήριον.[.]π̣ω̣λον̣τ̣[..(.)]ι

> I have been ordained (by a certain divinity) to compose, beside the immortal couch of Melia, a noble song with pipe and by the skills of my mind in your honor. I beg you, Far-Darter, offering with the Muses' skills… your oracle…

Pindar's reference to the composition of the song casts him as the god's interpreter for the community.[224] For scholars conditioned to read the lines through Pindar's role as a composer of praise poetry for his contemporaries, it is easy to overlook the significance of the rhetoric.[225] For the epinican audience, whatever we imagine the Muses or Graces to stand for in his audience's conceptions of poetic output, Pindar is undeniably more qualified to make a claim to being their surrogate than anyone else involved in or engaging with the performance of his poetry. In the context of religious performance, however, the rhetoric takes on greater meaning. Even if we embrace a cynical view of religious belief in Pindar's time, the success of the religious or civic event in which his musical composition was embedded demands that the rhetoric at least be acceptable to those in the audience with theistic beliefs.[226] Therefore, representing himself as an intermediary between a divinity and the community demands that Pindar's rhetoric be more than simply words. They must be words imbued with a degree of cultural and religious authority. But should we see Pindar's self-representation in the epinicia and non-epinica as connected?

---

[224] Rutherford 2001, 195-7 who also observes thematic problems with the following material.

[225] A vauable comparandum which demonstrates some of the dangers of mixing conventions of poetry for divine and mortal subjects is Aristotle's encomium of Hermias. Although the song seems to have been intended as an encomium, Aristotle faced criticisms for incorporating paeanic rhetoric in a song for a mortal man. For a discussion of the poem, its contents, the controversy, and stakes of generic composition in Aristotle's time, see Ford 2011, 8-44.

Maria Pavlou has recently argued that Pindar employs two personae in his poetry: one for human subjects and one for divine.[227] While it is possible to detect differences between the two types, we may wonder whether these arise from a rigid separation of the personae or are a consequence of different expectations of the performance. Some practical considerations are demanded. To begin, we must ask whether Pindar's audience was more familiar with the generic conventions of Pindar's epinicia, which were performed variously at private gatherings and civic celebrations in the victor's home city, or, songs such as paeans or dithyrambs, which were commonly performed at festivals in the great Pan-Hellenic centers in addition to individual communities? To judge from 5th century quotations of Pindar, his poems for religious/civic events seem to have enjoyed a greater reception than the epinicia.[228] A broader societal familiarity with the conventions of religious poetry suggests that the importation of rhetoric common to religious lyric in epinician would likely not go unnoticed. But this awareness creates an additional problem. If the epinicia were commissioned for money, as our current model suggests, how could Pindar use devices which grant him authority in religious poetry in a song composed for profit for a human subject without eroding the legitimacy of his claims in the religious poem?[229]

---

[226] For the importance of belief in the communicative strategies of apotropaic poetry, see Brown 2016.

[227] Pavlou 2012.

[228] Irigoin 1952, 7-20 collects the available evidence for the earliest period of reception.

We may even wonder why poets composed poetry for civic festivals if the epinician trade were so lucrative. While there is a great temptation to graft the evidence for commissioned epinicia onto civic poetry, the suggestion that Pindar or other lyric poets composed religious odes for profit is not only problematic but inconsistant with our available evidence.[230] This, however, should not imply that a pan-Hellenic poet like Pindar did not have personal gain in mind when agreeing to compose. Indeed, in his *Antidosis*, Isocrates calls attention to the reward Pindar allegedly received from Athens for the introduction of his dithyramb for the city: "Our ancestors honored the poet Pindar for just a single expression in which he named Athens the bulwark of Greece, gave him the title friend of the city' and granted him a gift of ten thousand drachmas." (Isoc. *Antid*. 165-6).

While we may reasonably be skeptical of Isocrates' account, the passage's suggestion that poets received rewards from the city *after* the performance avoids a significant problem for the rhetoric of divine inspiration.[231] If we assume poets were paid to compose religious poetry in which they might speak as the vessel of the Muses, Graces, or even Apollo, as we saw from the two paeans quoted above, the introduction of money up front casts the rhetorical connections between poet and prophet as tantamount to bribing an oracle.[232] This would no doubt erode the power of poet and perhaps even inspire ill will towards him. Worse still, if the Athenians sought to use the phrase "bulwark of Greece" as propaganda, the social awareness of the dynamics of commission would demonstrate that the praise was insincere; effectively rendering the phrase useless.

---

[229] Cf. Pelliccia 2009, 243-6 who discusses the problem of reconciling the commissioned epinician model with the larger literary output of Simonides, Bachcylides, and Pindar.

[230] For the position that the same mechanisms for the creation and distribution of epinicia were at play in the creation of the non-epinicia, see Hubbard 2014. Ieranò 2013, however, has collected considerable epigraphical evidence demonstrating that victorious poets treated dithyrambic victories as an extraordinary honor in Athens—even on par with victory in the greater dramatic festivals. In a tantalizing fragment from a Pindaric dithyramb, the poet may have even represented himself as writing the poem "(for the purpose of) sacrificing a dithyramb", θύσων διθύραμβον (S-M, frg. 86.a), to the god. This reading of frg 86a is supported by the often overlooked Pindaric apothemata (Drachmann 1903, 3-4) which record: Παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Δελφοὺς καὶ ἐρωτώμενος τί πάρεστι θύσων, εἶπε· παιᾶνα (Pindar) "Attending sacrifice at Delphi and being asked what he had to offer for sacrifice, he said: 'a paean.'" Though it may be tempting for some to read the story through Pindar's alleged stinginess, the passage reads as if it originated in scholiastic speculation on frg. 86a, or a similar passage.

[231] There are numerous possibilities for distortion in Isocrates' account. The chronological distance between Pindar and Isocrates was significant enough that details might have easily changed. Indeed, the size of the reward seems exorbitant, but cf. the tradition of the astonishing sum of 10,000 talents the 4th century Athenian historian Dyllus claimed the Athenians gave Herodotus for his favorable treatment of their city in the *Histories* (Plutarch, *De Mal.*

Instead, like the Pythia, if the poet were free to say whatever the gods wished, and spoke well of the object of the song, the conveyance of an inspired message would likely be met with reward. Indeed, countless thank offerings accreted in Delphi over the centuries for this very reason, and our Isocrates passage suggests the same dynamic for rewarding poets. However, it is crucial for the success of the propaganda that the vehicle of the message appear independent of the recipient of it. With this *quid pro quo* dynamic in mind, let us now turn to the evidence from *P*.4.

So Spoke the Prophetic Lines of Medea

Her. 862A-B.). The tradition of Herodotus's payment was used to discredit the historian. For problems with the tradition involving Herodotus, see Priestley 2014, 48-50. Looking at the passage in question, the opening flourish of frg. 76 looks very much like the first lines of *Pythian* 7 for the Athenian nobleman Megakles, but if the fragment dated to the period immediately after the Persian Wars while the question of which state contributed the most during the wars was being debated, we might easily see why the phrase carried such weight. A further connection to the Herodotean story may be seen in the description of Athens as the Bulwark of Hellas in frg. 76. These are similar terms which which Herodotus describes the Athenian contributions during the war at Hdt. 7.139.5, though he goes even a step further saying that "if someone were to call the Athenians the saviors of Greece, they would not be wide of the mark."

[232] The associations between prophets, greed, and corruptablity became a common rhetorical strategy to discredit public prophetic figures, especially *chresologoi*. For suspicion of malpractice in the interpretation of books of oracles, or *hieroi logoi*, see Henrichs 2003.

The propagandistic elements of prophecy in *P*.4 are well explored.[233] As we saw in the last chapter, scholars have interpreted the ode's prophecy as a function of its commission: Arcesilaus demanded support for his tottering regime in the form of an ode celebrating his Pythian Chariot victory. But given the demands on propaganda to maintain the illusion of independence, we may wish to re-examine Pindar's use of prophecy in the ode. To begin, let us ask how Pindar uses prophecy in *P*.4. Is propaganda *all* that his appropriation of prophetic language accomplishes?

For this purpose, it will be useful to examine the evidence under two lenses: within and outside of the myth. Pindar begins with a rapid succession of temporal shifts bridging the time from Arcesilaus' chariot victory to 17 generations earlier in the time of the Argonautic expedition for the Golden Fleece. The transition sets Medea's prophetic speech to the Argonauts in striking terms (9-13):

καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι
ἑβδόμᾳ καὶ σὺν δεκάτᾳ γενεᾷ Θή-
ραιον, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενής
παῖς ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, δές-
ποινα Κόλχων.

> And Medea's Theraion speech had its return in the seventeenth generation, which once the inspired child of Aeëtes spoke from her immortal mouth, the Colchean mistress.

Though brief, the passage contains much to give us pause. In particular, its representation of Medea being "ζαμενής" has been the source of controversy. William Slater recognized that the word occurs in contexts denoting an "inspired character, especially of those with prophetic gifts."[234] This reading has been generally followed by commentators since at least Fennel, and was posed earliest in modern scholarship by Erasmus Schmidt.[235] However, in a 1979 *Glotta* article and again in his commentary on *P*.4, Bruce Braswell contended that the notion that the adjective "means 'inspired' rests ultimately upon the supposed appropriateness of this meaning in the events; however, 'spirited' is not only perfectly appropriate to these events, but also to the latter two as well, where in fact it is the only really satisfactory sense which can be given to the word."[236] Braswell fails to recognize an important feature of the three characters flagged as ζαμενής in Slater's arrangement. Both Chiron, whom Pindar describes as ζαμενής in *Pythian* 9.38, and Medea are not traditionally prophetic, while the third, Silenus, enjoyed only limited prophetic power. If the use of the adjective were meant simply to imply that the figure was "spirited," the following content would be jarring. Using the adjective to mean "inspired" would resolve this tension. A second important similarity between these figures has gone unnoticed—all three of them are explicitly made immortal by Pindar. While this is unsurprising for Chiron and Silenus, Medea, as we shall see, was not commonly represented as immortal in Pindar's time. Therefore, it may be possible that that adjective has dual meanings. While Pindar's application of the term to mortal figures supports Braswell's suggestion of "mighty" or "powerful,"[237] for immortal figures "spirted" or "powerful" fails to capture the exceptional nature inherent to their status as immortals: they are already profoundly powerful or spirited relative to humans. However, since not all immortals have prophetic powers, the adjective coupled with the ascription of immortality may serve as a way to mark them out from their immortal peers. Therefore, I suggest the fissure in meanings observed by Slater falls between mortals and immortals who are ζαμενής.

---

[233] Gildersleeve 1891, 279-80, Fennel 1893,184-5, Duchemin 1968, 99-101, Kirkwood 1981, 161-2, Braswell 1988, 1-6, Gentili 1995,104-5, Lattmann 2010, 210-46.

[234] Slater 1968, 218.

---

[235] Schmidt 1615 ad loc, followed by Bennett 1620. Fennell 1893, 188 observes the only earlier use in poetry of the adjective "of a person not connected with prophetic powers, namely of Memnon, he is closely associated with a seer." Cf. *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, 307 where the superlative is used as an address to Apollo: Πῇ με φέρεις Ἑκάεργε θεῶν ζαμενέστατε πάντων. Here Hermes seems to use the adjective to suggest violence, cf. Richardson 2010, 194, though given the frequent use of double-speak in Hermes' speech throughout the hymn, the adjective may be craftily deployed to suggest both meanings, as, "Where are you bringing me, Far-Darter, most prophetic of all gods," would all be perfectly intelligible and accurate in context.

[236] Braswell 1988, 76.

[237] *N*.4.13, *Paean* 8. 64, frg. 231, and possibly 169.35. Cf. Slater 1968, 218.

This calls our attention to the second exceptional feature of the passage: Medea's immortality. While later traditions place her among the heroes fortunate enough to inhabit the Islands of the Blessed, a tradition already begun by Pindar's time,[238] in early accounts her status is less certain. The inclusion of her retrieval by Jason at the end of Hesiod's *Theogony* (992-1002) suggests that she is understood to be divine in the passage, but Hesiod never makes the point explicit.[239] Alkman, too, may have made her an immortal according to the later Athenagoras, but no fragments survive to confirm the attribution.[240] If the representation of Medea as a mortal hero was already winning out in the 6th century we may wonder why Pindar chose to mark the Cochean princess as explicitly immortal. The content of her speech offers some possibilities (13-16):

Κέκλυτε, παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν·
φαμὶ γὰρ τᾶσδ' ἐξ ἁλιπλά-
        κτου ποτὲ γᾶς Ἐπάφοιο κόραν
ἀστέων ῥίζαν φυτεύσεσθαι μελησιμβρότων
Διὸς ἐν Ἄμμωνος θεμέθλοις.

> Hear me, children of proud mortals and gods, for I say that from this sea-struck land one day the child of Epaphus will come to bear the roots of cities famed among mortals in the foundations of Ammonian Zeus.

---

[238] Ibycus, frg.10, which a scholiast to Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg*. 4.814-5 cites as the first to make Achilles and Medea marry in Elysium. The scholiast also claims Simonides followed Ibycus in making the two marry.

[239] See West 1966, 429 for a discussion of traditions involving Medea's mortality. The evidence seems to point strongly to a dominant tradition of Medea being a mortal hero.

[240] Alcman, frg. 163.

Medea’s opening words, Κέκλυτε, παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν, establish the speech as a prophetic. As Joseph Fontenrose has observed of verse prophecies, the most common way authors chose to begin literary oracles was with a combination of honorific adjective coupled to a vocative addressee and imperative verb.[241] Verbs denoting attention, listening, or observing are most common. This is exactly what we see in Medea’s speech. Next, Fontenrose demonstrates how the address is often followed by a restatement of the question posed to the prophet and serves as an assertion of the speaker’s mantic authority.[242]

Since the passage appears to be an automatic response by Medea, Fontenrose’s component “B” (restatement of the question) is omitted. However, Medea’s assertion of her authority in line 14, φαμὶ γὰρ, for *I* say, conforms closely to Fontenrose’s component “C” (speaker’s self reference). Medea, however, does not claim that she is a prophetess or cite any prophetic powers. Therefore, why should we assume that she has the power to issue prophecies if she does not develop her mantic authority? On our reading of Pindar’s introduction to Medea, the earlier passage accomplishes this task. By citing the heroine as a prophetic goddess before presenting the text of her speech, Pindar develops a scenario where Medea’s intra-carminal audience accepts her authority to issue prophecies, while the extra-carminal audience—unfamiliar with Medea acting as a prophetess—is prepared for it. In this way, Pindar’s introduction of Medea proleptically functions as Fontenrose’s component “C.” Indeed, if we take the adjective ζαμενής describing Medea to simply mean “powerful” or “spirted”, as Braswell suggests we should, we are left with a serious problem. How does an otherwise un-prophetic character issue a prophecy whose authority is solely predicated on the statement “Listen, for *I* say”? This is especially problematic given the ideological importance of Medea’s passage.

---

[241] Fontenrose 1978, 170-4. Fontenrose also notes that this formula is unique to verse oracles and not found in those he classifies as “historical” or authentic.

[242] Fontenrose 1978, 177-8.

A closer look illustrates why it was significant for Pindar to develop Medea’s prophetic authority (13-20):

φαμὶ γὰρ τᾶσδ' ἐξ ἁλιπλά-
        κτου ποτὲ γᾶς Ἐπάφοιο κόραν
ἀστέων ῥίζαν φυτεύσεσθαι μελησιμβρότων
Διὸς ἐν Ἄμμωνος θεμέθλοις.
ἀντὶ δελφίνων δ' ἐλαχυπτερύγων ἵπ-
        πους ἀμείψαντες θοάς,
ἁνία τ' ἀντ' ἐρετμῶν δί-
φρους τε νωμάσοισιν ἀελλόποδας.
κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μεγαλᾶν πολίων
ματρόπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι

> For I say that from this sea-struck land one day the child of Epaphus will have grown the root of renown cities at the foundations of Ammonian Zeus. In place of short winged dolphins, they will trade swift horses, and they will brandish reins instead of oars, and steer chariots driven by wind-like feet. And that omen will bring to pass that Thera become a mother of great cities…

Medea’s first mention of the Theraian foundation of Cyrene offers the passage’s most vivid prophetic language. She avoids explicitly mentioning which places she speaks of, instead employing circumlocution and focusing on the nature of the change that will transpire: when Epaphus’ daughter (Cyrene) bears the root of new cities (the city of Cyrene), then islanders will have become mainlanders. Significanly, the structure of Medea’s oracle maps comfortably on to the frameword devised by Joseph Fontenrose to describe oracular language. Specifically, Medea’s description of the circumstances of Thera’s foundation corresponds with what Fontenrose has termed component “D” the “Conditional Precedent” of the oracles. Indeed, in his collection of oracles, Fontenrose demonstrated how verse oracles traditionally employ a temporal marker with conditional clause, but sometimes replace the conditional with a phrase introduced by the temporal particle πότε.[243] The ambiguities and intentionally opaque language of the "conditional precedent" often demands an explication.[244] This seamlessly connects the opening with Pindar's second task: connecting the mythic with the historical past. He does this by demonstrating how the Argonaut Euphemus was given dominion over Cyrene in the form of clod of dirt gifted to him by an unnamed god (20-24):

τόν ποτε
Τριτωνίδος ἐν προχοαῖς
λίμνας θεῷ ἀνέρι εἰδομένῳ γαῖαν διδόντι
ξείνια πρῴραθεν Εὔφαμος καταβαίς
δέξατ' – αἰσίαν δ' ἐπί οἱ Κρονίων
Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἔκλαγξε βροντάν –

> [that omen] Which once in the estuaries of the Tritonian marsh, Euphemus, leaping down from the prow, received from a god, likening himself to man, giving land as a guest gift —and Kronian Zeus, the father, struck out the destined lightning for him.

Medea's expansion of her initial statement explains the connection between Cyrene and Thera. To emphatically demonstrate the Euphemid claim to Cyrene's divine favor she includes two deities in her narrative. The god who gives Euphemus the clod of earth will remain unnamed throughout Medea's narration, though many have surmised that the figured should be identified with Triton due to Pindar's allusion to the Tritonian marsh.[245] Medea then offers how the reception of the gift was met with Zeus' approval. These details, however, demand further explanation for the intra-carminal audience. Why should Thera and not Taineron, Euphemus' home city, be relevant to the Argonaut? Medea explains the connection (38-43):

πεύθομαι δ' αὐτὰν κατακλυσθεῖσαν ἐκ δούρατος
ἐναλίαν βᾶμεν σὺν ἅλμᾳ

---

[243] Fontenrose 1978, 178-9.

[244] Fontenrose 1978, 179-80 has termed the explanation component "F."

[245] Braswell 1988, 89-92, using Herodotus 4.179 who tells of Triton's promise to the Argonaut that 100 cities will spring up around the lake, and Gentili 1995, 432-4.

ἑσπέρας ὑγρῷ πελάγει σπομέναν. ἦ
μάν νιν ὤτρυνον θαμά
λυσιπόνοις θεραπόντεσ-
σιν φυλάξαι· τῶν δ' ἐλάθοντο φρένες
καί νυν ἐν τᾷδ' ἄφθιτον νάσῳ κέχυται Λιβύας
εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα πρὶν ὥρας

For I have learned that that (clod) has been washed from the deck in the evening and went into the depths with the brine, following the moist sea. But I, indeed, often urged him to guard it with toil relieving guards. But their wits were struck from them, and now the immortal seed of broad Libya has been poured upon this island before its time.

Euphemus' mistake explains away another potential challenge to the Battiad claim: if the Battiads were descended from Euphemus why didn't they settle the region sooner? The answer the poem proffers is that the guest-gift the divinity granted Euphemus was not treated with proper reverence. In addition to explaining the delay in Cyrene's foundation, the passage further details Medea's prophetic power. Medea had already mentioned that the choice for the Argonauts to proceed overland through the desert was her idea (*P*.4. 27). For the extra-carminal audience, this mention reveals how the princess's advice put the Argonauts in the place where Euphemus was to be granted dominion by a local god. In conjunction with this plan, Medea's recollection of her frequent pleas to watch over the gift reinforce the role she played in creating the Battiad dynasty. Presumably, either her prophetic power or immortal insight allowed her to grasp the significance of the gift bestowed on Euphemus. These were ignored and the validity of her warnings was revealed in the delay on Thera Euphemus' descendants must endure before they may arrive in Cyrene.

As a third aim of the passage, Medea's explication of the connections between Battis and the Euphemid myth gives Pindar the opportunity to connect Medea's prophecy to the Delphic oracle. As he has already mentioned, and will have Medea do again, this was the spot where the oracle sanctioned the Battiads as rulers of Cyrene. Arguably, it is the single most important place and event for the dynasty’s claim to legitimacy: connecting the two narratives strengthens both claims (50-7):

νῦν γε μὲν ἀλλοδαπᾶν κριτὸν εὑρήσει γυναικῶν
ἐν λέχεσιν γένος, οἵ κεν τάνδε σὺν τιμᾷ θεῶν
νᾶσον ἐλθόντες τέκωνται
    φῶτα κελαινεφέων πεδίων
δεσπόταν· τὸν μὲν πολυχρύσῳ ποτ' ἐν δώματι
Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει θέμισσιν
Πύθιον ναὸν καταβάντα χρόνῳ
ὑστέρῳ, νάεσσι πολεῖς ἀγαγὲν Νεί-
    λοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα.’

> But now he will find the chosen race in the beds of foreign women, who coming to this island with the honor of the gods will bear a man to be ruler of the dark-clouded plains. Whom, one day at a later time, when coming to the Pythian temple, Phoebus will call back with oracles, to lead many men in ships to the rich boundaries of the Nilotic Kronian.

These final lines seamlessly connect the Euphemid and Battiad mythoi the dynasty employed for legitimacy. While it may be easy for us to discount the importance of the prophecy contained in Medea’s speech, it is crucial that we recognize that the authority of the Battiads—and specifically Arcesilaus IV—to rule in Cyrene relied in part on the divine acknowledgement of their reign.[246] By making Medea an immortal prophetess, Pindar has left nothing to chance. He has made a claim for the infallibility of her words and more importantly given the Battiads divine sanction at each step of the establishment of their reign.

Medea’s prophecy interlaces with many of the points external to its narrative. The opening muse invocation incites the deity to engage in song as a way of increasing the swell of song due to Apollo and Delphi (1-4):

Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,

---

[246] Based on numismatic evidence, either Apollo Karneios or Zeus Ammon seems to have played a central role in the Battiad self-representation of the period. See Martin 1985.

ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,
Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων

> Today, Muse, it is necessary for you to stand beside a dear man, the king of well-horsed Cyrene, so that, along with Arcesilaus celebrating, you might increase the swell of songs owed to the Leotids and Pytho.

It is difficult to know precisely what Pindar meant by his expressed intention to "increase the swell of song owed to the Leotids and Pytho." While many have seen it as an indication that the song gives thanks for Arcesilaus' Pythian victory, the lack of elaboration on that victory in the following lines make this interpretation problematic. In Pindar's representation Apollo's prophetic center functions as the ode's central theme. The narrator immediately pivots to the role Delphi played in founding the Battiad line (4-9):

ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος
οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρεα
χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον
καρποφόρου Λιβύας, ἱεράν
νᾶσον ὡς ἤδη λιπὼν κτίσσειεν εὐάρματον
πόλιν ἐν ἀργεννόεντι μαστῷ.

> Where once, the priestess, companion of Zeus' golden eagles, declared Battis the founder of crop-bearing Libya—and Apollo happened not to be away—how leaving behind the sacred island, he would found a well-charioted city on the silvery breast.

This is the ode's first mention of the Delphic oracle to Battis. Though brief, the passage underscores the authority of Battiad rule: it is sanctioned by both Zeus and Apollo. Placed immediately after Pindar's description of Arcesilaus as a "dear man", the expansion suggests the reasoning behind the earlier description—Arcesilaus' and his family enjoy divine favor. As we have seen, Zeus' approval of the Euphemids will be made explicit at line 24, and Apollo's role will be expanded on throughout Medea's speech. In conjunction with the unnamed deity and the now immortal Medea, the cluster of divinities represented as supporting the Battiads is remarkable. A second temporal transition moves us from Battis to Medea by citing the fulfillment of Medea's Theraian prophecy (9-10):

> καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι
> ἑβδόμᾳ καὶ σὺν δεκάτᾳ γενεᾷ Θή-
> ραιον.

> And the Theraian speech of Medea had its return in the seventeenth generation.

As we have seen, this statement introduces Medea's prophecy, which will dovetail with the sequence of events the narrator has just described. The introduction also perfectly ties into the narrator's closing remarks:

> ἦ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες. ἔπτα-
> ξαν δ' ἀκίνητοι σιωπᾷ
> ἥροες ἀντίθεοι πυκινὰν μῆτιν κλύοντες.

> So spoke the lines of Medea's verses. And the god-like heroes stood unmoving in silence, listening to the sagacious wisdom.

The language Pindar uses to describe Medea's speech in these two pieces of third-person narrative is significant. In line nine, Pindar's narrative persona claims Medea's ἔπος, "speech," had ἀγκομίσαι, "had its return." While commentators have commonly noted that the verb ἀνακομίζω means "had its fulfillment", in this context its literal meaning suggests important connections in the poem.[247] Literally ἀνακομίζω means to bring back or even recover.[248] This is an especially relevant meaning given the multiple returns the poem will feature in its subsequent development. Indeed, looking to the later uses of the root word, we see how the verb sets up the poem’s central narratives. Jason claims he has returned to Iolcus to recover his father’s kingship (105-9):

---

[247] Braswell 1988, 73.

[248] *LSJ*, 109.

οὔτ' ἔπος ἐντράπελον κείνοισιν εἰπὼν ἱκόμαν
οἴκαδ', ἀρχαίαν κομίζων
πατρὸς ἐμοῦ βασιλευομέναν
οὐ κατ' αἶσαν, τάν ποτε Ζεὺς ὤπασεν λαγέτᾳ
Αἰόλῳ καὶ παισὶ τιμάν

Nor having spoken a shameful word to them, I have come home to recover the ancient honor of my father, ruled not in accordance with fate, which once Zeus granted as an honor to the leader Aeolos and his children.

The young hero’s desire for a return home and peaceful resolution to the dynastic struggle between himself and kinsman Pelias sets up the third use of the verb. In an exchange seeking to settle the quarrel, Pelias claims the soul of Phrixos has haunted him and demands appeasement (159-61):

κέλεται γὰρ ἑὰν ψυχὰν κομίξαι
Φρίξος ἐλθόντας πρὸς Αἰήτα θαλάμους
δέρμα τε κριοῦ βαθύμαλλον ἄγειν

For Phrixos commands us, going to the chambers of Aëetes, to recover his soul and bring back the deep-woolen hide of the ram.

This third use introduces the next and final narrative of the poem; the quest for the Golden Fleece. For Pelias, this matter must be settled before they can settle their personal quarrels.

Pindar’s choice of ἔπος, too, is important. In the singular, the term commonly means simply speech or word. However, in the plural, as Pindar concludes the passage, ἦ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες, the term means verse and often prophecy.[249] Commentators have noted the extensive use of dactyls in the passage.[250] Coupled with the strongly prophetic language with which Medea opens, the use of common elements of verse oracles in her speech, and description of the passage as an ἔπος, the prophetic nature of Medea’s speech is made unmistakable and the associations with the especially Delphic verse oracles more resonant.

---

[249] *LSJ*, 674. Sec. IV. S.V.

The narrator follows Medea’s prophecy with an apostrophe to Battis, highlighting the connection between Medea’s speech and the place of Arcesilaus’ victory (58-63):

> ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου, σὲ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ
> χρησμὸς ὤρθωσεν μελίσσας
> Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ· 60
> ἅ σε χαίρειν ἐστρὶς αὐδάσαισα πεπρωμένον
> βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράνᾳ,
> δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποι-
> νὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν.

> Blessed son of Polymnestos, it was you whom the oracle exalted in this speech, through the unsought song of the Delphic Honeybee, who three times calling you by name, revealed you to be the appointed king in Cyrene, when you were asking what recompense there should be from the gods for your cacophonic voice.

The passage interlocks with the second section of narrative we noted earlier and makes the prophetic message of Medea’s speech explicit. The connections between these passages and their inter-dependence alerts us to another important feature of the passage.

The structure of the first 70 lines reveals the tight interlacing of the passage’s themes. Lines 1-5 exalt Delphi; 6-8 Battis; 9-13 introduce Medea; Medea alludes to Battis’ Theraian foundation of Cyrene in 13-19; recedes temporally to explain why Euphemus’ line would return to Cyrene 20-26 and demonstrates Zeus’ ascent to the land grant at 23; cites her own role in bringing Euphemus to Cyrene 27; expands on Euphemus’ encounter with the divinity 27-37;

---

[250] For the metrical scheme of the passage, see Braswell 1988, 38. For interpretations of the meter in the context Braswell 1988, 78-9.

explains why Thera will be significant to Euphemus' line 38-52; foretells the Delphic recognition of Battis as king 53-7; the narrator then reinforces the prophetic nature of Medea's speech 56-9; apostrophizes to Battis, celebrating the Delphic oracle to him 59-63, concludes by returning to the present occasion of Arcesilaus' victory at Delphi as a representation of the divine favor the Euphemid line enjoys.

Looking at the structure from a schematic perspective, if A represents the present occasion of celebration, B represents Battis' Delphic oracle, C represents Medea, and D Euphemus, the passage would look like this: A, B, C, [B, D, C, D, B], C, B, A. This is a remarkable degree of symmetry and demonstrates how carefully Pindar crafted his representation of the series of prophetic steps leading to the foundation of the Battiad dynasty. No question is left unanswered, nor is any aspect of the Battiad's divine sanction to rule left assailable by potential critics. To be sure, the intricate, lapidary design of the passage reflects its nature as propaganda of legitimacy for the Battiads, but the degree of calculation and thought exerted to effect this outcome seems excessive for the task. This is especially true when we consider that the Battiads had been ruling in Cyrene for eight generations. They were not a new entity attempting to assert their right to rule over former equals but had long been ensconced in regal authority. Why would Pindar expend so much energy meticulously crafting this interlocking sequence?

Pindar and Cyrene

As François Chamoux noted long ago, the history of Cyrene in the period preceding and following the Persian Wars was rife with conflict.[251] This era saw popular uprisings, ousters of kings, and the eventual fall of the Battiad dynasty. Unfortunately, the paltry evidence makes it difficult to confidently flesh out the events that precipitated the monarchy's collapse. However, what we do possess illustrates how infirm the dynasty had been for at least a generation before the watershed events of the Greco-Persian wars. Chamoux's narrative of this period of Cyrenean history, recently expanded on by Irad Malkin, reveals how dependent on Herodotus we still are for information on the final years of the Battiad dynasty. As such, Herodotus provides us with a valuable starting place for a consideration of *P*.4's historical context.

---

[251] Chamoux 1953, 202-210.

Herodotus' Cyrenean logos (Hdt. 4.145-68 especially) covers the history of the Cyrenaica from the Battiad foundation of Cyrene to the death of Arcesilaus III. Written nearly a century after the events it described, Herodotus' history of the period was influenced by subsequent developments in the Libyan city. As such, the Cyrenean logos provides valuable hints for events during the time in which Pindar was writing.[252] The text's narrative of the expansion of Persia into North Africa offers us our first important possibility: the Cyrenean monarchy submitted to Persia in the mid-sixth century to secure Persian support for their tottering regime.[253] This is suggested both by Herodotus' narration of the city's instability and especially the historian's description of the Persian intervention on behalf of Arcesilaus III as he faced the threat of revolt. From what we know about the operations of the Persian Empire, the rulers sought to preserve local political power structures as a way to promote a sense of continuity in conquered communities and avoid political unrest.[254] In the context of the larger Greek world, however, the

---

[252] For problems in Herodotus' representation of Cyrenean events and possible chronological distortions, see Asheri et al. 2007, 669-73.

[253] See Mitchell 1965 for an overview of the Battiad relationship with Persia.

[254] For the strategies employed by the Persians to maintain stability in the geographically immense and religiously, culturally, and politically fragmented empire, see Young 1988, 79-87 in *CAH* Vol. IV.

Persian preservation of the Battiad monarchy represents a petrification of an increasingly outmoded political structure. Indeed, the mid to late sixth century saw numerous Greek communities reject autarchy in favor of popular rule. The pressure to create a popular government in Cyrene, too, seems to have been strong; however, with the aid of the Persian army any movement to overthrow the Battiads was likely doomed to failure.

The Greco-Persian Wars changed the empire's relationship to its periphery; especially the Greek world. Whether the Persians withdrew entirely from Libya following their defeat on the Greek mainland remains unknown.[255] However, given the Persians' continuing struggle with the Greek cites in the eastern Mediterranean and the Athenian-fomented uprising in Egypt following the assassination of Xerxes I in 465, it must have been clear to Cyrenaean populists that the Battiad monarchy no longer enjoyed the unequivocal support of the Persian army. Therefore, whether or not the Persians retained nominal possession over Cyrene, the monarchy was left to its own devices. The vulnerability of the Battiads in this time likely emboldened partisans to press for regime change.

Pindar's earliest surviving ode for a Cyrenean victor dates to this time. Our best evidence places the ode's composition in 474.[256] Significantly, *Pythian* Nine features a foundation myth for Cyrene that entirely omits the Battiad/ Ephemid mythos. In this poem, Pindar describes how Apollo's desire for the Thessalian nymph Cyrene results in his transportation of the eponymous heroine to Libya where she will reign over the city that bears her name. Irad Malkin has seen the Cyrene/Apollo myth as functioning as a "primordial creation trope": "The marriage of Apollo and Cyrene, described three times in the Ninth Pythian, forms what I would call a ‘primordial creation story’ of Cyrene, foreshadowing the ‘political’ foundation/colonization by Battos and the colonists. Strictly speaking, it is not a foundation story, since the nymph is given the honour of becoming the eponymous nymph of a city, which itself is to be built by ‘island-folk’ (Therans); she is not the actual founder, however, to the extent that nymph Cyrene is played upon as Cyrene-city (just as Lady Libya is also Libya tout court). Pindar’s language is significant all the same.”[257] The conceptual separation of the two myths which Malkin has made into complementary narratives obscures our view on the inherent tensions between them.

---

[255] For discussion of the post-war relationship between the monarchy and Persian king, see Chamoux 1953, 202-5; however, he is forced to rely on speculation, given the dearth of available material.

[256] For discussion of the date and context, see Carey 1981, 65-7, and 233-4

It is easy to see how *Pythian* 9’s foundation legend, coming originally from the Hesiodic *Ehoiai,* could have been used to counter the Battiad foundation myth or even actively work to subvert it.[258] Given the age and authority of the Apolline/Thessalian myth, Pindar’s choice to call attention to a foundation story that, if not actively contradicts, at least erodes some of the claims in the Battiad myth at a moment when the dynasty faced serious opposition and was divested of Persian aid must have had deleterious consequences for the monarchy.[259] This should not necessarily be taken to imply that Pindar was acting against the Battiad kingship in the earlier ode. Rather, the legend he chose to develop may have been more meaningful for a non-royal Cyrenean victor, but, in the politically volatile environment of the period, a Cyrenean foundation myth independent of the royal charter may have easily been used as a tool by anti-monarchical factions.

---

[257] Malkin 1994, 173.

[258] For discussion of the Hesiodic Cyrene, see West 1985, 85-7 and D’Alessio 2005a, 195-9 and 206-7, Hunter 2005, 243-5. Studniczka 1890, 40-4, who detects Peloponnesian political interest in the myth of *Pythian* 9, remains valuable for a consideration of the narrative in the broader context of Greek myth.

[259] See Dougherty 1993, 136-152, who discusses the relationship and tensions between the two foundation legends.

We may wonder why we should consider that Pindar's earlier myth found use as a political weapon.[260] On this point, Herodotus is again valuable. The role of prophecy in Herodotus' narrative of the rise and fall of the Battiad monarchy is a salient feature of his account. His description of the foundation of Cyrene more or less accords with Pindar's and likely demonstrates a reliance on the poet.[261] Since the historian composed his account of the death of Arcesilaus III long after the fall of the monarchy, the passage offers us important evidence for understanding the political currents Arcesiaus IV was working against. Though the historian offers few references to the end of the Battiads, one passage highlights not only the fact that by Arcesilaus III's rule the dynasty was near death, but may afford us a glimpse at the way partisans sought to erode the monarchy's legitimacy. The passage is worth quoting at length (Hdt. 4.163):

> "Meanwhile, Arkesilaos was on Samos collecting every man he could find with the prospect of sharing in a redistribution of land in Libya. When he had mustered a large army, he sent to Delphi to consult the oracle about his return. The Pythia gave him this response: four kings named Battos and four named Arkesilaos, for eight generations of men, does Loxias grant the kingship of Cyrene. His advice is not to attempt to go beyond that. As for you, return to your own land in peace, and if you find a kiln full of wine jars, do not fire them, but send them away with a fair wind. If you fire them, do not enter the place surrounded by water. If you do, both you and the prize bull will die."

As commentators have noted, the prophecy's opening lines look artificial in the context.[262] As the sixth Battiad, warnings of the monarchy's fall would have had little resonance with Arcesilaus III. Moreover, commentators have stressed how the fulfilment of the oracle demands that we read it as a *post eventum* prophecy applied retroactively.[263] There is, however, another option.

---

[260] As commentators have observed, the myth compliments the poet's concluding remarks that the victor will soon be looking to acquire a wife. I agree that the thematic connection to the young athlete's personal life mentioned in the conclusion justifies the choice of the myth and would suggest this argues against an intentionally subversive reading.

[261] I am grateful to Hayden Pelliccia for sharing his observation on the two passages for this point.

[262] Though the prophecy is written in prose, traces of the original dactylic rhythm and explicitly poetic language are preserved in Herodotus' passage. Stein 1893, 145 is especially useful for the formal and metrical considerations on the passage.

In a passage criticizing his fellow citizens' gullibility toward oracles, Thucydides observed how: "Among other things which they remembered in their distress was, very naturally, the following verse which the old men said had long ago been uttered "Dorian war shall come and with it, pestilence." So, a dispute arose as to whether dearth and not death had not been the word in the verse; but at the present juncture, it was of course decided in favor of the latter; for the people made their recollections fit in with their sufferings. I suppose, however, that if afterwards another Dorian war were to come upon us, and a famine should happen to accompany it, the verse will probably be read accordingly. The oracle also which had been given to the Spartans was now remembered by those who knew of it. When the god was asked whether they should go to war, he answered that they put their might into it, victory would be theirs, and that he would Himself be with them." (Thuc. 2.54.2-4)[264] Thucydides' skepticism on the operation of oracles is valuable for thinking about our Herodotus passage.[265] In Thucydides' representation, oracles circulated freely and were adapted to the present needs. In the case of the plague narrative, Thucydides suggests the motivation was an attempt to explain why Athens had been stricken with the disease—the war brought it on. Though Thucydides fails to dwell on the oracle's use in Athenian politics, we may surmise that the prophecy was used by anti-war politicians to illustrate the consequences of the choice to go to war with the Spartans. This message would work hand in glove with the second oracle he quotes, claiming the Spartans received it from Delphi.[266] Here we may more clearly see the political manipulation of oracles. The Spartan suggestion that "god is on our side", as conveyed by this oracle, is a powerful piece of rhetoric whose use ranges from, for example, Isaiah 7:14, *Deus Nobiscum* of Constantine and his soldiers, to the Prussian coat of arms proclaiming "Gott mit uns."[267]

---

[263] Stein 1893, 145, How and Wells 1912, 355 "[the prophecy] is obviously a prediction *post eventum,* made after the eighth and last Battiad had been deposed; this was about 460 B.C. Pindar obviously knew nothing of it in 466, when he sang the glory of the Battiads", Asheri et al. 2007, 691.

[264] Trans. Crawley in Strassler 1995.

[265] For Thucydides' skepticism and criticism directed at the credulousness of his fellow Athenians, see Marinatos 1981, 47-55. For detailed discussions of the passage, see Gomme 1956, 160, Rusten 1990, 194-5, and Hornblower, 1991, 327. Rusten 2013 discusses a case where an oracle about an earthquake on Delos may have instigated a historical recollection of an event that did not actually happen.

In the context Thucydides develops, we may see a more significant reason for the Spartan use of the oracle. Apollo's penchant for disease and illness as a weapon against his enemies was a commonly accepted feature of the god in Greek myths and prominently featured in the *Iliad*'s opening lines (Hom. *Il*. 1. 9-12).[268] Taken in tandem with the Athenian suffering Thucydides had just narrated, the circulation of the Spartan prophecy at a moment of the Athenian plague's most pernicious effects reinforces the oracle's message: Apollo has sided with the Spartans, and is smiting his Athenian enemies with plague. An awareness of this message is demonstrated by Thucydides' acknowledgement that the plague had no significant impact in the Peloponnese and his reuse of the prophecy, first cited in Thuc. 1.118.3.[269] This must have been a tremendously devastating piece of propaganda to employ against the Athenians while the city was plague-ravaged.[270] But the purpose of circulating this oracle was not simply to dishearten the already battered Athenians; it was to influence an actual change in policy or even end the war. This is a strategic, calculated deployment of an oracle against an enemy at an opportune moment for political gain.

---

[266] Gomme 1956, 160, observing the reuse of the Spartan oracle cited at 1.118.3, "The repetition here of the actual words does not suggest that Thucydides had the earlier passage in mind. Apollo, of course, is the god who would send the pestilence, as in the *Iliad*."

[267] Whitby 1998 discusses the use of the phrase in the case of Constantine.

[268] The connection between Apollo and the Theban plague in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* is another famous example.

[269] For connections between the plague and Apollo in this passage, see Kallet 2013.

Returning to Herodotus' oracle predicting eight generations of Battiad rule, we may now consider how the prophecy functioned as a political weapon against the ruling dynasty.[271] Scholiasts to Pindar's odes for Arcesilaus record how the king faced stasis upon his ascent to the throne.[272] Both *P.*4 and *P.*5 seem to allude to these crises, focusing on the Battiad's successful resolution of them. Had the oracle been circulating at the time of Arcesilaus IV's ascent, its invocation by partisans would have directly subverted the message of the dynasty's charter myth. Rather than a limitless rule over Cyrene, the oracle, allegedly coming from the same place where Battis was granted rule over Cyrene, places a cap on the number of Battiads that may rule with Apollo's sanction, and actively warns against a continuation of the royal line.

This is important if we consider the aim of the revolt was to impose a popular government, as seems likely.[273] By marginalizing the dynasty, democratic partisans could have asserted their legitimacy to rule and the importance of organizing new mechanisms of governance, as the sanctioned period of Battiad rule was coming to a close. The circulation of the oracle at a time when the monarchy was on uncertain footing would offer a close parallel to Thucydides' Spartan example above.

---

[270] For prophecy being used as a propagandistic weapon, see Scott 2014, 189-90. Though the passage he cites is from the second century, he notes that the strategy was much older.

[271] For a discussion of oracles directed against tyrants, and especially those that cast the Delphic oracle as pro-democratic, see Parke-Wormell 1956a, 121, Malkin 1989, 149, and Scott 2014, 82-3. For the opposite case, where Delphic oracles were used to support incipient tyrannies, see Morgan 1990, 178-83 who collects the evidence from Herodotus.

[272] Drachmann 1910, 91-4.

[273] For the establishment of the democracy after the fall of the Battiads in Cyrene, see Robinson 2011, 130-6.

Of course, existing oracles may be tailored to present circumstances, and what may have begun as a benign generic prophecy could be re-worked into an astonishingly "accurate prediction" of current events.[274] One of our only external sources for the last Battiad king's reign even records the circulation of a dire oracle for the king: (Heraclides Lembus, *Exerpta Politiarum* 17)

Ἀρκεσιλάου δὲ βασιλεύοντος λευκὸς κόραξ ἐφάνη, περὶ οὗ λόγιον ἦν χαλεπόν. δημοκρατίας δὲ γενομένης Βάττος εἰς Ἑσπερίδας ἐλθὼν ἀπέθανε, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ λαβόντες κατεπόντισαν.

> During the reign of Arcesilaus, a white raven appeared, concerning which there was a dire oracle. When the democracy was established, Battos[275], going to the Hesperides died, (when) they, taking hold of his head, drowned him.

The second century Hellenistic historian Heraclides Lembus' account offers some tantalizing details. The white raven is particularly important. One of the more famous myths involving Apollo is that of his love affair with Koronis. In Ovid's narration of the story, we are told how ravens were formerly white, but after one who had been appointed to guard Koronis had loquaciously chatted to the god about Coronis' infidelity, in a rage, Apollo turned him (and by extension all ravens) black.[276] As Apollo's sacred bird, the raven suggests Apollonian intervention against the dynasty.[277]

---

[274] To consider the impact of these prophecies, it is valuable to think about the relationship of the modern world to 16th century French prophet Nostradamus. Not only have some sought to claim the author predicted events like the Second World War or terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001, but numerous false prophecies have emerged which claim to foretell other events. While we may easily identify false prophecies, a remarkable number of people in our own society still believe the fabricated texts. This must have been even more widespread in the ancient world where, as in our own, new oracles were always being "found" or fabricated, however, there were far fewer mechanisms to disprove the fabrications. Moreover, those attributed to a famous prophetic site like Delphi or Baccis may have only been denied by the site after they were proven demonstrably false by events that transpired. However, should they be proven true, the sites would have no motivation to deny that they had in fact "originated" from them, as they provide additional "proof" of the site's prophetic power.

[275] There is dispute over who is meant in this passage. Though Arcesilaus had a son named Battus, most scholars believe Arcesilaus is meant by the lines. See Dilts 1971, 5-12 for discussion of the historical problems with the extant text of Heraclides. In particular, Dilts observes Heraclides' penchant for fantastic tales, but emphasizes that he preserves a considerable amount of material from earlier historians and Aristotelian *Politeai.*

It seems likely, then, that during Arcesilaus' reign the Delphic charter myth was coming under fire. Though the excerpt gives no indication of the time between the oracle and the later events, the significance of the passage for our discussion is clear. Coupled with the foundation myth of the *Ehoiai* and *Pythian* Nine, Cyrenaeans may have actively undermined the Battiad claims and asserted their legitimacy to rule over the claim staked by the monarchy.[278]

Contextualized in the ambit of Cyrene's political unrest, Pindar's introduction and speech of Medea take on greater meaning than pure encomium. In this way, we may see the passage as reacting and responding to the anti-monarchic rhetoric exemplified by Herodotus' and Heraclides' passages. Pindar's re-use of the adjective ζᾰμενής when introducing Medea at line *P*.4.10 is our first indication that counter-mythologizing is at play in the passage. By describing Medea in the same terms as his earlier Chiron (*P*.9.38), Pindar has placed his first-person prophecy foretelling the foundation of the Battiad line on the same footing as the earlier foundation myth. Malkin's observation of the distinctions between the two kinds of foundation myth the odes employ may also reveal the poet's conscious strategy to undermine the use of his earlier myth as a political weapon against the dynasty. On this reading, the poet consciously chose to place the Battiad myth in space that was independent of that which his earlier myth covered, allowing the foundation myths to co-exist without one being used to subvert the legitimacy of the other.

---

[276] For an outline of the Hesiodic version see West 1985, 69-72. The story of Coronis is covered in *Pythian* 3 and scholiasts to the ode trace the story back to the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* (frg. 87 and 88 discussed by West above). The fullest continuous account is at Ovid, *Met*. 2.256-611.

[277] There is also an interesting parallel with Charon of Lampsakos in the detail. The fifth century historian records the appearance of white doves at the time of the Persian general Mardonius' shipwreck off the coast of Mount Athos, and remarks that these birds had never been seen in the region before the incident (Charon. frg.3).

[278] For similar polemical myths in Pindar, see Carnes 1995, who explores the Aiginetan appropriations of the Aiakidai, and the complications that arose from various myth traditions about them.

We may also see Pindar’s editorial hand in the tight interlacing of narratives featured in *P*.4’s first 69 lines. While scholars have predominantly treated this overlap as a consequence of lyric narrative, the possibility that Pindar is actively engaging a hostile tradition demands we rethink the purpose of the structure.[279] From this vantage point, the tightly fitted narratives act like chainmail. Each step reinforces the next and previous by asserting and defending the divine approbation of Battiad rule. As narrative levels expand, the number of divinities assenting to the Cyrenaen royal house grows. Pindar represents Medea, Apollo, “Eurypylus,” and Zeus all sanctioning the Battiads, and Apollo’s role is made emphatic. This is not surprising, given the role of Delphi in colonial charter myths,[280] but if, as I have suggested, propagandistic oracles like the one Herodotus cited were circulating in an attempt to further weaken the power of the monarchy, Pindar’s development of the Delphic relationship to the kingship is especially significant. This view is supported by the narrative personae Pindar deploys in these passages.

As we have seen, the poetic rhetoric of divine inspiration carried considerable clout in the archaic Greek world. *P*.4’s opening muse invocation exploits the rhetoric and obscures the source of the information it presents.

Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,
        ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,

---

[279] Greengard 1980 provides a thorough analysis of the structures of epinican odes and sees a greater degree of thematic reoccurrence in *P*.4 than is usual in the epinica (Greengard 1980, 86-7 n.57). Sigelman 2015, 50-85 offers a detailed analysis of macro-structures and lyric narrative.

[280] See Detienne 1990 for the role of Apollo as *archegetos* generally, and Dougherty 1993, 103-117 for the inter-relationship of Arcesilaus, Battus, and Apollo with specific reference to *P*.5.

> Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
> θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων,
> ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος
> οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρεα
> χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον
> καρποφόρου Λιβύας…

> Today, Muse, it is necessary for you to stand beside a dear man, the king of well-horsed Cyrene, so that along with Arcesilaus celebrating, you might augment the breeze of song owed to the Leotids and Pytho, where once the priestess, companion of the golden eagles of Zeus, proclaimed Battis the founder of crop-bearing Libya, nor was Apollo away…

The speed of the transitions to subordinate clauses in the first 12 lines denies the audience the ability to clearly identify the speaking persona. Instead, the appeal to the muse to preside over the unfolding song conflates the material in the song with its rhetorically divine source.[281] This is significant because in a normal epinician proem, the Pindar's poetic persona is conspicuous. So, for example, in the opening of *Olympian 1* the poet's function of inspiring conviviality at the victor's feast is highlighted:

> Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
> ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·
> εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρύεν
> ἔλδεαι, φίλον ἦτορ,
> μηκέτ' ἀελίου σκόπει
> ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἁμέρᾳ φαεν-
> νὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι' αἰθέρος,
> μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·
> ὅθεν ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται
> σοφῶν μητίεσσι, κελαδεῖν
> Κρόνου παῖδ' ἐς ἀφνεὰν ἱκομένους
> μάκαιραν Ἱέρωνος ἑστίαν…

> Water is best, but gold, blazing like fire that pierces through the night, is a conspicuous mark of great wealth—but if, dear heart, you wish to sing of contests, cease looking for another brilliant star in the empty sky warmer than the sun during the day, nor will we sing a contest greater than Olympia, from where a famous song attends the thoughts of the wise—to sing the child of Cronus coming to the rich altar of Hieron…

---

[281] For similar strategies in Muse invocations, see Murray 1981, Finkelberg 1990, and Bowie 1993.

Pindar develops Hieron's victory as the poem's central theme. He rests his authority on his status as one of the *sophoi* referenced in line 9.[282] This song, composed in 476 at the height of Hieron's power required little external validation of the poem's subject. This is what we see in many of the surviving odes. The poet, confident in his craft, introduces the victory, victor, and subject of the poem.[283] Only the victor is mentioned in the opening lines of *P*.4; his *Komos*, while included, is not explained, and no expansion on the king's Pythian chariot victory is made until nearly 65 lines later. Re-thinking the role of the Muse in the poem's opening line offers an explanation.

While the function of the Muses to act as the personified deities of song is commonly found in Pindar's poetry, a secondary group of invocations are more congruent with the instructions to the Muse we see in *P*.4's first line.[284] (O.10.3-6)

> Μοῖσ', ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ
> Ἀλάθεια Διός, ὀρθᾷ χερί
> ἐρύκετον ψευδέων
> ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον.

> But, you Muse, and Truth, the daughter of Zeus, with a correcting hand cast aside the friend-injuring reproach of lies.

Here, the Muse functions as a defensive rhetorical tool. Pindar invokes the Muse, together with the personification Truth, to demonstrate his good will toward the victor and desire to celebrate his success. To repel the suggestion that he said he would compose a song on false pretenses, the poet implores the two divinities in a dual imperative to ἐρύκετον, repel/draw aside, the reproach, and repay the victor not only his premium but also interest. We see a defensive invocation of the Muse again in *Olympian* 3 (3-6):

---

[282] Gianotti 1975, 85-109 and Gerber 1982, 24-9.

[283] The opening lines of *O*.2 seem to playfully acknowledge the convention (1-2):

> Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι,
> τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;

[284] For the differences between the Muses and Graces with a discussion of the functions of both, Johnston 1983, 46-9 collects the evidence. For the role of the Muses in Pindar, see Lanata 1963, 8, Bowra 1964, 4, Grube 1965, 9; Mackie 2003, 36-76 is particularly thorough on the issue.

> Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω ποι παρέ-
> στα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπον
> Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ
> ἀγλαόκωμον·

Thus, the Muse stood beside me, as I found a sparkling new manner of joining the *Komos*-glorifying voice to the Dorian measure.

While elsewhere Pindar extols the virtue of new song, it is not unlikely that in the ancient world, as in our own, novelty and innovation in music was met with some resistance.[285] Pindar's citation of the Muse, then, defends against criticism of the poem's musical innovation, and asserts the authority of the source from which new strain of song flowed. By standing beside the poet, the Muse shelters him from reproach. Pindar's utilization of the verb παρίστημι here corresponds directly with what we see in *P*.4 (1-2):

> Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
> στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας.

Today, Muse, it is necessary for you to stand beside a dear man, the king of well-horsed Cyrene.

The separation of the preposition and verb in the first lines may be a case of tmesis. Citing *O.3*, Braswell has observed of the passage in *P*.4: "Greek, ἵστημι, c. dat. Used with *para*

---

[285] The transition formula in *O*.9 following Pindar's breakoff when beginning a story about Heracles fighting with other gods, "Praise old wine, but the newer blooms of song" *O*.9, 48-9, suggests that the position was not a given but that the poet has to assert it in the context. D'Angour 2011, 12-18 discusses the Greek attitudes toward novelty, especially their general suspicion of it.

(and esp. the compound παρίστημι), like English “to stand by” or “beside (someone)” (cf. Latin ‘‘adsistere”), can imply help as well as presence, even when (as here) it is not specially emphasized; cf. also B. 11. 5.”[286] There is an important reason for not emphasizing the king’s need for the Muse’s help or defense; this statement would concede his weakness. Instead, as we have seen, the poet contextualizes the song as due to Delphi and Artemis and Apollo. He then rapidly shifts to Delphi and the series culminates in Medea’s prophecy.

It is no coincidence that Medea’s speech utilizes so many of the markers of verse oracles Fontenrose recoded: it is intended to be one. In the unsettled political context we have developed, the purpose of the prophecy becomes clear. Pindar’s invocation of the Muse to offer Arcesilaus aid alerts us to the poet’s divine authority. As such, rhetorically, Medea’s speech is transmitted to him through the Muse, who was commonly thought to have known the truth of all things.[287] The verisimilitude of the speech to known, or even famous, verse oracles grants it additional credibility—to its audience it sounded like a real prophecy. In this way, Medea’s prophetic voice counters anti-monarchal propaganda and reasserts the Battiad claims to rule through the medium in which it was it was actively being challenged. The interlacing structure reinforces this goal.

As we have seen, the poem’s narrative begins with the present occasion, moves to Delphi and Battis, recedes to Medea’s speech which describes the preceding events involving Euphemus and foretells Battis’s kingship, returns to Battis, and concludes with an exaltation of Arcesilaus and his chariot victory. Closing with the chariot victory serves less as an indication that it should be taken as the subject of the ode and more as an additional piece of evidence for the poem's larger claims about the Battiad kingship.

---

[286] Braswell 1988, 57.

[287] For the role of the muses as a persuasive rhetorical tool/weapon, see Pucci 1977, 8-34.

On this reading, the victory is paramount in demonstrating the god's continuing favor. It actively subverts the suggestion intrinsic to the prophecy Herodotus records. Far from a failing monarchy falling from the god's favor, the Battiads are powerful, blessed, and their continued successes serve as an illustration of this. By putting the Muse's defense, the Battiad charter myth, Medea's prophecy, and the Euphemid claim in dialogue with Arcesilaus' victory, Pindar has offered the strongest possible claim for the dynasty's viability.

Having considered the reception of Medea's prophecy in a Cyrenean political environment, it is instructive to place it in its Pan-Hellenic context. As Kathryn Morgan has shown in the case of Sicilian despots, Greek tyrants in the years following the Greco-Persian Wars faced the unenviable challenge of legitimating a form of government which had become taboo on the mainland.[288] Herodotus, in the last quarter of the 5th century felt personally compelled to defend the Macedonian monarchy against charges of barbarism and assert their Hellenic credentials (Hdt. 8.137-9), and as we saw in the first chapter, Euripides illustrated the Hellenism of Macedonians with his play *Archelaos*.[289]

The case of Macedon affords us a vauable parallel for considering the position of the Battiad monarchy in the years after the Persian Wars. Not only was its form of government considered archaic among the Greek states, but the kingdom's submission to Persia clearly left a lasting stain on its public image. This same stigma attached itself to other Medizing states as well. Pindar's home city of Thebes, for example, faced a similar dilemma—yet the challenge for

---

[288] Morgan 2015, 87-132.

[289] For the controversies over the production of the play and its general aim, see Harder 1985, 125-31.

Thebes was considerably easier. As one of the mainland's oldest and mythologically richest states, Thebans in the post-war era faced no significant threat to their Hellenic identity.[290]

This was not the case in Cyrene or Macedon. At the periphery of the Greek world and utilizing a system of government commonly viewed as Asiatic, the Battiads, like the Macedonian kings, must have faced real challenges to their Hellenic credentials.[291] As we saw with Euripides in Macedon, a poem legitimizing the official royal narrative involving the dynasty's Hellenism and written by an internationally famous mainland poet like Pindar would serve as a powerful statement to the larger Greek world. Cyrene and its monarchy were not only Greek but were the offshoot of one of the greatest adventures in the Greek mythic tradition.

Captatio

Having explored the details of Medea's speech and situated them in their historical and poetic contexts, let us close this chapter with a consideration of the section's relationship to the larger work. As we have seen, the section wastes no time to enter the mythic past. Once there, Pindar goes to extraordinary lengths to foreground the Hellenism of, and divine assent to, Battiad rule. Why would Pindar begin his poem this way if not on the dictates of the royal commissioner?

---

[290] For the struggle with and rehabilitation of the Theban image in the period, see Rockwell 2017, 58-9. Herodotus' persistently hostile representation of the Thebans indicates that the project was not entirely successful. The intensity of Herodotus' negative portrayal served as the foundational argument for Plutarch's *De Malignitate Herodoti* (*De Mal. Her*. 31.b-d).

[291] It is vauble to note that the other poem written for Arcesilaus' chariot victory of 462, *P.*5, accomplishes a similar objective by emphasizing the city's connections to the Doric world through its celebration of *Karneia* and connections to the Spartan royal Ageid house. For the Dorian connections in *P.* 5, see Nafissi 1980, Nicolai 1992; to Sparta specifically, Nafissi 1985; and the problematic issue of the 1st person identified with the Ageidai, Lefkowitz 1985 (in Lefkowitz 1992).

Seeing the poem as a structured argument to secure the exile Demophilus' repatriation offers an answer. On this view, the thematic harmony of the first 70 lines suggests a clear rhetorical unit. But to accomplish what? I suggest the oratorical strategy of *captatio benevolentiae* provides a clear explanation for the section. Discussing the rhetorical function of the exordium in argument, Aristotle informs us (*Rhet*. 2.14.7):

> "The defendant, when about to introduce himself, must remove all obstacles, so that he must first clear away all prejudice… The object of an appeal to the hearer is to make him well disposed or to arouse his indignation, and sometimes to engage his attention or the opposite… As for rendering his hearers tractable, everything will lead up to it if the speaker wishes… Hearers pay most attention to things that are important, things that concern their own interests, that are astonishing, that are agreeable." [292]

Aristotle's view on exordium's function in persuasive rhetoric maps well onto the features we have noticed in the first 70 lines of *P*.4.[293] On this reading, the unit attempts to disarm an audience that may be hostile to the eventual plea for repatriation at the poem's conclusion. To accomplish this task, the poet offers the king badly needed propaganda to legitimize his rule. As we have seen, in the poltical environment of the post-Persian Wars era, this assisted the Battiads in both the Pan-Hellenic community and the volatile political community of Cyrene.

The mechanics of argumentation Aristotle observes also support this reading. The devices of apostrophe, geneaology, and myth intertwine to afford the king an opening which will engage and maintain his interests—it is a story about him and the foundation of his dynasty. With an eye to the concluding plea, we may appreciate how when read as a *captatio benevolentiae* the unit connects Demphilus' repatriation plea with these powerful assertions of the dynasty's legitimacy.

---

[292] Trans. Freese.

[293] For similar views on the power of the rhetorical strategy and its deployment, see Cic. *Inv*. 1.20; 11; *De Or*. 2.322; Quint. *Inst*. 4.1.5; *Rhet. Her*. 1.6.

Should suspicions of treason surrounding Demophilus remain, the opening rejects the legitimacy of them. In effect, this is the exact work the rhetorical figure is intended to accomplish. It disarms potential hostility to a defendant's case before the introduction of the main themes of the argument by playing to the audience's vanity.[294] The king hears exactly what he needs to in order to accept that Demophilus is no longer a threat to him.

To this point, neither Demophilus' name nor his case have even been suggested. It may be that the king was aware of the plea beforehand, but even if not, our next section introduces us to the theme of exile, return, and dangers therein in a way that prepares its audience for the plea. In this way, it continues the work the opening has done and builds on it by carefully developing a case through mythology. Let us now explore how it accomplishes this next task.

---

[294] For this reason, Cicero, *De Or*. 2.115, calls it the most effective rhetorical tool to engender sympathy in an audience.

IV

JASON AT THE SYMPOSIUM: THE EXILE AND THE KING

Of the nearly 200 lines of *P*.4 dedicated to the Argonautic myth, roughly half are focused on two meetings of Jason and Pelias before the mission begins.[295] By way of comparison, the same material Pindar elaborates in 100 lines of his 299-line poem, Apollonius' *Argonautica*—a nearly six-thousand-line composition–covers in 12 (Ap. Rhod. *Arg*. 1.5-17). From any perspective, we must concede that Pindar's investment in this background material is proportionally remarkable. What motivated him to spend so much time on the preliminary dynamic between the returning Jason and king Pelias?

Jason's *Nostos*

As we saw earlier,[296] *P*.4's myth has traditionally been interpreted as either a purely encomiastic celebration of the Battiad kingship or a covert attack on Arcesilaus. In a 1979 article, however, Christopher Carey argued that the myth offered Arcesilaus complementary positive and negative exempla:[297] Jason's probity, respectfulness, and piety could be read as encouraging Arcesilaus to show pity toward Demophilus and to allow him to return. Conversely, Pelias exemplifies the corresponding faults. The king’s rudeness at their initial meeting, and his violent aggression toward Jason’s father in the past serve as a negative example of kingship, which Arcesilaus should naturally avoid.[298] Carey’s argument that the myth serves a parainetic purpose will be adopted here. Modifying some of the particulars of Carey’s argument, I will now reconsider how Pindar develops the parallels.[299]

---

[295] Scholars have attempted to explain the length of the scenes variously. The most pervasive is that Pindar wass attempting to create the illusion of complete epic narration by focusing on the setup. (E.g. Braswell 1988, 160, "the incidents to be told are selected with great care so as to produce the effect of fullness, whereas others which would doubtless have found a place in a real epic are omitted.")

[296] Chapter 2.

[297] One of the best explored examples of the literary device of parainetic myth exemplum is the exchange between Phoenix and Achilles in book nine of the *Iliad*. The scene follows a similar template: a wise adviser offers an admonitory example from myth to illustrate the larger argument and attempt to dissuade the prince from a particular

Jason At Iolcus

*P.*4’s myth formally begins in the epic manner with a question (70-8):

τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας, 70
τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος
        δῆσεν ἅλοις; θέσφατον ἦν Πελίαν
ἐξ ἀγαυῶν Αἰολιδᾶν θανέμεν χεί-
        ρεσσιν ἢ βουλαῖς ἀκνάμπτοις.
ἦλθε δέ οἱ κρυόεν πυκινῷ μάντευμα θυμῷ,
πὰρ μέσον ὀμφαλὸν εὐδένδροιο ῥηθὲν ματέρος
τὸν μονοκρήπιδα πάντως 75
        ἐν φυλακᾷ σχεθέμεν μεγάλᾳ,
εὖτ' ἂν αἰπεινῶν ἀπὸ σταθμῶν ἐς εὐδείελον
χθόνα μόλῃ κλειτᾶς Ἰαολκοῦ,
ξεῖνος αἴτ' ὦν ἀστός.

What beginning took them on their voyage, and what danger bound them with

---

behavior through the negative example of the story narrated. For Phoenix’s function as an instructor to Achilles see Yamataga 1991; Mackie 1997; Muellner 2004, 146-50.

[298] Carey 1979.

[299] Martin 1984 offers a full treatment of the reception of the Indo-European tradition of princely instruction literature in early epic and especially Hesiod’s *Works and Days*. West 1978 explores the wisdom literature genre in the context of the eastern Mediterranean literatures and their reception in early Greek poetry. Also influential in antiquity was Hesiod’s *Precepts of Chiron*, which took the form of an exchange between Achilles and Chiron in which Chiron instructs his young ward through gnomai and myth. The importance of this work for Pindar is argued by Kurke 1990, and more recently Hernandez 2015; his reference to it in *Pythian* 6 is symptomatic of his interest in moral instruction—a point of particular importance for the royal odes since gnomai and other forms of moral instruction contained in them are quite literally instruction to kings. On the common figure of the wise adviser in Greek literature, see, in addition to Latimore 1939, and Irwin 2005 who explores Solon’s authoritative poetic persona and its relationship to Herodotus’ representation of the 6th century Athenian sage.

> strong nails of adamant? It was fated that Pelias would perish because of the proud Aiolians, at their hands or through their inflexible counsels. And an oracle came to him that chilled his crafty heart, spoken at the central navel of the tree-clad mother to be greatly on guard in every way against the man with one shoe, whenever he comes from the high dwelling places to the sunny land of famous Iolcus, whether he be a stranger or townsman. (Trans. Race)

The beginning of Pindar's narration roots the Argonautic voyage in an ominous prophecy delivered to Pelias at an undefined point in the past.[300] Identifying a Delphic oracle as the originator of the Argonautic quest, Pindar foreshadows the role Apollo and his prophetic site will play in Cyrene's foundation. The poet has already called attention to the latter three times in the poem: in the opening (4-6, ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρεα χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον καρποφόρου Λιβύας), at the conclusion of Medea's speech (53-6, τὸν μὲν πολυχρύσῳ ποτ' ἐν δώματι Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει θέμισσιν Πύθιον ναὸν καταβάντα χρόνῳ ὑστέρῳ, νάεσσι πολεῖς ἀγαγὲν Νείλοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα), and in an apostrophe to Battus during the transition from Medea's speech and the beginning of the myth (60-3, ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου, σὲ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ χρησμὸς ὤρθωσεν μελίσσας Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ· ἅ σε χαίρειν ἐστρὶς αὐδάσαισα πεπρωμένον βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράνᾳ, δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποινὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν). The repeated emphasis on Delphi, and the unique reference to Arcesilaus' victory at the beginning of the myth is likely encomiastic in intention, as Braswell and others have contended, but since, as we have seen, encomiastic celebration of athletic success was not exclusive to epinicia,[301] we may easily take them to be cited as instantiations of the god’s good will toward the dynasty in a broader sense.[302]

---

[300] Burton 1962, 154, took lines 71-2 and 73-8 as two oracles about Pelias' fate, with the second expanding on the first. While in some traditions Pelias may have received two prophecies—especially since a request for clarification after unfavorable oracles seems a commonplace in literature: Fontenrose 1978, 88-119; Bowden 2005, 17-25—the following lines may easily be taken as an expansion on the opening point that Pelias would die by the hands of an Aeolian, as Braswell 1988, 164-5, has seen.

Pindar immediately introduces Jason, the man foretold in the prophecy—a foreigner who is in fact a citizen—(78-83):

ὁ δ' ἦρα χρόνῳ
ἵκετ' αἰχμαῖσιν διδύμαισιν ἀνὴρ ἔκ-
παγλος· ἐσθὰς δ' ἀμφοτέρα νιν ἔχεν,
ἅ τε Μαγνήτων ἐπιχώριος ἁρμό-
ζοισα θαητοῖσι γυίοις,
ἀμφὶ δὲ παρδαλέᾳ στέγετο φρίσσοντας ὄμβρους·
οὐδὲ κομᾶν πλόκαμοι κερθέντες ᾤχοντ' ἀγλαοί,
ἀλλ' ἅπαν νῶτον καταίθυς-
σον.

> And in time he came, a terrifying man with twin spears. Both types of clothes covered him—that which is native to Magnesia fitting his astonishing limbs, and he covered himself from beating downpours with a leopard skin. Nor were his glorious locks of hair cropped, but streamed down his entire back.

Considerable scholarly attention has been given to the figure Jason cuts.[303] While parallels with Homeric warrior-heroes are readily apparent, the scene’s dramatic quality is equally important. A comparison with a parallel passage from Bacchylides, Pindar’s contemporary, will show how arresting Pindar’s tableau of Jason is.

In Bacchylides 18, a dithyramb written for the Athenians, the mise-en-scène is nearly identical to Pindar’s account of the returning Jason. In Bacchylides’ poem, the Athenian citizens learn from King Aegeus about the approach of a mysterious stranger who has recently performed acts of heroism. The king’s second speech describes the stranger’s physical appearance (Bacch.18.46-60):

---

[301] Chapter 2.

[302] Braswell 1988, 155; Duchemin 1955; Duchemin 1963 read the relationship differently and suggested that prophecy plays a more important role than athletics in the appropriation of Delphi in these passages. I agree that the religious center’s prophetic function is more developed in these lines, but can see no reason to exclude the athletic role of the site from our understanding of them. Any mention of Delphi may easily convey both of the site’s major cultural functions, and both are significant for Arcesilaus. For the role of athletic contests and the festival circuit in the dissemination of Delphi’s oracular fame, see Morgan 1990, 212-23.

[303] Burton 1962, 41; Braswell 1988, 172-5.

> Δύο οἱ φῶτε μόνους ἁμαρτεῖν
> λέγει, περὶ φαιδίμοισι δ' ὤμοις
> ξίφος ἔχειν <ἐλεφανόκωπον>,
> ξεστοὺς δὲ δύ' ἐν χέρεσσ' ἄκοντας
> κηΰτυκτον κυνέαν Λάκαι-
> ναν κρατὸς πέρι πυρσοχαίτου·
> χιτῶνα πορφύρεον
> στέρνοις τ' ἀμφί, καὶ οὔλιον
> Θεσσαλὰν χλαμύδ'· ὀμμάτων δὲ
> στίλβειν ἄπο Λαμνίαν
> φοίνισσαν φλόγα· παῖδα δ' ἔμ<μ>εν
> πρώθηβον, ἀρηΐων δ' ἀθυρμάτων
> μεμνᾶσθαι πολέμου τε καὶ
> χαλκεοκτύπου μάχας·
> δίζησθαι δὲ φιλαγλάους Ἀθάνας.

> He says that only two men accompany him, and that he has an [ivory handled] sword slung around his glorious shoulders, and two hewn javelins in his hands, a Lakonian helmet covering his fiery-haired head; a purple cloak around his chest, and a wooly Thessalian mantle. And that a yellow Lemnian fire drips from his eyes, and that he is a youth just reaching adolescence, and is mindful of the playthings of war and of bronze-clashing battle; and he is seeking gleaming Athens.

Like Pindar’s Jason, Theseus carries two spears (ξεστοὺς δὲ δύ' ἐν χέρεσσ' ἄκοντας), and is clothed in distinctly regional garments **(**χιτῶνα πορφύρεον στέρνοις τ' ἀμφί, καὶ οὔλιον Θεσσαλὰν χλαμύδ').[304] His conspicuous youth and formidable figure also parallel Jason’s. But unlike Jason, Bacchylides’ Theseus has not yet reached town. Bacchylides’ conclusion achieves its dramatic force through the discrepancy of knowledge between the intra-carminal and extra-carminal audiences. The concluding line (δίζησθαι δὲ φιλαγλάους Ἀθάνας) sounds an especially ominous note for the intra-carminal audience who know nothing of Theseus beyond the events the messenger related to King Aegeus. They learn they are being approached by a man who has slain several notorious local villains. There is no indication of his purpose in doing so, nor if he approaches Athens with hostile or friendly intent: the anxiety felt by the internal audience at the poem's closing is palpable.[305]

---

[304] For discussion of the two heroes’ clothing in the context of hunting youths, see Vidal-Naquet 1981, 151-75.

The external audience hearing the dithyramb, however, is aware that their fellow Athenian citizens in the poem have nothing to fear from the stranger; indeed, they know that the figure will become one of their greatest heroes. This may be why Bacchylides does his best to depict Theseus "from the outside." He represents Theseus as physically imposing, skilled in battle, formidably armed, and of uncertain national identity—just as Pindar does with Jason.[306] The foreign elements of his clothing emphasize that, like Pindar's Jason in Iolcus, Theseus is both foreign and native—something the extra-carminal audience may know but the intra-carminal audience does not.[307] The mixed clothing makes a domestic hero appear foreign, frightening, and dangerous, conveying the fear that the return of an exile strikes in the community from which he was expelled.[308]

---

[305] On the dramatic irony of the situation, cf. Maehler 2003, 191.

[306] Barron 1980 has suggested that the individual characteristics of Theseus' dress correspond to the names of the Athenian politician Kimon's sons, Thettalos and Lakadaimonios, as does the feature of Theseus' red hair with his third son Oulios. If Theseus is meant to suggest the Philaids, this may root the performance of the dithyramb in the time of Kimon's return of Theseus' bones and the construction of the Theseum in the mid 470s, following the Athenian conquest of Skyros (on the dating of the Theseum see Zaccarini 2015, 181-4, who is skeptical of the tradition), or at least place the ode before his ostracism in 460. For the dating of the Theseum and the return of Theseus' bones, see Podlecki 1971; Francis 1990, 51-3; Parker 1996, 85-6; Guiffrida 2004, 260-1; and Shapiro 2012, 160-82. Maehler 2003, 190, however, prefers a later date of 460-55 on the grounds of the ephebic connections in the ode between the description of Theseus and the possible age of Kimon's sons. For which, see Merkelbach 1972, 56-62; Ieranò 1987, 87-103. In either case, the dithyramb seems to have been composed very close to the date of *P*.4.

[307] There may be additional parallels with the myth of Jason; however, the dearth of evidence concerning the Theseus myth in the archaic period makes it difficult to reconstruct. Later tradition has Medea recognize Theseus as Aegeus' son and send him on a series of quests, as Pelias does Jason, in the hopes of getting rid of him permanently—most notably the Marathonian Bull. Gantz 1993, 255, collects the visual evidence which seems to suggest that Medea played a role in Theseus' story at an early date, but early vases featuring a figure assumed to be Medea do not name the character. Bacchylides' text, however, may argue against seeing Medea as involved in Theseus' return if the reconstruction at line 48/9 is accurate, since the ivory-handled sword played a key role in Aegeus identifying the figure as his own son.

Pindar uses the device of an anonymous townsperson to show the impact made by Jason's appearance. A burgeoning crowd of townspeople talks among themselves about the formidable foreigner who has appeared in their midst (85-93):

τὸν μὲν οὐ γίνωσκον· ὀπιζομένων δ' ἔμ-
πας τις εἶπεν καὶ τόδε·
'Οὔ τί ποὺ οὗτος Ἀπόλλων,
οὐδὲ μὰν χαλκάρματός ἐστι πόσις
Ἀφροδίτας· ἐν δὲ Νάξῳ φαντὶ θανεῖν λιπαρᾷ
Ἰφιμεδείας παῖδας, Ὦτον καὶ σέ, τολ-
μάεις Ἐπιάλτα ἄναξ.
καὶ μὰν Τιτυὸν βέλος Ἀρτέμιδος θήρευσε κραιπνόν,
ἐξ ἀνικάτου φαρέτρας ὀρνύμενον,
ὄφρα τις τᾶν ἐν δυνατῷ φιλοτά-
των ἐπιψαύειν ἔραται.'

> They did not recognize him. But someone of those gazing on him said this among other things: "This cannot be Apollo…Nor, indeed, the bronze charioted husband of Aphrodite. And they say that the sons of Iphimedea perished in radiant Naxos—Otos, and you, bold lord Ephialtes. The swift arrows of Artemis, hurried from her unconquered quiver, hunted down Tityos, that men might lust to attain lovers within their station."

The reaction of the anonymous townsperson becomes increasingly negative. The possibility that the figure may be a god is raised solely to be rejected: there is *no way* the approaching figure is Apollo (Οὔ τί ποὺ οὗτος Ἀπόλλων). The dismissed Apollo is succeeded by a more sinister divine candidate, Ares, also rejected (οὐδὲ μὰν χαλκάρματός ἐστι πόσις Ἀφροδίτας). The townsperson then considers darker mortal parallels for the stranger.[309]

---

[308] Bacchylides seems to have enjoyed using the tension between knowledge and appearance for dramatic effect in his poetry. The best parallel is found in the conclusion to the epinican *Ode 5* for Hieron. The implication that the meeting of Heracles and Meleager in the underworld will bring about Heracles' death is strongly implied, but unexpressed by the actual details of the ode. The audience is left to contemplate the encounter with their own knowledge of myth and realize how an event that seems ostensibly fortuitous is deleterious to the hero. See Pelliccia 2009, 259; Cairns 2010, 242-5.

Otus and Ephialtes, twin sons of Poseidon by Iphimedeia, were known for their size and violence, as we see in Homer.[310] In the *Iliad* (5.385-91), the twins overpower and imprison Ares, which was the transgression for which they were destroyed.[311] The more familiar version of their myth (*Od*.11.305-20) tells how the twins planned to build a bridge to Olympus with the mountains of central Greece and lay siege to the gods. The narrator concludes that they would have accomplished these feats had Apollo not killed them before they reached maturity.[312] In our passage, Pindar apostrophizes Ephialtes, calling him τολμάεις: the "epithet assumes knowledge of the myth."[313]

Tityus, the final figure in the anonymous townsperson's speech, is equally troubling. The paltry remains of his myth cite his attempted rape of Leto. This violation secured an eternity of having his innards eaten by vultures.[314] For Pindar's anonymous speaker, Tityus' punishment serves a didactic function; ὄφρα τις τᾶν ἐν δυνατῷ φιλοτάτων ἐπιψαύειν ἔραται.[315] He was killed

---

[309] Cf. Kirkwood 1982, 184, "The implication of these murmurings is that Jason must be a deity or the gigantic and violent enemy of deity."

[310] For a side by side comparison of the passages, see Sotiriou 1998, 132.

[311] For the peculiarities of the Iliadic version of the story, see Cassio 2012, 221-3, who, drawing on the scholiasts to the passage, argues that the version we see in book 5 of the *Iliad* reflects a Cyprian version of the story where the twins might not have been villains, but instead were guardians of Adonis appointed by Aphrodite. Whether this Cyprian version existed independently of the *Iliad* is unclear. Pindar's use of the myth in frg.162-3 follows the *Odyssey*.

[312] Gantz 1995, 170-1 adds the detail that the twins sought to marry Hera and Artemis respectively—a story found in Apollodorus and hinted at in Callimachus Hymn 3. Gantz argues that this story may be early and connects the story with the twins' plot to scale Olympus, but this reconstruction must remain speculative.

[313] Braswell 1988, 184.

[314] Homer, *Od*. 11.580-1.

[315] The gnome has a long history: Alcm. *PMG*. 1.17 and Rhian.1.14 Powell.

"that a man may desire to touch upon loves he is allowed." In this way, Tityus' sexual transgression offers an exact parallel to Ixion, another villain of royal Pindaric lyric, and a figure who propounds a similar gnome to mankind (*P*.2.21-4):

θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς 21
λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ
παντᾷ κυλινδόμενον·
τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς
        ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι.

> In accordance with the commands of the gods, they tell that Ixion says these things to mortals, whirling all around on his winged wheel: go and repay your benefactor with deeds of gentle recompense.
>
> (Trans. Race with modification)

In Pindar's account, after Zeus had purified Ixion for the murder of a kinsman, the mortal king attempted to rape Hera.The two characters' actions are remarkably similar. As several scholars have pointed out, Ixion's violation of Zeus' xenia is especially resonant in a royal setting where guests, courtiers, and subjects regularly intermingled.[316] While Tityus' warning exhibits notably erotic language reflecting his sexual crime,[317] its application should not be restricted to sex. Many objects of desire—especially political power—were commonly described in sexual terms.[318] Intra-carminally, the concluding gnome warns the approaching foreigner of the fate suffered by similarly intimidating figures for transgressions against benefactors.

---

[316] A third transgressive character is Tantalus in *Olympian* 1. His crime was distributing ambrosia to his fellow symposiasts—another character acting above their station. For discussions of the poet's role as mediator of audience and royal interests, see Burton 1962, 116-28; Cole 1992, 113-31; Carey 2007; Morgan 2015, 200-208.

[317] See Braswell 1988, 185.

[318] Ludwig 2002, 10-22.

The First Encounter of Jason and Pelias

Given the anonymous man's reaction, it is unsurprising the king is at best guarded in his own (95-100):

τάφε δ' αὐτίκα παπτά- 95
ναις ἀρίγνωτον πέδιλον
δεξιτερῷ μόνον ἀμφὶ ποδί. κλέπτων δὲ θυμῷ
δεῖμα προσήνεπε· 'Ποίαν γαῖαν, ὦ ξεῖν', εὔχεαι
πατρίδ' ἔμμεν; καὶ τίς ἀνθρώ-
πων σε χαμαιγενέων πολιᾶς
ἐξανῆκεν γαστρός; ἐχθίστοισι μὴ ψεύδεσιν
καταμιάναις εἰπὲ γένναν.' 100

> And right away marking that a sandal was conspicuous on his right foot alone, he was thunderstruck. Stealing his fear away in his soul he addressed him: "What land, stranger, do you boast to be your home? Who of earth-born mortals issued you from her pale belly? Speak your lineage, not befouling it with hateful lies."

There has been considerable debate over the tenor of Pelias' brief address to Jason. While in basic detail the speech is little more than an embellished version of the traditional Homeric formula, "who are you and where are you from," many scholars have detected boorishness or even an open insult in the term "πολιᾶς γαστρός" used to describe Jason's mother.[319] On this reading, we are meant to take the adjective πολιᾶς to mean old/aged from its common use to describe the hair of the elderly, rendering roughly "what old-maid bore you?" As Bruce Braswell has noted, however, outside of the context of describing hair, πολιός should not be assumed to mean old, and, even if it were, that calling a mother "old" as an insult is unclear.[320] Braswell instead prefers to take the adjective metaphorically to mean “revered,” which runs the risk of over-correcting. It may be possible to read the expression neutrally as a physical descriptor of light color, since the range of the color implied by the adjective includes light white to grey-flecked.[321] Given the Greek association of light-skin color with femininity, the white-grey color would fit a description of a woman’s pregnant belly, as Reiter argued long ago.[322] There are other indications that the speech is not intended to be insulting. In line 95, Pelias hides away his fear in his soul (κλέπτων δὲ θυμῷ δεῖμα), implying that what follows does not express his animosity toward the figure, but instead masks it.[323]

---

[319] Boeckh 1821 ad loc.; Gildersleeve 1885, 291; Fennel 1893, 195, "Pelias in the insolent bluster of sudden terror asks Jason in effect "what low hag brought you forth?"; Burton 1962, 155-6, detects insult, but offers skepticism: "Pindar appears to give the words a passion and vigour which reveal character and an emotion and form a telling contrast to Jason's reply. However tempting it maybe to conclude from the language of vv.98ff. that Pelias imputes to Jason an old hag of low degree as his mother, *there is no evidence that Greek poets used either πολιός or χαμαιγενής as epithets of contempt or abuse*" (Emphasis added).

[320] Braswell 1988, 189-91.

This reading accords better with the details Pindar has already given us. Explicit hostility would fail to engender the sense of security needed to elicit the information the king wants, and would instead betray his fear of the stranger. Instead, taking Pelias’ address as calculating—welcoming but guarded—makes the best sense of it in context.[324] A reconsideration of the brief transition between speakers accords with this reading.

---

[321] Duchemin 1967, 122, took the adjective to mean skin color in its simplest sense without denoting age or rank; she denies any malice in Pelias’ language.

[322] Reiter 1962, 61-2.

[323] See Stanford 1952 for a discussion of Pindar’s vocabulary for color in *P*.4. He suggests that the poet’s color choices mirror the characterizations he develops for Pelias and Jason. Stanford observes that instead of words to denote blackness, which is traditionally associated with villains, Pindar prefers words meaning gray, murky, or opaque for Pelias. He argues this is intended to convey the obscurity of Pelias’ true intentions.

[324] There is an additional, unexplored option for Pindar’s use of πολιᾶς here. Stanford 1952, N.6, suggests it: “is it too fantastic to see in the curious phrase πολιᾶς γαστρός a reflection of the Grey Man’s greyness?”, but does nothing more with the observation. The idea is supported by Hellanicus (frg.123), who records that a shepherd found Pelias who had been exposed: καὶ τὸν <μὲν> Πελίαν ὠνομάζετο, ἐπεὶ ἐπελιώθη αὐτῶι ἡ ὄψις λακτισθέντι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἵππου. The passage on πελῐόομαι in the Eytmologicum Magnum (680.21) draws a direct connection between it and πολιός, indicating a greyish color. If this meaning was current in the fifth century the adjective may have been chosen less with a view to Pelias’ psyche and more as etymologizing play. For similar etymologizing/punning on Hieron’s name in Pindar, see Pelliccia forthcoming.

While scholars have taken the lines bridging the two speeches—τὸν δὲ θαρσήσαις ἀγανοῖσι λόγοις ὧδ' ἀμείφθη· (100-1)—to mean: “Taking courage, he answered him with gentle words in this way,”[325] this reading presents a formal problem. In his study of speech markers in lyric, Rudolf Führer has observed the coupling of ὧδ' with λόγοις in this passage is an unnatural and unparalleled expression,[326] since, as Eduard Fraenkel noted in his commentary on the *Agamemnon*, the words are “two expressions which are strictly speaking in competition with one another.”[327] In other words, one or the other is otiose. If we do not take ὧδ' with λόγοις how else might we interpret the sentence?

One possibility is to accept Braswell’s argument that Pelias’ speech is courteous instead of insulting. The verb θαρσέω can use the dative to express the source of one’s courage, as we see in Hom. *Il.* 4.233: τοὺς μάλα θαρσύνεσκε παριστάμενος ἐπέεσσιν.[328] If we interpret Pelias’ speech as deceptively gentle we can meet Fraenkel’s objection by taking the words out of competition with each other: “Taking heart from his (Pelias’) gentle words, he (Jason) answered him thus.” Read in this way, the expressions point backward (τὸν δὲ θαρσήσαις ἀγανοῖσι λόγοις) and forward (ὧδ' ἀμείφθη), and neither is otiose.

Jason’s reply begins by highlighting his tutelage under Chiron (*P.*4.102-119):

‘Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χί- 102
ρωνος οἴσειν. ἀντρόθε γὰρ νέομαι
πὰρ Χαρικλοῦς καὶ Φιλύρας, ἵνα Κενταύ-
ρου με κοῦραι θρέψαν ἁγναί.
εἴκοσι δ' ἐκτελέσαις ἐνιαυτοὺς οὔτε ἔργον
οὔτ' ἔπος ἐντράπελον κείνοισιν εἰπὼν ἱκόμαν 105

---

[325] Trans. Race 1997, 273.

[326] Fuhrer 1967, 11, especially note 20.

[327] Fraenkel 1950 (Vol II.), 308.

[328] LSJ s.v. θαρσέω. A.3.

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·
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
δὲ τράφεν Χίρωνι δῶκαν.
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 κικλῄσκων προσαύδα.

> I say that I will honor the instruction of Chiron, for I have returned from the cave from the side of Charichlo and Philyra, where the chaste daughters of the centaur raised me. Having filled out twenty years, directing no shameful deed or word toward them, I have come home to recover my father's ancient honor of kingship—ruled now not in accordance with fate—which once Zeus furnished to the leader Aeolos and his sons. You see, I have learned that lawless Pelias in obedience to his slippery mind forcefully stripped my rightly ruling parents of it. And at the very first moment I saw the sun's blaze, they, fearing the aggression of the arrogant leader, and assuming gloomy mourning throughout the house, mixed with the wails of women, as though I had died, secretly sent me in purple swaddling clothes, confiding my journey to the night, and they gave me to Chiron, the son of Kronos, to raise. But now you know the thrust of the story. Dear citizens, clearly direct me to the home of my white-horsed ancestors, for I have come as a native—the son of Aeson—to no foreign land of others. And the divine beast addressed me calling me by the name Jason.

Jason begins by claiming he will honor the teachings of Chiron, whom he emulates in speaking.[329] He states the terms on which he hopes to return: he has come to his ancestral home to recover his father's kingship (κομίζων πατρὸς ἐμοῦ…τιμάν).

---

[329] Braswell 1988, 192, sees the juxtaposition of physical prowess and mild nature as an additional parallel with Chiron: "Jason begins not only by saying, but also showing that he is a pupil of Chiron, who combined in his own person the natural boldness of the centaurs with his special quality of gentleness."

The choice of κομίζων here is significant. Of its thirteen uses in the Pindaric corpus (all epinician), three refer to the soul's resurrection from death (*P*.3.56, *P*.4.159, *N*.8.44) or to transcendence of death through deeds (*N*.6.30).[330] Jason calls attention to an often-noted association of exile with civic death[331] in recalling household's grief at his departure: κᾶδος ὡσείτε φθιμένου δνοφερόν ἐν δώμασι θηκάμενοι μίγα κωκυτῷ γυναικῶν, (assuming gloomy mourning throughout the house, mixed with the wails of women, as though I had died). The lamentation and mourning behavior Jason mentions simulates a funeral for the baby who will be stripped of his identity and rights while in exile.[332] In this way, the exile's return to his home is the civic equivalent of resurrection. Jason's statement that he has come to restore his ancestral throne complicates the meaning of κομίζω by implying a civil revival.

To this point, Jason's speech has answered Pelias' two questions: "Who are you? And where are you from?" While scholars have been quick to impute hostility and crassness to Pelias, Jason's response has been nearly universally praised for its moderation and tact. Perhaps this attribution of unmitigated restraint to Jason requires qualification.

Jason does not address the person who posed the questions to him. His speech begins with a first-person answer to the question, "who are you?"—Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἴσειν, "I say that I will honor the teachings of Chiron."[333] After expanding on his experiences with

---

[330] The other instances are *O*.2.14; *O*.13.59; *P*.3.56; *P*.5.51; *P*.8.99; *N*.3.19; *N*.3.48; *N*.6.30; *N*.7.28; and *N*.8.44. Cf. Slater 1968, 284-5.

[331] Centanni 1997, 177-183, Forsdyke 2005, 7-11. Cf. Soph. *Phil.*946-7: κοὐκ οἶδ' ἐναίρων νεκρόν, ἢ καπνοῦ σκιάν, εἴδωλον ἄλλως, and Soph. *O.C.* 108: οἰκτίρατ' ἀνδρὸς Οἰδίπου τόδ' ἄθλιον εἴδωλον.

[332] For a full discussion of classical Greek funerary customs, see Parker 2001, 28-37, and for mourning rituals 38-47. Pindar's use of κωκυτός to describe the women's wailing instead of, e.g. οἰμωγή, another common poetic term for wails of lamentation, may also be intentionally suggestive of the underworld river of the same name found in the *Odyssey*, 10.519, and Aesch. *Ag.*1160.

[333] For an analysis of first person pronouncements in Pindar and earlier poetry, see Currie 2013, 164-6, and especially *n.*135.

Chiron, he pivots to his own genealogy. We hear nothing of Pelias in the first half of Jason's speech. It is only when Jason narrates Pelias' aggression toward his father that the king appears in the third person. In Jason's account of how he was separated from his parents, home, and position, Pelias is referred to as lawless, arrogant, and violent. These are not traits it is diplomatic to impute to an interlocutor. We may wonder if Jason's response is directed to Pelias at all.[334]

A direct address is first used at line 116: ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν κεφάλαια λόγων ἴστε, "You all know the highlights of the story." While it might be possible for Pindar to have Jason use the plural of Pelias alone, the following lines rule that out: λευκίππων δὲ δόμους πατέρων, κεδνοὶ πολῖται, φράσσατέ μοι σαφέως, "Dear citizens, point me clearly to the home of my white-horsed ancestors" (117/8).[335]

On this reading, we may take the details of Jason's speech as an indication that the young man is confronting the anxiety involving exiles we detected in the anonymous townsperson's speech in his own. Robert Garland has explained: "In many cases… a returnee represented a serious threat to his or her city-state, since it was likely that his return would reignite the stasis that initially provoked his expulsion… No less problematically, the return of exiles also created legal battles, notably when their property had been acquired by new owners… Whatever procedure was adopted… We may suspect that recriminations would have been commonplace, if not the norm."[336] These are the concerns Jason's representation seeks to dispel. As Jason has stated, it was too dangerous for him as an infant to remain in Iolcus: had his parents not sent him off to Chiron, the king would have killed him. He was too young at the time of his departure to have engaged in politically subversive activity to justify his exile—it was Pelias' violence, intemperance, and injustice that precipitated his departure. That notwithstanding, the calm, collected and gentle manner of the exile suggest that he will not harm his uncle but instead seek to rejoin his community peacefully.

---

[334] If the speech answers the questions Pelias posed, avoids answering him directly, and addresses him only in the third person, we may see a parallel to Agamemnon's speech at *Il*.1.286-91, where Agamemnon shifts from engaging Achilles directly to referring to him obliquely after Nestor proposes a détente between them.

[335] Currie 2013 sees 1st person declarations like the one Jason begins with as indicative of a public pronouncement. Cf. *P*.9.89-96.

[336] Garland 2014, 182-3.

Considering Jason's need to justify his return, his characterization of Pelias should be met with skepticism.[337] We have too few details to know how accurate it is—Pelias may or may not be the irredeemable reprobate Jason portrays him as. And, indeed, Pindar may have intentionally chosen to obscure Pelias' true character. By doing so, the narrative shifts attention from potentially unflattering parallels between Arcesilaus and Pelias, which scholars like Gildersleeve have feared, by resisting a clear characterization of the king, instead focalizing the poor decisions the king made in his regal capacity.

Jason at the Symposium

The next two scenes offer an illuminating view of the exile's return. In the first, Pindar describes a tearful encounter between Jason and his father (*P*.4.120-4):

> τὸν μὲν ἐσελθόντ' ἔγνον ὀφθαλμοὶ πατρός· 120
> ἐκ δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ πομφόλυξαν
> δάκρυα γηραλέων γλεφάρων,
> ἃν περὶ ψυχὰν ἐπεὶ γάθησεν, ἐξαίρετον
> γόνον ἰδὼν κάλλιστον ἀνδρῶν.

---

[337] The potential bias of the speaker is especially important to identify given earlier traditions in which Pelias was the legitimate king of Iolcus; for which see Gantz 1995, 189-95. While we need not see Jason's rendering of events as inherently inaccurate, they contain tremendous potential for distortion and correspondingly color our interpretation of the king. Given the royal audience of *P*.4 and the various Argonautic traditions that existed, there was likely to be more sympathy for the poem's ruling king in the ode's initial performance than we might have for him.

> The eyes of his father recognized him when he approached. And then tears burst from his aged eyelids, as he rejoiced in his heart, seeing his exceptional child was the finest of men.

From a narrative perspective the scene offers little in the way of plot development, and investing five lines in Aeson's reaction is peculiar in view of the lack of interest Pindar shows in sentimentality elsewhere. Deliberate emotional manipulation in forensic cases may provide a parallel. In Lysias 20.34, the speaker describes the impact made by displaying grief-stricken family members to engender sympathy in a jury: "Nevertheless, gentlemen of the jury, we see that if somebody brings forward his children and weeps and laments, you take pity on the children if they are to lose their citizen rights on his account, and you pardon the father's crimes on account of the children, without knowing whether they are going to turn out well or badly when they grow up."[338] To judge from comments like Lysias' and its parody at Ar. *Vesp.* 951, displaying sobbing family members was a common and effective device in the courtroom.[339]

The power of pity was not limited to the suffering of children. Greek rhetoric often equated the elderly with children because of their inability to function independently.[340] The famous scene between King Priam and Achilles makes this point (*Il.* 24.486-92, 504-5): "Remember your father, godlike Achilles, whose years are like mine, on the grievous threshold of old age. Him, too, likely enough, those who dwell round about are treating evilly, nor is there anyone to ward harm and ruin from him. But he, at least, while he hears of you as still living, rejoices in his heart, and hopes day by day that he will see his son returning from the land of Troy… but respect the gods, Achilles, and take pity on me remembering your own father." The impact of the enemy king's plea is readily apparent (*Il.* 24.507): "So he spoke, and in Achilles he roused a desire to weep for his father." Priam's depiction of the aged Peleus emphasizes how without the powerful young Achilles to protect him, the old man is vulnerable to predation by neighbors and friends alike.

---

[338] Todd 2000, 226.

[339] Cf. Andoc. 1.148; Pl., *Ap.* 34.c; Dem. 21, 186-8.

[340] Falkner 1995, 52-70.

If we read *P*.4 like a forensic speech to secure Demophilus' return, we may reasonably ask what work Pindar's representation of Aeson is doing. To be sure, the scene may be designed to evoke pity in the king for Demophilus and his family, but we have too few details on the historical circumstances of Demophilus' exile to offer anything on this point beyond a guess.[341] From the perspective of the extra-carminal audience, we may expect that the depiction of the helpless old man rejoicing at the sight of his exiled son returned would have an especially strong emotional impact.[342] As A.D. Morrison has observed in the case of the Sicilian odes, the power audience members exerted on a ruler in their response to the ode was significant and often underappreciated.[343] While we cannot know the exact composition of the audience, given the affinity of rulers—especially tyrants—to employ exile as a political solution to civil conflict, it is highly likely that some in the audience had either been exiled themselves at some point in their lives or seen loved ones exiled.[344] This is significant given the arresting depiction of Aeson. By focalizing the human impact of the exile, Pindar has crafted Aeson's recognition scene to resonate with those familiar with its sting.[345] Accordingly, the audience's response to the human cost of exile could apply additional pressure on Arcesilaus to confront its attending consequences.

---

[341] Potamiti 2015, 10-11, sees a significant connection between Jason's "gentle words" and conditions of supplication which may inform the parallelism with Demophilus. Perhaps supplication informs the second speech on some level, but I cannot agree that any case in isolation is clearly informed by it. When he engages Pelias, Jason's delivery is characterized as gentle, but the content is direct and forceful—particularly in the second speech. On this point, it is well to recall that Jason, unlike Demophilus with Arcesilaus, is not Pelias' subordinate, but an equal who in Pindar's representation has a legitimate claim to the throne. Moreover, his claim is not shaped by a desire for clemency, but for rectification of former abuses by Pelias. He can be more assertive and aggressive than a subject of the king; however, he chooses mildness and self-restraint to achieve his goals.

[342] Sultan 1999, 67-74, discusses the emotional impact of return in epic generally.

[343] Morrison 2012, 19-24.

[344] For the prominence of exile as a political tool among oligarchic factions and tyrannies, see Forsdyke 2005, 245-60.

With Aeson's acknowledgement of Jason's identity, the reunited family celebrates the eldest son's return (128-37):

> ἐν δαιτὸς δὲ μοίρᾳ
> μειλιχίοισι λόγοις αὐτοὺς Ἰάσων δέγμενος
> ξείνι' ἁρμόζοντα τεύχων
> πᾶσαν ἐυφροσύναν τάνυεν
> ἀθρόαις πέντε δραπὼν νύκτεσσιν ἕν θ' ἁμέραις 130
> ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον.
> ἀλλ' ἐν ἕκτᾳ πάντα λόγον θέμενος σπου-
> δαῖον ἐξ ἀρχᾶς ἀνήρ
> συγγενέσιν παρεκοινᾶθ'·
> οἱ δ' ἐπέσποντ'. αἶψα δ' ἀπὸ κλισιᾶν
> ὦρτο σὺν κείνοισι· καί ῥ' ἦλθον Πελία μέγαρον·
> ἐσσύμενοι δ' εἴσω κατέσταν· τῶν δ' ἀκού- 135
> σαις αὐτὸς ὑπαντίασεν
> Τυροῦς ἐρασιπλοκάμου γενεά·

> And in the turn of the banquet, Jason, receiving them with gentle words, and furnishing accompanying hospitality, stretched out all conviviality for five days and nights in succession, enjoying the sacred blossom of the good life. But on the sixth day, setting out the entire story from the beginning he addressed his relatives, and they gave approval. And quickly he sprang from his couch along with them, and they set out for the home of Pelias. Rushing inside, they stood. And upon hearing, the king himself, the son of lovely-tressed Tyro, faced them.

The passage portrays Jason as the host of the banquet, graciously receiving his guests, offering them the pleasures of the banquet, and warmly addressing them. As many commentators have shown, Jason's charisma and charm are clearly on display.[346] But the intra-carminal tranquility belies the innate potential for conflict the scene conveys. Indeed, the sympotic and komastic undercurrents of the passage, which should play a significant role in its interpretation, have gone largely unnoticed. On this point, the language Pindar chooses to describe the activities at the banquet is significant. The first illustration of sympotic culture is found at lines 128-9 (ἐν δαιτὸς δὲ μοίρᾳ μειλιχίοισι λόγοις αὐτοὺς Ἰάσων δέγμενος ξείνι' ἁρμόζοντα τεύχων). These lines introduce the theme of feasting and the affirmation of guest friendship between Jason and his extended family and friends.[347] In particular, the phrase αὐτοὺς Ἰάσων δέγμενος in the context of feasting evokes scenes depicting a komastic new arrival's request for admission to a symposium.[348] As Malcolm Heath has observed of the term's use in komastic contexts: "the question whether the Komos would be given a cordial reception was accordingly crucial, and for this *dechesthai* becomes an almost technical term in komastic literature."[349]

---

[345] Though Pindar is commonly understood by scholars to be less inclined to sentimentality, Bacchylides seems to have been favorable to it, for which, see Carey 1999.

[346] Gildersleeve 1885, 292-3; Braswell 1988, 212.

A famous example is from Plato's *Symposium*. First, we see Agathon graciously welcome the uninvited Aristodemus to his banquet, as he reaches Agathon's house just as dinner is about to begin (Pl. *Symp*.174 E 2-175A9). Later, when Alcibiades and his Komos arrive, we see Agathon instructing his slaves on how to handle them (Pl. *Symp*. 212 C2-D2):

> καὶ ἐξαίφνης τὴν αὔλειον θύραν κρουομένην πολὺν ψόφον παρασχεῖν ὡς κωμαστῶν, καὶ αὐλητρίδος φωνὴν ἀκούειν. τὸν οὖν Ἀγάθωνα, Παῖδες, φάναι, οὐ σκέψεσθε; καὶ ἐὰν μέν τις τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ᾖ, καλεῖτε· εἰ δὲ μή, λέγετε ὅτι οὐ πίνομεν ἀλλ' ἀναπαυόμεθα ἤδη.
>
> And suddenly the courtyard door was struck, letting off a great noise, like that of komasts, and they heard the voice of a flute-girl. And Agathon said, "slaves, won't you see who it is? If it's one of our friends, invite them in. If not, tell them that we are not drinking, but have already given it a rest."

---

[347] Cf. Giannini 1995, 464.

[348] Alc. 374.

[349] Heath 1988, 180.

The dynamic of entry and participation is made explicit with Alcibiades' request to join Agathon's symposium (Pl. *Symp.* 212E1-5): Ἄνδρες, χαίρετε· μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα δέξεσθε συμπότην, ἢ ἀπίωμεν ἀναδήσαντες μόνον Ἀγάθωνα, ἐφ' ᾧπερ ἤλθομεν; (Greetings, gentlemen! Will you admit a very drunk man to your symposium, or, after only crowning Agathon—which is why we came—should we be off?). Yet, Agathon as host has the right to accept or deny any request for admittance. He chooses to allow him to stay and participate. In Pindar's representation of Jason, the young man serves this function and welcomes his guests with his characteristic mildness.

The following lines make the sympotic revelry clearer: πᾶσαν ἐυφροσύναν τάνυεν. The noun εὐφροσύνη is common in Homer and Archiac poetry to denote the pleasure of intoxication and conviviality associated with the symposium.[350] Xenophanes' famous description of sympotic preparation is instructive for considering its associations (Xenophanes,1.4-10):

κρητὴρ δ' ἕστηκεν μεστὸς ἐυφροσύνης·
ἄλλος δ' οἶνος ἑτοῖμος, ὃς οὔποτέ φησι προδώσειν,[351]
μείλιχος ἐν κεράμοις, ἄνθεος ὀζόμενος·
ἐν δὲ μέσοις ἁγνὴν ὀδμὴν λιβανωτὸς ἵησιν,
ψυχρὸν δ' ἐστὶν ὕδωρ καὶ γλυκὺ καὶ καθαρόν·
παρκέαται δ' ἄρτοι ξανθοὶ γεραρή τε τράπεζα
τυροῦ καὶ μέλιτος πίονος ἀχθομένη·

> The punchbowl stands full of cheer, and another wine is at hand, which says it will never fail you, it is gentle in its jugs, and fragrant of blossoms. In its midst, frankcense emits its sacred scent, and there is cold water—sweet and pure. Golden bread loves sit nearby and the table of honor is full of cheese and rich honey.

---

[350] Latacz 1966, 161-73. In contexts to denote sympotic pleasure, cf. Homer, *Od.* 9.5-11; 10.465, 20.8; *Theog*, 776-9 W; Sol. 4.10 W; Anacr. 2 W. See Hobden 2013, 28-34, for the role of *euphrosyne* in the context of the symposium.

[351] The text of this line is uncertain. Adkins 1985, 178, took the mangled transmitted lines and the prosaic language they contain as an indication of corruption.

Xenophanes' scene captures the delightful setting of the symposium.[352] In his surviving representation, wine is the vehicle through which εὐφροσύνη reaches the guests and inspires a sense of cheer.[353] Coupled with trappings of religious activity, Xenophanes' scene coveys a sense of almost otherworldly peacefulness and joy. This is also the quality Pindar emphasizes in Jason's participation: ἀθρόαις πέντε δραπὼν νύκτεσσιν ἔν θ' ἁμέραις ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον. "The sacred blossom of the good life" seems reminiscent of the language Xenophanes uses in the literal sense at lines 6-7 (ἄνθεος ὀζόμενος· ἐν δὲ μέσοις ἁγνὴν ὀδμὴν λιβανωτὸς ἵησιν**).**

On this reading, the multiday duration of the festivities is also significant.[354] As Pindar tells us, the feasting continued uninterrupted for five days and nights (*P*.4.130-1). There are important mythic precedents for multiday feasting following the arrival of a visitor.[355] Glaucus' story of Bellerophon in *Iliad* 6 shows many parallels. In Glaucus' narration, after Bellerophon had been sent away from Corinth to Lycia, a feast celebrating his arrival in Lycia lasted for 9 days (6.174-5). On the 10th day, the Lycian king read the letter Proteus, the Corinthian King, sent with Bellerophon condemning him. Immediately after reading this, he enjoined Bellerophon to slay the Chimera assuming he would perish (6.175-9). The parallels with Glaucus' story may suggest the outcome of Jason’s tale. Like Bellerophon, Jason will triumph over the seemingly impossible challenge and prosper as a result.[356]

---

[352] Defrades 1962 sees the atmosphere as programmatic in the poem. However, there is considerable dispute over the state of the fragment, its message, and aims. See Lesher 1992, 48-9; Adkins 1985, 174-86, for a discussion of the controversies.

[353] Defrades 1962, 76.

[354] There is an interesting divide between multiday feasting and drinking in myth and in society. In myth, the conviviality stretches for several days without a noticeable degeneration in the behavior of the guests. However, the famous story related by Timaeus of Tauromenium about a multiday symposium at a home in Akragas demonstrates an awareness of the fact that the longer drinking and festivities continue the more out of control the gathering becomes. For a discussion of the trope of the wild symposium in Timaeus' story, see Slater 1976, recently revisited by Corner 2010. It may be possible to see a clever hybrid of the two kinds of symposia in Pindar's representation of Jason's convivial scene.

[355] Braswell 1988, 214. For the proposal of a certain period of feasting before action, Cf. *Il*. 9.466-77, and *Od*. 14.249-54.

It may also be possible to see in Jason’s speech a significant connection with the sympotic topos of alcohol inciting a desire for power.[357] A fragment of a Bacchylidian encomium for Alexander of Macedon is an example (frg.20B, 6-12):

εὖτε νέων ἁπαλὸν γλυκεῖ' ἀνάγκα
σευομενᾶν κυλίκων θάλπησι θυμόν,
Κυπριδός τ' ἐλπὶς διαιθύσσῃ φρένας,
ἀμμειγνυμένα Διονυσίοισι δώροις·
ἀνδράσι δ' ὑψοτάτω πέμπει μερίμνας·
αὐτίκα μὲν πολίων κράδεμνα λύει,
πᾶσι δ' ἀνθρώποις μοναρχήσειν δοκεῖ·

> And when the sweet compulsion of speeding cups warms the tender hearts of the young men, and the hope of the Cyprian, mingling with the gifts of Dionysus, makes their hearts flutter. The wine sends a man’s thoughts soaring on high: immediately he is destroying the battlements of cities, and he expects to be monarch over all the world.[358]

Bacchylides’ passage describes the grandiose fantasies alcohol inspires in symposiasts in a generalizing way.[359] A consideration of this literary topos in the interpretation of our scene suggests the conclusion of Jason’s banquet may be more subversive than we might expect.

---

[356] A further parallel may be seen in the fact that in some traditions Jason, like Bellerophon, eventually falls from the gods’ favor and is reduced to poverty. Diod. Sic. 4.55, suggests that he committed suicide after Medea murdered their children, though this account, like that in the argument to Euripides’ *Medea*, seems dependent on the innovations Euripides introduced to the myth, for which, see Page 1938, xv-xxxiv.

[357] The presentation of political speeches at the symposia is another common feature in its literary representations, as Hobden 2013, 140-3 observes. See also Pellizer 1990, 180-2. Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1174-5, where Bdelykleon instructs Philokleon on proper conversation at the symposium: ἐπιστήσει λόγους σεμνοὺς λέγειν ἀνδρῶν παρόντων πολυμαθῶν καὶ δεξιῶν.

[358] Trans. Gerber.

[359] Fearn 2007, 55-62, argues that the passage is concerned with the young Alexander’s monarchal aspirations, however, there is no clear indication from the text that Alexander was not already in power. I cannot agree that line 17, Ὦ παῖ μεγαλ[–⏑⏑]ṿ [⏓– Ἀμύντα] should be taken as an indication of the honorand’s age when Pindar uses the patronymic referring to Hieron as the “child of Deinomenes” at *P.*2,18 (σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει.), who is certainly was not a child at the time of the performance. For the common

An important detail in this passage is often overlooked. That Jason and his guests are still in the throes of sympotic revelry is confirmed by the narrative's final lines (*P*.4.134): αἶψα δ' ἀπὸ κλισιᾶν ὦρτο σὺν κείνοισι. Generations of scholars have taken ἀπὸ κλισιᾶν ὦρτο to mean "emerged from his tent."[360] This meaning fails to consider the sympotic language that preceded the final actions, and, as Bruce Braswell has rightly observed, ignores the noun's more common meaning of "couch," which is appropriate to the situation.[361] But how does this change our understanding of the scene?

As Babette Pütz has observed, Greek literature illustrates multiple forms of the Komos ranging from an orderly religious procession to a violent drunken riot.[362] In particular, Pütz notes how the time of the *Komos* and its place of origin often determine its character. Thomas Cole helps us expand on this view: "What all such occasions have in common is a collective highly demonstrative passing beyond the bounds of some private space which serves both as the original locus of the movement of the Komos, and the ultimate source of the contribution which the Komos seeks to make to the larger realm that lies beyond. This contribution may affect all of the larger realm or be confined to a part of it—at least for the time being."[363] Cole's observation that the source of the *Komos* is significant for identifying its purpose is useful for interpreting our

---

use of the patronymic as an honorific title, see Gildersleeve 1892, 258, cf. *O*.6.80, ὦ παῖ Σωστράτου. See Alc. 6.27; Sol. 9 West 3-4; Thgn. 39-52, on the emergence of monarchies in political poetry. There may be a reception of the topos at Hdt. 9.82.2 involving Pausanias' astonishment at why the Persians would attack resource poor Greece when they came from such extraordinary wealth. Scholars commonly note the irony of the passage hinting at the Spartan's desire for monarchial power in later life, but, placed in the context of banqueting, the association seems to run even deeper than previously observed. Cf. Marincola and Flower 2002, 251.

[360] See Braswell 1988, 219, for an overview.

[361] Braswell 1988, 219-20.

[362] Pütz 2007, 121-3. For the variation in the komosKomos, see Wecoski 2014, 28-9, and bibliography at *n*.34.

[363] Cole 1992, 18.

scene. Pütz has observed that in the plays of Aristophanes, *komoi* stemming from symposia often result in violence.[364] It is possible that this trope informs our scene. Depicting the inebriated, aggressive partisans participating in the symposium and enacting a *Komos* after Jason's speech, which elaborated Pelias' crimes, is at least suggestive of political violence.[365]

The following lines may have been particularly unsettling for the ode's royal audience (*P*.4.134-5): καί ῥ' ἦλθον Πελία μέγαρον· ἐσσύμενοι δ' εἴσω κατέσταν· τῶν δ' ἀκούσαις αὐτὸς ὑπαντίασεν, "And they went straight to the home of Pelias, and rushing inside they stood. He, hearing them, himself opposed them." Pindar's depiction of the king receiving the *Komos* implies a solitary despot at the mercy of a crowd assembled against him.[366] While there may have been others in the palace, Pindar has chosen to eliminate any mediation between the king and the leader of the band of political rivals. The scene heavily suggests that this komastic intervention could end badly for the king.

In a Cyrenean context, these actions would have been troubling. In the fourth book of his *Histories*, Herodotus recounts a period of intense violence and civil war in Cyrene following the dynasty's submission to Persia in the late 6th century. After a brief period of exile, the king, Arcesilaus III, returned and with extraordinary violence purged the city of enemy partisans either by death or exile. Concerned for himself after he received an oracle about his own death, he sought advice from his father-in-law in the neighboring city of Barke, and there, "Barkaians and some of the exiles from Cyrene, noticing him in the agora, killed him and his father-in-law"

---

[364] See Pütz 2007, 142-6, for representations of violent *komoi* in Aristophanes.

[365] Murray 1990 situates the subversive behavior of Alcibiades and his followers culminating in the mutilation of the Herms in the ambit of sympotic political activity. See Rösler 1980 for a similar view on the political role of the symposium in elite political activity in the context of Alcaeus' poetry.

[366] The abrupt and disruptive entry of a *komosKomos* into a house in mourning is found at Plut. *Mor*. 128d, where Plutarch complains about drunken komastic behaviors.

(Hdt. 4.164.2-4). To judge from Herodotus’ account of Cyrene, its history in the late archaic period was marked by exceptional violence and numerous political reprisals. In such a context, it is difficult to imagine that a scene fraught with as much potential for violence could be received neutrally or go unnoticed.

A further detail is worthy of consideration. Pindar began the ode by enjoining the Muse to stand beside Arcesilaus, who is engaging in a Komos (1-3):

> Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ 1
> στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,
> ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,
> Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
> θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων…
>
> Today, Muse, it is necessary for you to stand beside a dear man, the king of well-horsed Cyrene, so that with Arcesilaus celebrating his Komos you might enhance the breeze of song due to the Leotids and Pytho.

Scholars have noted how Pindar occasionally represents the Komos as a celebratory context serving as a foil to his own song.[367] The song is calm, collected, and dignified while the Komos can easily deviate from dignity. The performance of the ode and its relationship to the celebratory Komos share important features with second pair of speeches. Jason’s komastic activity recalls the external circumstances with which the poem begins, and places additional emphasis on the behaviors the two men exhibit in their final engagement. A closer look at these speeches suggests a possible motivation for the parallel.

---

[367] Bundy 1962, 22, Kurke 1992, 144-5, Morgan 1993, 4, and Eckermann 2010, 308-11 for a survey of the bibliography.

The Second Meeting of Jason and Pelias

Jason’s gentle, restrained, and respectful character is best illustrated in his second speech to Pelias (138-56):

‘Παῖ Ποσειδᾶνος Πετραίου,
ἐντὶ μὲν θνατῶν φρένες ὠκύτεραι
κέρδος αἰνῆσαι πρὸ δίκας δόλιον τρα-
χεῖαν ἑρπόντων πρὸς ἔπιβδαν ὅμως
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ χρὴ καὶ σὲ θεμισσαμένους ὀρ-
γὰς ὑφαίνειν λοιπὸν ὄλβον.
εἰδότι τοι ἐρέω· μία βοῦς Κρηθεῖ τε μάτηρ
καὶ θρασυμήδεϊ Σαλμωνεῖ· τρίταισιν δ' ἐν γοναῖς
ἄμμες αὖ κείνων φυτευθέν-
τες σθένος ἀελίου χρύσεον
λεύσσομεν. Μοῖραι δ' ἀφίσταιντ', εἴ τις ἔχθρα πέλει
ὁμογόνοις αἰδῶ καλύψαι.
οὐ πρέπει νῷν χαλκοτόροις ξίφεσιν
οὐδ' ἀκόντεσσιν μεγάλαν προγόνων τι-
μὰν δάσασθαι. μῆλά τε γάρ τοι ἐγώ
καὶ βοῶν ξανθὰς ἀγέλας ἀφίημ' ἀ-
γρούς τε πάντας, τοὺς ἀπούρας
ἁμετέρων τοκέων νέμεαι πλοῦτον πιαίνων·
κοὔ με πονεῖ τεὸν οἶκον ταῦτα πορσύνοντ' ἄγαν·
ἀλλὰ καὶ σκᾶπτον μόναρχον
καὶ θρόνος, ᾧ ποτε Κρηθεΐδας
ἐγκαθίζων ἱππόταις εὔθυνε λαοῖς δίκας –
τὰ μὲν ἄνευ ξυνᾶς ἀνίας
λῦσον, ἄμμιν μή τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐ-
τῶν ἀναστάῃ κακόν.

Child of Petraian Poseidon, the minds of men are sooner to praise ill-gotten gains than justice, although they come to a harsh reckoning the day after. Nevertheless, it is necessary for you and me, by restraining our anger, to weave future prosperity. I will speak to you, understanding what I say. One heifer was mother to Kretheus and bold counseling Salmoneus, but we, conceived in the third generation after them, look upon the golden might of the sun. May the Moirai step aside if some resentment arises to eclipse reverence in relatives. It is unbecoming for us two to divide the great kingdom of our ancestors with bronze piercing swords and spears. For I offer you sheep, a golden herd of cattle, and all the fields—those furrows of my parents you manage, fattening your wealth. Nor does it trouble me much furnishing these things to your estate. But as for the monarchal scepter and throne, sitting upon which once Kretheus issued

> edicts to the horse riding host—release these without public grievance, lest some new evil arise from us from them."

Jason's gnomic opening underscores Pelias' former transgression against Aeson and calls attention to the fact that the king had, as yet, experienced no retribution for his ill-gotten gains. Now, however, he was surrounded by the son of the man he ousted and a band of his allies. Yet, the speech does not dwell on the animosity between the two figures. Jason calms possible tensions through an appeal to reason—both men need to extinguish their resentment toward one another and attempt to establish an enduring peace.[368] Foregrounding their common ancestry, Jason tries softening Pelias by emphatically calling his attention to the shamefulness of their quarrel and its great potential for internecine violence. He then purposes his terms: Pelias may retain the wealth he plundered from Jason's father but must restore Kretheus' throne to its rightful heir. Jason's speech concludes on a similar note to how it began: comply with the offer or face the long overdue consequences of usurping the throne.

The vacillation between appeals to kinship and threats of civil unrest in Jason's speech powerfully highlight the risks the king faces should he deny Jason's return. Yet, Jason avoids being overtly threatening: his speech remains diplomatic. In this way, Jason's conduct may offer a positive exemplum as Carey suspected, though not in the way he argues.[369] Considering the komastic elements of the preceding passage, we may appreciate how Jason's behavior reflects the figure of the ideal *komast*. Italics inconsistent here, and with Komos later; I like italics for making this key word stand out, under the guise of italicizing a Greek termHe is restrained, respectful, mild, and shuns the violence of the inebriated bad komast.[370] In short, he acts with moderation. For Arcesilaus, who was celebrating, or had just concluded, a *Komos*, Jason’s conduct is significant. He offers the king a powerful example of diplomacy and restraint at a time when his success and support may have encouraged arrogance or excess. Details of the speech drive the message deeper.

---

[368] For the role of ill-gotten gain being associated with φρένες, see Pelliccia 1995, 297-8. Cf. Hom. *Il*.18.113. Cf. also Jason's description of Pelias succumbing to his slippery mind at *P*.4.109: Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευκαῖς πιθήσαντα, φρασίν**.** This may make the opening gnome even more pointed.

[369] Carey 1979.

Generations of scholars believed that Demophilus and Arcesilaus were related because of the role kinship plays in mediating the dispute between Jason and Pelias.[371] While this may be possible, no independent evidence exists to confirm the relationship. Moreover, the existence of kinship between the two historical figures is not required to appreciate one of the speech’s more conspicuous links to another myth.

Jason’s wish that the Fates step aside if a quarrel arise between family members bears a striking resemblance the curse of Oedipus placed upon his sons. The earliest version of Oedipus’ imprecation comes from the cyclic *Thebaid* (frg. 2. 6-10):

αἶψα δὲ παισὶν ἑοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπαρὰς
ἀργαλέας ἠρᾶτο· θοὴν δ' οὐ λάνθαν' Ἐρινύν·
ὡς οὔ οἱ πατρώϊ' ἐνηέι <ἐν> φιλότητι
δάσσαιντ', ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀεὶ πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε

> And quickly he swore baneful curses against both of his sons–and it did not escape the swift Erynys—how they would not divide their patrimony in friendship, but that there would always be war and battle for them both.

---

[370] Alcibiades’ conduct in Plato’s *Symposium* is instructive for the figure of the “bad komast.” He bursts into Agathon’s house with flute girls in tow, is disruptive, arrogant, and insulting toward Socrates. The character of the “bad komast” is described by Aristophanes’ Philocleon at *Wasps* 1253-5 and rejected by his son in 1256-60. The humor of the description is amplified by the fact that Philocleon will become a one-man bad komosKomos at the conclusion of the play. Cf. MacDowell 1971, 300.

[371] Beginning with Boeckh in modern scholarship, but ancient scholiasts, too, were of this opinion.

Scholars have suspected that the poem went on to relate the exact words of the curse after these lines,[372] but even in the state we have it, the fragment offers its central features: the brothers would divide Oedipus' kingdom through civil war.[373] Roughly five years before *P.*4, Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* contained a similar version of events. As the chorus meditates on the long history of violence in the family of Labdacus, they offer us a glimpse of Oedipus' curse (*Sept.* 785-91):

τέκνοις δ' ἀρχαίας
ἐφῆκεν ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς,
αἰαῖ, πικρογλώσσους ἀράς,
καί σφε σιδαρονόμῳ
διὰ χερί ποτε λαχεῖν
κτήματα· νῦν δὲ τρέω
μὴ τελέσῃ καμψίπους Ἐρινύς.

> And, wrathful, he imposed a bitter-spoken curse on his sons in payment for their former care of him, alas, that they one day acquire his possession with a sword wielding hand. But now I tremble—may the swift Eyrnys not fulfill it.

We see many of the same points made conspicuous in Jason's speech (145-48):

Μοῖραι δ' ἀφίσταιντ', εἴ τις ἔχθρα πέλει
ὁμογόνοις αἰδῶ καλύψαι.
οὐ πρέπει νῷν χαλκοτόροις ξίφεσιν
οὐδ' ἀκόντεσσιν μεγάλαν προγόνων τι-
    μὰν δάσασθαι.

> May the Moirai step aside if some resentment arises to eclipse reverence in relatives. It is unbecoming for us two to divide the great kingdom of our ancestors with bronze piercing swords and spears.

---

[372] For the disappointing state of the surviving lines and possibilities of interpretation, see Davies 1989, 24-5 and West's overview of the fragments in West 2007, 4-9.

[373] Stesichorus' account in the Lille papyrus is noteworthy for several new details he seems to have introduced into the legend. In the surviving lines, Jocasta attempts to mediate the conflict, while the seer Teiresias prophesizes the internecine slaughter as mandated by the Fates; the actual words of the curse, however, are missing.

In Jason's account, the Moirai serve the same function the Fury had in Aeschylus and the *Thebaid*.[374] The most significant parallel is in the final two lines where Jason explicitly states that it is not right for the two of them on account of their kinship to divide their patrimony by violence. Here we have an almost perfect match with Aeschylus' version of Oedipus' curse.[375] This, however, is not the only parallel between Jason's speech and the cyclic *Thebaid*.

While the form of the myth most familiar to us has Eteocles and Polynices strike an ill-fated agreement to rule in succession, a fragment from the fifth-century historian Hellenicus seems to preserve an older form of the arrangement (frg. 98):

Ἑλλάνικος δὲ ἱστορεῖ κατὰ συνθήκην αὐτὸν παραχωρῆσαι τὴν βασιλείαν Ἐτεοκλεῖ λέγων αἵρεσιν αὐτῷ προθεῖναι τὸν Ἐτεοκλέα, εἰ βούλοιτο τὴν βασιλείαν ἔχειν ἢ τὸ μέρος τῶν χρημάτων λαβεῖν καὶ ἑτέραν πόλιν οἰκεῖν.

> Hellanicus tells how in accordance with their compact, he (Polynices) yielded the kingship to Eteocles, saying how Eteocles offered him the choice—whether he wanted the kingship or instead to take a portion of their wealth and inhabit another city.

The accord Hellanicus has Eteocles offer his brother is also advanced by Jocasta in Stesichorus' account (frg. 222A, 218-24):

ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε, παίδες, ἐμοῖς μύθοις, φίλα [τέκνα, πίθεσθε˙
ταιδε γὰρ ὑμὶν ἐγὼν τέλος προφα[ίνω,
τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα δόμους ναίειν πα[ρὰ νάμασι Δίρκας,
τὸν δ᾽ ἀπίμεν κτεάνη
        καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχοντα φίλου σύμπαντα [πατρός,
κλαροπαληδ[ὸν ὃς ἂν
        πρᾶτος λάχηι ἕκατι Μοιρᾶν.

---

[374] In the Lille Papyrus of Stesichorus the Moirai are responsible for bringing the curse to bear. For the function of the Furies in the Seven, see Solmsen 1937.

[375] This should not suggest a dependence on Aeschylus. While this may be a possibility, given the intense interest of archaic poets in the house of Oedipus, and especially the war of the Seven against Thebes, it is very likely that both authors are relying on a common source that is now lost. Indeed, if scholars like West are right, it may have been in the epic *Thebiad* immediately following the fragment we possess.

> But, come, my sons, obey my words, my dear children; for thus do I reveal the outcome for you, that one of you, possessing the palace, dwell (by the spring of Dirce?), and the other having the flocks and all the gold of his dear father, departs—he who, by the will of the Fates, first obtains the leaping lot.

These two passages are almost identical to what Pindar's Jason proposes to Pelias. Both agreements attempt to equitably draw lines between the quarreling parties by allowing one figure to rule, while the other is compensated with wealth and property. In *P.*4, Jason willingly offers to accept the loss of the lands Pelias took from his father and add to it a portion of his livestock, if the king accedes to his request for the kingship. Noting the similarities between the two mythical circumstances, we may wonder what significance these echoes of the *Thebaid* would have had for Pindar's audience.

After the Trojan cycle, the Theban war myths were among the most popular epics in the archaic and classical period.[376] In outline,[377] the story featured two princes, one of whom (Polynices) leaves the city of Thebes, while the other remains to rule over it (Eteocles). In different versions of the myth, the exiled Polynices is either cheated of his share of the rule, or felt cheated by the terms they reached. While in exile, Polynices finds his way to Argos, where he befriends the city's king, Adrastus, and is joined to him through marriage to the king's daughter. After Polynices explains his situation to the king and allies at his court, Adrastus promises to restore him to the Theban throne. Soon after, the exiled brother returns to Thebes with his new allies to demand his share of the kingdom back. Yet, in the ensuing battle both princes perish along with a substantial portion of the city. It is unsurprising why this story would resonate with Archaic Greeks. The history of the period is marked by countless instances of civil unrest and upheavals. By illustrating the internecine toll civil war takes on its city, the *Thebaid* myth serves to vividly illustrate the lethal consequences of stasis and failure to embrace diplomacy in domestic disputes—all parties suffer as a result of their greed or intractability.[378] In this context, allusions to the *Thebaid* offer a powerful warning.

---

[376] Pausanias, 9.9.5. tells us that still in his time the work was placed third in the cannon of Homer's works after the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

[377] Classical allusions to the myth are numerous. The *Iliad* features a prominent allusion to it (4.376-81 and 405-10) as does Hesiod's *Works and Days* (161-3). The story was also tremendously popular in Attic drama, where Aeschylus' *Septem*, Sophocles' *Antigone*, and Euripides, *Phoenissae* survive to offer various treatments of the myth. A continuous narrative of the events is found at Apoll. *Bib.*3.6-7. Gantz 1995, 501-528 collects the ancient literary and visual evidence.

Jason's conclusion calls attention to the point (154-6): τὰ μὲν ἄνευ ξυνᾶς ἀνίας λῦσον, ἄμμιν μή τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀναστάῃ κακόν, "release these things without public grief, lest some new evil arise for us from them." Two words of Jason's vocabulary are noteworthy. The first is the public nature of the adjective used in the phrase ξυνᾶς ἀνίας. ξῡνός, or common, is frequently deployed to mean public, relating to the state.[379] The implication is that Pelias has the power to make a public argument against Jason. This, however, may provoke a civil war. The negative possibility is suggested in Jason's verb choice: ἀναστάῃ. ἀνίστημι commonly describes upheavals and revolt in extant historical texts.[380] The combination of the two makes Jason's message and the resonance of the allusions to the epic *Thebaid* powerful and clear. By rejecting a diplomatic offer from a mild and respectful figure, the king would be inviting civil conflict.

Pelias' response to Jason is deviously courteous. Ostensibly, he accepts Jason's proposal (156-67):

> 'Ἔσομαι
> τοῖος· ἀλλ' ἤδη με γηραιὸν μέρος ἁλικίας
> ἀμφιπολεῖ· σὸν δ' ἄνθος ἥβας ἄρτι κυ-

---

[378] For the resonance of these themes in the trilogy of which the *Septem* was the conclusion, see Kirkwood 1969 who focuses on the choices made by Eteocles fulfilling the long-standing familial curse.

[379] *LSJ*. s.v. ξῡνός.

[380] *LSJ*. s.v. ἀνίστημι.

μαίνει· δύνασαι δ' ἀφελεῖν
μᾶνιν χθονίων. κέλεται γὰρ ἑὰν ψυχὰν κομίξαι
Φρίξος ἐλθόντας πρὸς Αἰήτα θαλάμους
δέρμα τε κριοῦ βαθύμαλλον ἄγειν,
τῷ ποτ' ἐκ πόντου σαώθη
ἔκ τε ματρυιᾶς ἀθέων βελέων.
ταῦτά μοι θαυμαστὸς ὄνειρος ἰὼν φω-
νεῖ. μεμάντευμαι δ' ἐπὶ Κασταλίᾳ,
εἰ μετάλλατόν τι· καὶ ὡς τάχος ὀτρύ-
νει με τεύχειν ναῒ πομπάν.
τοῦτον ἄεθλον ἑκὼν τέλεσον· καί τοι μοναρχεῖν
καὶ βασιλευέμεν ὄμνυμι προήσειν. καρτερός
ὅρκος ἄμμιν μάρτυς ἔστω
Ζεὺς ὁ γενέθλιος ἀμφοτέροις.’

> “I will be exactly as you say. But already the aged portion of life is upon me, while your blossom of youth is just now in swell, and you are able to excise the wrath from the land. For Phrixos orders that, going to the chambers of Aeëtes, we recover his soul and bring back the deep-woolen hide of the ram, on which once he was saved from the sea and from the godless missiles of his stepmother. An astonishing dream appearing to me said these things. And I enquired in Kastalia if something must be sought out, and it urged me to furnish him an escort by ship as soon as possible. Fulfill this challenge willingly and I swear that I will relinquish the kingship and rule to you. As a strong oath, let Zeus, ancestor to us both, stand as witness.”

Pelias’ response simultaneously agrees and deflects. Like Jason, Pelias appeals to their shared heritage to make his point.[381] But where Jason used their kinship to justify his return and emphasize the importance of peace through diplomacy, Pelias exploits it to manipulate Jason into leaving. The speech appears rich in Pindaric innovation. First, the king’s comment that Phrixos’ soul demanded return appears nowhere else in the mythic tradition.[382] This point is significant in an ode designed to secure an exile’s return: Jason’s nostos can only come after the symbolic return of a long exiled kinsman.[383] The motivation behind Phrixos' return—the alleviation of a plague—conforms with many documented mantic consultations from antiquity, especially from Delphi.[384] This lends Pelias' claim to have consulted Delphi some support, yet, it may just as easily be a veneer of credibility designed to manipulate Jason.

---

[381] Schubert 2004, especially 19-22.

[382] There are numerous other versions of how the campaign was launched and for what reasons. Pherecydes records a tradition that Pelias saw Jason in a field with a single shoe on and asked him what he would do to a man if he had received the lethal oracle about him. Jason’s response was that he would have him retrieve the Golden Fleece, so Pelias then instructs him to do so. For other versions of how the expedition came to be, see Gantz 1995, 340-4. Apollonius’ sources are also informative, of which the Argive mythographers Agias and Derkylos are significant since they seem to collect material likely from Eumelus’ *Cornithiaca*.

Pelias' second speech reflects the qualities we observed in his first. The king seems reasonable. He does not behave like the violent usurper of Jason's earlier description, but rather presents his position calmly and deliberately. He acknowledges the validity of Jason's claim, emphasizes their kinship, and caps his response with an oath to uphold their agreement. Yet, despite the king's apparent acceptance of Jason's propsal, something must have gone wrong for Medea to murder Pelias. Does the text offer any suggestions as to what?

The thinly drawn character of Aeëtes offers some possibilites. While the Colchean king is often depected as violent and menacing in other representations of the Argonautic myth, Pindar makes his Aeëtes a comparably tame figure.[385] We first meet the king upon Jason's arrival in Colchis, where the king prepares the contest of the plow (227-31):

ὀρ-
θὰς δ' αὔλακας ἐντανύσαις
ἤλαυν', ἀνὰ βωλακίας δ' ὀρόγυιαν σχίζε νῶτον
γᾶς. ἔειπεν δ' ὧδε· 'Τοῦτ' ἔργον βασιλεύς,
ὅστις ἄρχει ναός, ἐμοὶ τελέσαις 230
ἄφθιτον στρωμνὰν ἀγέσθω,
κῶας αἰγλᾶεν χρυσέῳ θυσάνῳ.

---

[383] In the cultural ambit of the late archaic period, the symbolic return of a deceased hero's bones or trappings to his home city seems to have been an important political event. Herodotus records a tradition of the Spartans recovering the bones of Orestes at the behest of the Delphic oracle as a way to augment their rule, and Plutarch's account of Cimon's recovery of the bones of Theseus shares many of the same features. See Boedeker 1998 for a discussion of the cultural politics of hero bones and their eleaboration in Herodotus. As Hayden Pellicia has suggested to me, Pindar's innovation in the myth may be participating in this trend.

[384] Fontenrose 1978, 24-34.

[385] Apollonius' depiction of Aeëtes in particular draws parallels between the figure and the Cyclops of the *Odyssey* at *Arg*. 3.176-81, for which see Hunter 1989, 117. In Hunter's view (1989, 31), Aeëtes "combines the brutishness of the Cyclops with a cruel despotism."

> He stretched straight furrows as he drove them and split open the stretch of clodded earth a fathom deep. Then he spoke thus, “When the king, whoever it is who captains the ship, completes this task for me, let him take away the immortal bedding, the fleece that gleams with golden fringe.”

The pronouncement declaring the challenge is the only first-person speech the king is given. Pindar makes Jason quickly meet the challenge, and successfully accomplish the task through Medea’s aid (*P*.4.233). Upon Jason’s success, Aeëtes cries out in distress that the young hero accomplished the challenge, but nevertheless keeps his end of the deal. Here Pindar offers more details (241-6):

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 ἃν πλαγαὶ σιδάρου.

> At once the wondrous son of Helios told him where Phrixos’ knives had stretched out the shining hide, but he did not expect him to perform that further trial, because it lay in a thicket and was right by the ferocious jaws of a serpent, which exceeded in breadth and length a ship of fifty oars, which stokes of iron have fashioned.

In Pindar’s representation, Aeëtes’ compliance with Jason’s request for the location of the Golden Fleece is explicitly motivated by the expectation that Jason would fail to recover it. This is a common motivation in Greek myth. [386] By sending a hero on a seemingly lethal quest, villainous characters expect to be rid of the threat the hero poses to him. Indeed, this is the very motivation of Pelias in Apollonius’ version of the myth (*Arg.*1.15-7):

---

[386] Greek myth abounds in parallels for kings sending away a potential threat to their rule by imposing a challenge that will almost certainly kill them. Perseus’ retrieval of the Gorgon head, Bellerophon’s task to slay the Chimera, Theseus’ retrieval of the Marathonian Bull, Theseus’ recovery of Minos’ ring in Bacchylides 17, the labors of Heracles, and Pelops’ race against Oenomaeus are some of the more famous examples.

καί οἱ ἄεθλον
ἔντυε ναυτιλίης πολυκηδέος, ὄφρ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
ἠὲ καὶ ἀλλοδαποῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι νόστον ὀλέσσῃ

> And he enjoined the challenge of the toilsome voyage on him so that he might lose his return on the sea or among a foreign people.

But Pindar has clearly chosen not to develop this context in Pelias’ second speech. The dangers of parallelism generations of scholars were wary of may help explain the features of Pindar’s characterization of Pelias. As we have noticed, Pelias’ character is depicted as cautious and calculating on the one hand and courteous on the other. *Prima facie*, it is easy to read the figure as an entirely different character from the normally blunt and menacing reprobate figure he cuts in Greek myth.[387] This has important implications for the reception of the myth. By divesting Pelias of his traditionally iniquitous persona, Pindar created a safer narrative environment to suggest and explore parallels with the king.

Indeed, had the poet extensively developed his Pelias as the ode’s villain, then Gildersleeve, Braswell and others would likely be right to say the parallels were too insulting for the king to even entertain them. The flexibility of Greek myth allowed the poet to rehabilitate Pelias enough to allow for the parallelism to safely register. However, the traditional negative qualities of Pelias are not entirely lost. Instead, they are safely placed in the underdeveloped figure of Aeëtes, who is too thinly drawn to suggest any immediate parallels beyond his status as a king. His identity as a non-Greek too is important. As we noted in the last chapter, the anxieties over the Hellenism of Greek kings in the periphery of the Hellenic world were a significant feature in their self-representations. Aeëtes' expressed desire for Jason to fail in the task of recovering the Golden Fleece might be easily understood as playing off of these apprehensions.

---

[387] For which, see Gantz 1995, 189-92.

Therefore, taking Pelias and Aeëtes as two pieces of the same character,[388] the myth's concluding apostrophe to king Arcesilaus makes better sense (249-51):

κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν,
ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐ-
τᾷ, τὰν Πελίαοφονόν·

> He slew the gray-eyed, dappled-backed dragon with skill and, Arcesilaus, he stole Medea, by her own craft, the slayer of Pelias.

Pindar's shortcut bypasses many critical details of the myth's conclusion. Minimally, the choice to underscore Aeëtes' expectation of failure suggests that Jason's success dealt the king a blow. Yet, the possibility that Jason's departure with the fleece was met with resistance is also implied by the comment. Traditionally, it was in this context that Medea murdered her little brother Apsyrtus.[389] The brutality of this narrative, however, is completely overlooked and focus quickly shifts to the consequences for Pelias.

Medea's role in Pelias' death highlights the mistake he made sending Jason to Colchis—it caused him to find and bring back Medea. [390] Like Aeëtes, then, Pelias' expectation that Jason would perish trying to accomplish his challenge cost him the very thing he was attempting to preserve through his deceit. [391]

---

[388] Apollonius ironically calls attention to the parallelism of the two at *Arg*. 3.405-6:

ἐσθλοῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν οὔτι μεγαίρω
ὡς αὐτοὶ μυθεῖσθε τὸν Ἑλλάδι κοιρανέοντα.

[389] Pherecydes frg. 32 contains the earliest narrative of the events. Medea takes and kills her young brother at the suggestion of Jason to buy them time in their escape from Aeëtes and his subjects.

[390] Numerous versions of the myth's conclusion exist. They seem spilt between Jason killing Pelias as revenge for murdering Aeson (D.S. 4.50-1, and Ap. *Bib*.1.9.27), and Medea killing Pelias through the deception of false rejuvenation. (There is extensive visual evidence for this version in Athenian pottery from the mid-6th century on. See Gantz 1995, 191. This may have been the myth in Sophophles' *Rhizotomai*, and was the plot for Euripides'

As such, Pindar's narrative foregrounds the decisions Pelias made instead of his villainous character. Through this representation, parallels with the king are blunted of their potentially insulting content. Indeed, the issues confronting Pelias are like those facing any king. Pelias' choices, however, do depict how a bad king decides the outcome of problems like repatriation, and Pindar emphatically calls Arecisilaus' attention to the consequences of that decision in the apostrophe. Beyond the outcome of this choice, the poem's audience are free to see whatever other parallels to their Cyrenean king they wish, but for Pindar these parallels are unexpressed, and perhaps even consciously suppressed by avoiding direct characterization of Pelias.

Peliades, produced in 455). Pindar's preference for Medea being Pelias' murderess avoids having the returning exile dispatch the king.

[391] While Pindar does not explicitly state that Pelias' death results from a false oath, the thrust of the myth tradition Pindar inherited which universally has Pelias plotting against Jason suggests a broken oath is behind his punishment and death by Medea. It should be mentioned that different traditions attribute his death to different spurned divinities. Outside of Pindar, Hera seems to be the divinity most commonly responsible for Pelias' death. See Gantz 1995, 365-7 on the subject.

V

DEMOPHILUS AT THE SYMPOSIUM: THE PLEA FOR RETURN

P.4’s formal plea for the repatriation of Demophilus begins at line 262. Over the next 37 lines, Pindar reincorporates many of the poem’s earlier themes to illustrate the wisdom of allowing Demophilus to return. As such, the section is a tour de force of argumentation; yet, it is also among the text’s most difficult sections.

The conclusion opens with an imperative to the king (262): γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν (know, now, the wisdom of Oedipus). Many have rightly noted that the appeal emphasizes the following material’s enigmatic quality,[392] but important shades of meaning remain unexplored. Let us examine the passage in full (263-9):

> εἰ
> γάρ τις ὄζους ὀξυτόμῳ πελέκει
> ἐξερείψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύ-
> νοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος,
> καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ' αὐτᾶς, 265
> εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται λοίσθιον,

---

[392] Scholars are agreed on the point that the reference to Oedipus at line 262 serves as a way to flag the riddle, but some have seen the potential for more significance given the emphatic position of the phrase “wisdom of Oedipus.” Gildersleeve 1890, 310 says “Pindar, to whom all Theban lore was native is repeating a parable of Oidipus, and, if I mistake not, a parable of Oidipus in exile.” Fennell 1893, 208; Burton 1962, 168-9; Duchemin 1967,149; Carey 1979, 144; are in general agreement with Gildersleeve, but Kirkwood 1982, 197 is uncertain: “The wisdom of Oedipus applies specifically to the first parable, that of the oak tree, but carries over into the second parable too. It is uncertain whether the ‘wisdom’ is only Oedipus’ ability to solve riddles, and hence means ‘be wise in the wisdom of Oedipus’, or includes also the suggestion that Oedipus in exile (like Demophilus) is still great.” Braswell 1988, 362 rejects any associations with the myth: “to bid Arcesilaus to “know the wisdom of Oedipus” is simply another way of inviting him to consider the riddle, nothing more… there is no ambiguity here, nor need we supposes that Pindar is quoting an otherwise unknown parable of Oedipus as does Carey, following Gildersleeve… The reference to Oedipus certainly does not extend beyond his proverbial ability to solve riddles, so that we need not even consider the possibility of an allusion to Oedipus’ exile as does Kirkwood.” Giannini 1995, 502 is more complex, adopting a position similar to Kirkwood.

ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κιόνεσσιν
    δεσποσύναισιν ἐρειδομένα
μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφέπει δύστανον ἐν τείχεσιν,
ἑὸν ἐρημώσαισα χῶρον.

> If someone should strike off the branches of a great oak with a sharp axe and disgrace its glorious form although it cannot bear foliage, it gives an account of itself, if ever it comes at last to a winter's fire, or if, supported by a master's upright columns, it performs a wretched toil within foreign walls, having left its own place desolate.
>
> (Trans. Race with modification)

In his book of *Rhetoric,* Aristotle noted how the appropriation of enigma for potentially controversial material was a common and effective rhetorical device for introducing uncomfortable topics.[393] To illustrate the point, the 4th century philosopher records several stories of poets using riddles and parables as allegorical tools in public address.[394] Pindar's riddle may be functioning in a similar way.[395] Ancient scholiasts suggested that the oak of the parable refers to Demophilus.[396] On this reading, the parable illustrates the misfortune attending a disenfranchised citizen. They are stripped of their rights (264), disgraced (264), and forced to find service under a foreign master (267-9).

The language of line 264—αἰσχύνοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος—reflects a similar sentiment on exile expressed in the elegiac exhortations of Tyrtaeaus. In frg.10.W 8-10, the Spartan poet describes a soldier's plight after shunning battle: he is exiled from his community and:

---

[393] Arist., *Rhet.*3.2.7-13 on the use of metaphor and riddle.

[394] The most famous is the story of the kind, involving the lyric poet Stesichorus, has the poet attempt in vain, to warn the people of Himera against electing Phalaris to the generalship of the city using a parable. Arist. *Rhet*. 2. 20.5-6. Cf. Page 1962, 140-1.

[395] The use of riddles, gnomai, and exempla are prominent in Herodotus' famous scene involving the conversation of Solon and Croesus (Hdt. 1.28-32). Solon uses the case of Tellos the Athenian, whose name has long been the object of suspicion, and Cleobus and Biton to argue against Croesus' expectation to be named the most blessed man in the world.

[396] Drachmann 1910, 162-3.

χρησμοσύνῃ τ' εἴκων καὶ στυγερῇ πενίῃ, αἰσχύνει τε γένος, κατὰ δ' ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχει, πᾶσα δ' ἀτιμίη καὶ κακότης ἕπεται, “yielding to need and hateful poverty, he shames his family ,disgraces his glorious form, and all dishonor and baseness follows.”

Given the similarity of thought and context it seems likely that the two passages are drawing on a shared literary topos describing the plight of exile.[397] In Tyrtaeus’ passage, the humiliation and shame of banishment reinforces the importance of following Spartan precepts to never shirk from battle—the violation of which justifies the base condition of his figure.[398] For Pindar, however, the waste of the oak, its barrenness,[399] and piteousness emphasize the loss to the exile’s community. The riddle’s concluding lines—ἑὸν ἐρημώσαισα χῶρον—make the civic void conspicuous. As such, unlike Tyrtaeaus’ passage, Pindar emphasizes how exile is mutually damaging. The banished figure suffers a reduction in status, prestige, and identity, while the marginalization of an exceptionally talented individual deprives the community of his contributions.

Still more troubling, the exile’s absence from his community allows his talents to be enjoyed by a foreign entity. The concern is expressed in the second half of Pindar’s riddle. As Braswell has observed while noting the speculative nature of the suggestion, the use of the oak as a column in the home of a foreign master may be taken to suggest that while abroad an expatriate may find service as a mercenary.[400] We need not see the passage as commenting on historical details of Demophilus' banishment to find the observation useful. Taken instead as a suggestion that exiles often found work as mercenaries while abroad, the passage warns against protracted displacement.[401] This message finds potent resonance in the myth. As we have seen, Jason's eventual liaison with Medea is only made possible through Pelias' imposing the mission to Colchis on him. Pelias' attempt to be rid of the young man backfires horribly: the hero returns with the instrument of the king's death. Moreover, the importance of this point to Pindar's narrative goals can be surmised by the apostrophe to the king at line 250: ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτᾷ, τὰν Πελίαοφονόν.

---

[397] For Pindar’s knowledge of Tyrtaeus, see Schadewaldt 1928, 301, n.1. For the possibility of a second reference to the same poem at line 288, see Braswell 1988, 387.

[398] For the ideological imperatives the poem reinforces, see Latacz 1977.

[399] Cf. *Theogn.* 383-99, which also shares many features with the Tyrtaeus passage, including language.

[400] Braswell 1988, 361: “Those who enjoy speculation are free to see a further reference in the parable to Demophilus’ having taken employment in the service of another ruler as, e.g. a mercenary subaltern, an assumption which fits 265 and 267.”

The notion that exiles make dangerous affiliations while abroad is significant also for the passage's connection with the Theban myth. As we saw in the last chapter, Oedipus' son Polynices forged the alliances behind the Argive invasion of Thebes during his exile in Argos. [402] Considering this aspect of the myth, the deleterious consequences of exile add an additional layer of meaning to Pindar's opening injunction to "know the wisdom of Oedipus." [403]

---

[401] See Trundle 2004, 132-64, whose analysis emphasizes the prosopgraphical networks that influenced mercenary service and created hierarchies in mercenary forces based on social standing. If this is the case, we should not expect an elite like Demophilus to become part of the rank and file, but instead would have likely attained a higher rank thanks to his privileged background. He also touches on personal resentments toward rulers or elites motivating some to become mercenaries.

[402] Sophocles makes many of these themes explicit in Creon's repudiation of the dead prince Polynices (Soph. *Ant.* 198-202):

> τὸν δ' αὖ ξύναιμον τοῦδε, Πολυνείκην λέγω,
> ὃς γῆν πατρῴαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς
> φυγὰς κατελθὼν ἠθέλησε μὲν πυρὶ
> πρῆσαι κατάκρας, ἠθέλησε δ' αἵματος
> κοινοῦ πάσασθαι, τοὺς δὲ δουλώσας ἄγειν.

"But his brother, Polynices I mean, who came back from exile meaning to burn to the ground his native city and the gods of his race, and meaning to drink the people's blood and to enslave its people…" (Tr. Lloyd-Jones)

[403] There are numerous examples from historical sources of exiles who befriend powerful rulers during their time in exile and attempt to recover power through the foreign aid they acquire. Herodotus' vivid characterization of the Peisistratid tyranny is replete with examples of factions gaining the upper hand, exiling their enemies, and exiles acquiring aid during their time away and recovering power. In particular, the historian's vivid representation of Peisistratus's son, Hippias, who served as a counselor to Darius during his invasion of Greece, offers a valuable

After concluding his riddle, Pindar exhorts the king to positive action (270-4):

ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος, Παι-
    άν τέ σοι τιμᾷ φάος.
χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλ-
    λοντα τρῶμαν ἕλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.
ῥᾴδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖσαι καὶ ἀφαυροτέροις·
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἕσσαι δυσπαλὲς
    δὴ γίνεται, ἐξαπίνας
εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἁγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται.

> But you (Arcesilaus) are the most opportune healer, and Paean honors you with his light. It is necessary to apply a soft hand when dressing a sore wound. For easily can even weaklings shake a city; but to set it back in place again is a difficult struggle indeed, unless suddenly a god serves as steersman for the leaders.

(Trans. Race with modification)

While Emmett Robbins has attempted on etymological lines to draw a parallel between Jason and Arcesilaus through the poet's use of ἰατήρ, Jason's actions in the myth fail to render a clear parallel for him acting as a healer.[404] Instead, a consideration of the appeal to Παιάν elucidates Pindar's description of Arcesilaus as the ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος.

---

example. The exile inspires anti-Athenian attitudes in Persia (5.91.1), suggests the Persians fight at Marathon because the region was better suited for cavalry (6.102, 107), and hopes to recover the tyranny of Athens through Persian intervention (in Miltiades' speech at Marathon, though likely a genuine motive,6.109.3.) The exiled Spartan king Demaratus, who describes the customs and ethos of the Spartans to the Persian king (7.102-4) and offers a successful strategy to the king which is rejected (7.234-5) is another conspicuous example in Herodotus of an exile finding favor in a foreign court and serving as an informant against his home country.

[404] Robbins 2013, 192-201, originally published in 1977, and Segal 1986, 19. The view was more recently taken up by Sigelmann 2016 who concludes: "Jason the self-revitalizing flower is Jason the healer—he who takes upon himself the responsibility of infusing with new life not only himself, but the entire world of the polis." This view might work if we knew anything about Iolcus after Jason's return in Pindar's representation, but the notion that Jason fully bought in to Pelias' story that Phrixos' soul was poisoning the city of Iolcus and underwent the voyage to heal the city is perhaps reading too much into the exchange and importing the circumstances of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* to our passage. Pindar does not explain why Jason so willingly undertakes the dangerous voyage. We may just as easily imagine that the quest presented the young hero with an opportunity to demonstrate to the community the validity of his claim to the throne in the event that Pelias attempted to renege, as he did. For similar epideictic demonstrations of worth, see Versnel 1990 in the case of manifestations of power confirming the divinity of new gods.

Apollo’s healing guise was commonly invoked as Paean in early Greek poetry.[405] Indeed, an entire genre of poems, the paean, arose to celebrate this aspect of the god. The multiplicity of occasions for which paeans were composed complicates our understanding of its primary meaning, but we know for certain that the paean played an important role in civic festivals concerned with health and healing.[406] As Ian Rutherford has shown,[407] the various occasions for which an apotropaic paean were sung is cleverly incorporated into the list of omens a Thebans chorus fears an eclipse portends in Pindar’s 9th paean (13-20):

πολέμοιο δὲ σᾶμα φέρεις τινός,
ἢ καρποῦ φθίσιν, ἢ νιφετοῦ σθένος
ὑπέρφατον, ἢ στάσιν οὐλομέναν
ἢ πόντου κενεώσιας ἂμ πέδον,
ἢ παγετὸν χθονός, ἢ νότιον θέρος
ὕδατι ζακότῳ ῥέον,
⌊ἢ γαῖαν κατακλύσαισα θήσεις
ἀνδρῶν νέον ἐξ ἀρχᾶς γένος;

> Do you convey a sign of some war, or the withering of crops, or the unspeakable power of a blizzard, or baneful civil war, of the sea emptied over the plain, or a frozen earth, or a summer deluge, flowing with unquenchable water, or flooding the earth, will you instate a new race of men, right from the beginning?

The list of potential calamities for which the eclipse serves as an evil omen demonstrates a pervasive fear of natural disasters, but a single man-made catastrophe, civil war, is included in this fragment.[408] The need to heal a community suffering from stasis, or civil war, fits comfortably within the palliative function of the paean and seems to have been a common motivation for their composition.[409] As we have seen, the little historical information we have on the period in Cyrene agrees on the suffering it experienced from civil strife. Considering how in Pindar's representation the stasis has abated, the appeal to Arcesilaus to embrace his role as healer ties the few historical details we have together with the ameliorative message of the following lines.[410]

---

[405] Paean appears already in Homer (*Il*.5.401, 899; *Od*.4.232) and is commonly referenced in early Greek poetry. Cf. Sapph.20c.5, Hesiod. frg.2. M-W.

[406] For general study of the genre, see Käppel 1992, for the various social contexts of the paean, see Rutherford 2001, 23-58.

[407] Rutherford 2001, 191-5.

[408] The use of a list to introduce the theme of an ode seems to have been one of Pindar’s favorite devices. *O*.2 begins by asking which god, hero, and victor the chorus will celebrate, and an often-cited fragment from a Threnody (frg. 128C, Threnos 3) opens with a list of choral genres serving as a priamel to the threnody.

Arcesilaus is uniquely positioned to heal the community and promote peace through his capacity to grant amnesty and bind together formerly separate factions.[411] This message is implied by lines 271/2: χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλλοντα τρώμαν ἕλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.[412] The irenic function of paeans ties Pindar's opening with the section's concluding remarks: (272-6)

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἕσσαι δυσπαλὲς
    δὴ γίνεται, ἐξαπίνας

---

[409] A passage from the Hellenistic scholar Dionysius Thrax cites the alleviation of stasis as one of the primary functions of Paean: "the Paian is a poem in honor of Apollo and Artemis, and it contains a request for a relief from plagues, stasis, or similar things" (D.T., 451.12-3) quoted in Rutherford 2001, 37, n.2. Additionally, Pindar, *Paean* 2 for the Abderans emphasizes the importance of peace and tranquility in the wake of the city's former destruction, and Bacchylides, frg. 4, 60-80, a paean offers a detailed image of a city peace. See Rutherford 2001, 37-53 for a discussion of the non-Apolline functions of paeans.

[410] That the crisis had passed is implied by the gnome at line 291, mentioning how when storm winds die-down sails are changed, and *P*.5.10-11, which similarly uses the metaphor of the storm to allude to the stasis that gripped Cyrene. For parallel uses in the poetry of Alcaeus of the storm to describe civil war troubling the ship of state, see Page 1955, 179-197, and Fränkel 1975, 189-93. Sophocles uses the metaphor extensively in *Antigone*. Creon's first speech uses it throughout and the figure of the winterstorm-tossed ship is repeated in the opening of the "Ode to Man" (Soph. *Ant*. 334-40).

[411] The metaphor of healing a torn nation is a rhetorical common-place in times of civil war. The reception in tragedy is particularly robust, see especially Soph. *Ant*.165-90, and Aesch. *Sept*.840-60. In more recent history, the conclusion of Lincoln's second inaugural address concerning the American Civil War famously touches on all these themes: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations"

[412] Pindar's choice to foreground the "gentle hand" of Arcesilaus is significant. As Aeschylus shows, the action of a king healing a city of its perceived aliment is not always gentle (*Ag*. 848-50): ὅτῳ δὲ καὶ δεῖ φαρμάκων παιωνίων, ἤτοι κέαντες ἢ τεμόντες εὐφρόνως πειρασόμεσθα πῆμ' ἀποστρέψαι νόσου. For an exploration of the history of the relationship between the figure of the doctor and king, and the political appropriations of the figure of the doctor in the 5th century, see Jouanna 2012, 21-38.

εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἁγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται
τὶν δὲ τούτων ἐξυφαίνονται χάριτες. 275
τλᾶθι τᾶς εὐδαίμονος ἀμφὶ Κυρά-
 νας θέμεν σπουδὰν ἅπασαν.

> But, to set it back in place again is a difficult struggle indeed, unless suddenly a god becomes a helmsman for the leaders. But for you the blessings of such things are unfolding. Dare to devote all your serious effort to the cause of blessed Cyrene.
>
> (Trans. Race)

In Pindar's representation, Paean, as an agent of peace and healing, is attempting to aid the king in the difficult task of restoring the civil-war ravaged polis. But how is the king to do this? The last three lines of the passage are of special significance and have gone underappreciated in scholarship on the ode. The language of 275–τὶν δὲ τούτων ἐξυφαίνονται χάριτες—is particularly remarkable. As commentators rightly parse the sentence, the subject χάριτες best reads as the as the plural of χάρις with the middle-voice verb ἐξυφαίνονται: "for you the web of this favor is being woven out."[413] Yet, given the collocation of ἐξυφαίνονται and χάριτες, and the shared form "χάριτες" for both the nominative/accusative plural of χάρις and the nominative plural name, Χάριτες, (the Graces) something else may be at play. What would the two words in such close contact have suggested to the audience hearing the passage?

ἐξυφαίνονται is an especially curious choice of verb.[414] As many scholars have noted, the act of weaving had especially strong connections to poetic composition in Ancient Greek poetry, and Pindar himself commonly employs the verb ὑφαίνω to mean "to compose" or "to preform" poetry.[415] Considering the verb's poetic associations, situated next to "χάριτες," the poetic content becomes especially important. Given that the two words are identical, the audience may have misheard “χάριτες,” as Χάριτες—the Graces. A moment’s thought would correct the sentence’s syntax from this possible deviation but activating the word’s further poetic associations could have been significant in its context.

---

[413] The translation is from Braswell 1988, 376, who supplement his reading with "by the gods."

[414] It is a rare word which occurs only once more in the Pindaric corpus. In *N.*4.44-5, the narrative persona uses a present imperative form to direct the Phorminx: ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ, Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ μέλος, "sweet Phorminx, right away weave together this song with the Lydian mode."

[415] Frg. 179 ὑφαίνω δ' Ἀμυθαονίδαισιν ποικίλον ἄνδημα in the scholia to *N.* 7.79 illustrating the alleged etymological connection between "hymnos" and "uphainein," as one scholiast to the passage notes (Drachmann 1927, 133): ἀναφέρει δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὑφαινομένων ποικιλίαν ταύτην, ἐπεὶ τὸ ποίημα ὑφάσματι παρέοικεν. Cf.

As William Slater has observed, the Graces are commonly metonymically linked to poetry itself in Pindar’s surviving corpus.[416] Mishearing the statement as a claim that the Graces are trying to bring an end to the stasis in Cyrene reminds the audience of the poet’s inspired position and the importance of listening to his message. In this way, the ambiguity of the word activates the poetic associations of the word χάρις,[417] and foregrounds the poet’s role in the negotiation.

Maintaining the theme of poetic power from the preceding lines, the thirteenth triad of *P*.4 opens with an appeal to Homer’s wisdom (277-9):

τῶν δ' Ὁμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος
ῥῆμα πόρσυν'· ἄγγελον ἐσλὸν ἔφα τι-
    μὰν μεγίσταν πράγματι παντὶ φέρειν·
αὔξεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι' ἀγγελίας ὀρ-
θᾶς

> And among the sayings of Homer, take this one to mind and heed it: he said that a good messenger conveys the greatest honor to every affair. The Muse, too, is enhanced by a true message.

(Trans. Race with Modification)

Maehler 1981, 90. Bacchylides also makes use of the image of weaving out a song. So, 5.9-14: ἦ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις ὑφάνας ὕμνον ἀπὸ ζαθέας νάσου ξένος ὑμετέραν πέμπει κλεένναν ἐς πόλιν, χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας καινὸς θεράπων, and 19.3-11: ὃς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λάχησι δῶρα Μουσᾶν, ἰοβλέφαροί τε κόραι φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμὰν ὕμνοισιν· ὕφαινέ νυν ἐν ταῖς πολυηράτοις τι καινὸν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις, εὐαίνετε Κηΐα μέριμνα, which combines all three elements of weaving, song, and the graces. ὑφαίνω and its compounds only occur once in Pindar (*P*.4.141) and once in Bacchylides (18.51) in contexts which do not reference poetry.

[416] Slater 1968, 542 1.B and 543 2.B.

[417] For the significance of χάρις and the Charites in early Greek poetry, see Scott 1984.

According to scholiasts, the quotation is based on *Iliad* 15. 206-7:[418] Ἶρι θεὰ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες· ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἰδῇ, “Goddess Iris, this word of yours is rightly spoken, and a deed is fine when a messenger knows what is right.” Given the divergences, Pindar’s passage looks like a re-working of the Homeric text.[419] He has transferred the honor from the conduct and knowledge of the messenger (himself) to the value of a true message for its recipients (Arcesilaus).[420] This makes sense. Through these modifications, the poet has again emphasized the importance of listening to what his poem has to say.[421] His choice to cite the most famous Greek poet as his source for the message also serves to illustrate the permanence that can be achieved through poetry. Lines 277-8, αὔξεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι' ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς, reinforce the importance of his poetic message by recalling the ode’s opening apostrophe to the Muse (1-5):

Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,
    ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,
Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
    θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων.

---

[418] Drachmann 1910, 165. See also, Burton 1962, 170-1, Cf. Kirkwood 1982, 198: “The Homeric passage nearest to what Pindar gives is Iliad 15.207, which is not very similar, but the context of that line is so appropriate that it seems altogether likely that Pindar had this passage in mind.”

[419] For the argument that the Homeric corpus underwent changes through its continued performance until at least the Hellenistic period, see Nagy 1996, and Nagy 1991, 339-83 for a similar view on the Pan-Hellenization of the text of Pindar through continued re-performance in the classical period. Nagy’s observations should make us cautious when considering the relationship between Pindar’s quotations of Homer or other poets, but as Maehler 1982, 54-5, and 122 has shown in the case of Bacchylides, lyric poets were relatively free to re-work earlier poetic texts to fit their own poetic needs. As Braswell 1988, 378 points out it is unlikely that many would have had the passage so well memorized as to call out the poet for improper quotation; additionally he notes the possibility that gnomai based on Homeric passages circulated independent of the text itself. See Sider 2001 for a similar view on the reception of the Homeric generation of leaves in lyric.

[420] Sotiriou 1998, 123.

[421] The representation of the Muse conveying a song to all boundaries of the world is common in Pindar’s poetry and represents a symbiotic relationship of poet and praise object; see Carnes 1997, and Calame 2012.

> Today, Muse, it is necessary for you to stand beside a dear man, the king of well-horsed Cyrene, so that with Arcesilaus celebrating his Komos you might enhance the breeze of song due to the children of Leto and Pytho.

By calling attention to the ode’s opening lines and reinserting the Muse in the exchange between the poet and king, Pindar again asserts the divine inspiration we discussed in chapter 3, and underscores the importance of heeding his words.[422] As such, the passage intensifies the message of the preceding lines: the Muse’s report confers distinction on the recipient of the poetry, but only if the message is true.

The truth value of the praise, however, may be questioned. As is common in encomiastic poetry, the praise for the object of celebration ranges from his accomplishments to his character. *P*.4 is no exception. In lines 258-62 the poet pivots from the Argonautic myth to the present day:

ἔνθεν δ' ὔμμι Λατο-
  ίδας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον
σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄστυ χρυσοθρόνου 260
διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας
ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις.

> From there (Thera), the son of Leto furnished the plain of Libya to your family to make prosper through honors coming from the gods, and the divine city of golden Cyrene to govern, to you who have devised policy based on just counsel.

(Trans. Race with Modification)

Praise of this kind can act as a double-edged sword. It is valueless if it does not ring true to its hearers, or if the king chooses to act in a way that is inconsistent with it. Therefore, by praising Arcesilaus as a fair, wise counseling ruler, Pindar puts the onus on him to act as one. Should the Cyrenaean king choose to maintain his grudge against the young exile whose case Pindar now takes up, the claim that the Muse gains distinction through a true report implies the negative: a false report may inflict more damage on the king's image than benefit. The praise of the king is precariously balanced against the successful repatriation of the exile.

---

[422] Pindar also uses the device of Muse inspiration to introduce the myth at *P*.4.67-8: ἀπὸ δ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ Μοίσαισι δώσω καὶ τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ·.

Pindar's praise of Demophilus, by contrast, is unqualified. He begins by emphasizing the exile's alleged fame for justice (279-81):

ἐπέγνω μὲν Κυράνα
καὶ τὸ κλεεννότατον μέγαρον Βάττου δικαιᾶν
Δαμοφίλου πραπίδων

Cyrene and the most famous home of Battis have come to know the just heart of Demophilus

We cannot know how accurate the passage's claim about the young man was. This, however, should not blind us to an important point: Pindar's proclaiming the young man famous for his justice effectively makes him so through the poem's performance. As such, whatever the audience knew of Demophilus before the poem, Pindar's advocacy of the youth actively (re)casts him as a responsible, precociously mature young man. The further treatment of Demophilus' character in the following line extends the poet's rehabilitation of the youth, reinforcing the wisdom of restoring him to his native city (281-7):

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,
οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρ-
    ρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.
εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν· θεράπων δέ οἱ, οὐ δρά-
    στας ὀπαδεῖ.

> For that man—a youth among boys—but in councils he is aged, as though he were happening upon his hundredth year of life. He orphans a malicious tongue of its shining voice, and he has learned to hate the man committing violence—not striving against the noble, nor protracting any end, since opportunity in men's affairs has a brief span. He has come to know it well. He attends it as a companion, not a slave.

(Trans. Race with Modification)

While commentators have observed the passage's focus on the exile's return, few have examined the role wisdom and learning play in Pindar's representation of the young exile. Perhaps the most significant lines for an appreciation of this theme are 283-4: ὀρφανίζει μὲν κακὰν γλῶσσαν φαεννᾶς ὀπός, ἔμαθε δ' ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν. The first half of the sentence has been interpreted variously. Some scholars have taken the line to mean that he has not spoken out against Arcesilaus while in exile.[423] Others infer that he has acted in such a way that no one could slander his conduct.[424] The ambiguity of the language, however, may be intentional. Both are valuable claims to make on an exile's behalf and well represent his good conduct abroad toward the man who exiled him—he has not been engaging in seditious slander against the king nor acting in a such a way that anyone could suggest he has.[425]

The maturity of his behavior is reflected in the second half of the sentence—ἔμαθε δ' ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν. Pindar's choice of verb to describe Demophilus' actions, ἔμαθε, is particularly important. As we have observed, the circumstances behind Demophilus' exile are unknown. If the man was in exile through no fault of his own, then verb may be taken "timelessly," to mean "he knows to hate the man committing violence." On this reading, the line may demonstrate Demophilus' divergence from those directly responsible for his unfortunate circumstances. Yet, if the young man had been exiled for sedition, stating that "he has learned to hate the man committing violence” strongly asserts his rehabilitation since going into exile.[426] If this is the case, it may be possible to see an intentional adaptation of the πάθει μάθος trope in the lines.[427] This theme has already been suggested in the myth. Recalling Jason’s return to Iolcus, the exile’s first words to the gathered crowd are significant: Φαμὶ διδασκαλίαν Χίρωνος οἴσειν (I say that I will honor the teachings of Chiron). Jason’s claim is that during his exile he acquired the best education available from the finest teacher. As a pupil of the centaur, he literally learned during his suffering in exile. However, since we do not know the circumstances behind Demophilus’ exile, the exact meaning and its relationship to earlier content must remain ambiguous.

---

[423] Gildersleeve 1891, 303; Kirkwood 1982, 199.

[424] Duchemen 1967, 152; Giannini 1995, 507.

[425] A dispute over alleged slander of Dionysius II at the Olympic games is made a central point of the second Platonic letter (310B4-311). This must have been a considerable issue for kings and tyrants who were unable to leave the cities they reigned over to defend themselves in person on the Greek mainland.

The theme of the suffering exile is continued in the following passage (287-92):

φαντὶ δ' ἔμμεν
τοῦτ' ἀνιαρότατον, καλὰ γινώσκοντ' ἀνάγκᾳ
ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα. καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ
προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρῴ-
ας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπό τε κτεάνων·
λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας. ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ
μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου
ἱστίων.

They say that the most vexsome thing is for someone to know the good but to be forced to be out of reach. Yes, that Atlas, even now, wrestles with the sky, away from his homeland and his possessions, though Zeus freed the Titans. In time, the sails change when the wind abates.

---

[426] This reading is paralleled by Pindar’s comments on Ixion at *P.*2 21-5:

θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς
λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ
παντᾷ κυλινδόμενον·
τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς
ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι.
ἔμαθε δὲ σαφές.

[427] For the *locus classicus* of the motif, see Aesch, *Ag.*177. As Denys Page has observed on the use of the maxim: “Aeschylus tells us that Justice is not man-made: it is a rule for life on earth imposed by Zeus. If you break his law, he will teach you to mend your ways by inflicting punishment; you will learn perforce not to ignore the divine origin and sanction of the rules of conduct which govern civilized society.” Denniston, Page, [2008], 85. Herodotus makes the theme a cornerstone to his history after the explicit mention of the trope by Croesus at 1.201. For Herodotus, there seems to be a contrast between learning by example and story, as Solon attempts to educate/warn Croesus, which is how intelligent people learn, and learning by suffering which is inflicted upon those who cannot understand the meaning in warning narratives told to them.

(Trans. Race with Modification)

The opening gnome highlights the piteousness of the powerless.[428] Whatever good fortune he may have enjoyed before, Demophilus is now bent and broken by his separation from home. Like the oak of the earlier riddle, he is far from his proper place and unable to return by his own means. The imagery of the columnar oak is repeated in the figure of Atlas.[429] As the proverbial pillar who holds up the sky, Atlas is an important point of comparison for Demophilus' suffering.[430] But how does the passage relate to Demophilus' position? While some scholars have taken the reference to the Titan to mean only Demophilus, Atlas' myth and his relationship to the freed Titans may have wider reference.[431] The almost complete loss of the epic *Titanomachy* makes it difficult to know what narratives it contained. In the possible near-Eastern archetype, the *Enuma Elis*, Marduk, a sky god equivalent to Zeus, freed the defeated gods he had imprisoned as a show of clemency.[432]

---

[428] A very similar context and gnome is found at Herodotus 9.16.5. In this scene, a Persian soldier dining at a home in Thebes tearfully relates to a Thersander, an Orchomenian nobleman, his fear that the final campaign will end in disaster. After explaining his thinking, the soldier laments: τι δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀμήχανον ἀποτρέψαι ἀνθρώπῳ· οὐδὲ γὰρ πιστὰ λέγουσι ἐθέλει πείθεσθαι οὐδείς. Ταῦτα δὲ Περσέων συχνοὶ ἐπιστάμενοι ἑπόμεθα ἀναγκαίῃ ἐνδεδεμένοι. Ἐχθίστη δὲ ὀδύνη ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι αὕτη, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν.

[429] Braswell 1988, 389, "The image of Demophilus wrestling like Atlas against the weight of the sky recalls that of the oak functioning as a lintel or architrave."

[430] For Atlas as the column holding up the sky, Hom. *Od.*1.52-4, Hes. *Th.*517-9, and Aesch. *P.V.* 347-50.

[431] Braswell 1988, 360, argues that nothing more is to be seen in the reference to Atlas than the idea that Demophilus is separated from his possessions and uses the passage to infer that Arcesilaus has not seized Demophilus' property, from which money he paid for the ode.

[432] *Enuma Elis* 6.11-34, 7.27-9.

The earliest extant reference to Zeus freeing the Titans in Greek literature is found in the fragmentary lines of the *Works and Days* transmitted by papyri between 173-4.[433] The lines explicitly state that Zeus freed his father, Cronos, whom Hesiod in the *Theogony* has Zeus imprison in Tartarus, and allowed him to rule over the Islands of the Blessed.[434] As West, and other have argued, the authenticity and date of these lines is uncertain.[435] The version of the myth they attest, however, closely conforms to the account of the Islands of the Blessed Pindar includes in *O.*2, where Cronos is stationed as ruler (*O.*2.70-8). The best indication of a tradition of Zeus freeing the Titans comes from the Prometheus plays attributed to Aeschylus.

Throughout the text of the first play, *Prometheus Bound*, the breaking of Prometheus is said to be part of Zeus' cosmic plan. Hephaistos, feeling pity for Prometheus, explains Zeus' violent behavior through the newness of his reign (*P.V.*34-5): Διὸς γὰρ δυσπαραίτητοι φρένες· ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῇ, "Zeus' heart is implacable—and everyone is harsh who has recently come to power."[436] As the play progresses, Prometheus' recalcitrance and refusal to bend to the will of Zeus provokes further torments. Eventually, the violence inflicted on him, prophesied by Hermes(1000), and set between the two plays, breaks Prometheus' unwillingness to accede to Zeus, and procures the Titan's freedom in the second play. The softening of Zeus' violence and anger toward his former enemies is only possible when they have learned to accept his rule and submit to it. The chorus of freed Titans in the second play serve a reminder of the clemency Zeus offers if Prometheus abandons his pride.

---

[433] The lines, quoted in West's edition of the *Works*, come from two papyrus fragments of the text, but are not transmitted in the manuscript tradition, though their contents are alluded to in several ancient sources (Zenob. 3.86, *IG* 14.1389,I 8)

[434] Hes. *Th.* 717, 729 referencing the imprisonment of the titans in Tartarus and 851 explicitly including Cronos among the imprisoned titans.

[435] West 1978, 194-5.

[436] The intensely political nature of the play makes it a valuable study on attitudes toward tyranny in Athens. See Griffith 1983, 6-21 for a discussion on the political context and possible allusions to Pericles in the figure of Zeus.

The content of the *Prometheus Unbound* offers an important parallel to an earlier version of the myth. Scholiasts to Apollonius Rhodius attribute to the mythographer Pherecydes an account whereby Heracles encounters Prometheus and slays the eagle that has feasted on his liver (10-15). In thanks for this act of kindness, Prometheus reveals the location of the apples of the Hesperides, and tells Heracles that he must have Atlas retrieve them (15-6). Heracles seeks out Atlas, who retrieves the apples while Heracles holds the sky, but Atlas attempts to cheat Heracles, saying that he will take the apples to Eurystheus himself, and presumably leave Heracles to hold the sky forever. Heracles, however, perceives the deception (17-20), and manages to trick Atlas into taking back the sky and makes off with apples (Pherec. frg.17, 10-26).

The relative characterizations of the two Titans may shed light on *P*.4.289-91. In the trilogy, though Prometheus was initially obstinate and unwilling to accept Zeus's rule, he endured his punishment, and eventually, through the suffering inflicted on him, was softened and succumbed to the will of Zeus. Atlas by contrast remained unbroken. His deceptive treatment of Zeus' son Heracles suggests that he has not changed through his punishment, nor learned to accept the primacy of Zeus and his family, but was still looking for a way to get the upper hand. This same contrast may inform our passage:

καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ
προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρῴ 290
    ας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπό τε κτεάνων·
λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας.

> And that famous Atlas even now wrestles with the sky, separated from his home and possessions, though immortal Zeus freed the Titans.

(Trans. Based on Kirkwood 1982)

In the context of Pindar’s plea for Demophilus’ repatriation, the juxtaposition of the exiled youth with Atlas and the other Titans makes more sense if we understand it as one between the repentant and unrepentant. The underscored contrast encourages Arcesilaus to recognize Demophilus’ rehabilitation and grant the same clemency that Zeus showed his former adversaries. He is not an unreformed Atlas, though he still suffers as if he were.

The gnome that follows reinforces this reading (292-4):

ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ
μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου
ἱστίων.

And in time, the sails change when the wind abates.

Though some scholars have taken the aphorism as a source of encouragement to the exile,[437] the maxim makes better sense when seen as an exhortation to the king. Indeed, it is difficult not to see the ship of state repeated in these lines. As such, the directive to change sails should concern the captain of the ship, or, in the context of the state, the king. Indeed, Pindar has Aeëtes’ speech cleverly incorporate the connection (230): βασιλεύς, ὅστις ἄρχει ναός, “The king—whoever has command of the ship.” As we have seen, the violent storm was a common metaphor for civil war in Greek literature. Since this storm has passed, and serene sailing returned, the strategies necessary for successfully sailing the ship must also change. On this reading, the gnome serves as more than mere filler; it extends the exhortation to grant clemency as the poet introduces his final, direct appeal for the exile’s repatriation (293-99):

ἀλλ' εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦ-

---

[437] Braswell 1988, 391: “A common image used to express the changes of fortune… Here unlike the passages just cited, the image is not a warning that good fortune can change to bad, but an encouragement (directed to Demophilus).

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

> He prays, having drained off his accursed disease to the end, he may one day see his home; that he may participate in symposia by Apollo's fountain, often indulging his heart in youth, and touch upon peace, plucking the ornate phorminx in the company of his cultured citizens, neither causing injury to anyone, nor suffering it from his townsmen. And he would tell, Arcesilaus, what a spring of ambrosial verses he found, recently hosted in Thebes.
> (Trans. Race with Modification)

The first line of the concluding passage introduces a prayer from the exile for his return in the language of healing a disease. As such, the king is placed in an analogous role to that of a god. Pindar has already suggested the divinely inspired capacity of the king to heal (470-1):

ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος, Παι-
άν τέ σοι τιμᾷ φάος.
χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλ-
λοντα τρώμαν ἕλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.

> But you (Arcesilaus) are the most opportune healer, and Paean honors you with his light. It is necessary to apply a soft hand when dressing a sore wound.

The healing language is not the only aspect of the passage to be repeated in the build-up to the plea. Pindar's description of Demophilus a few lines before concludes by foregrounding his relationship to καιρός (487-8):

ὁ γὰρ και-
ρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.
εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν· θεράπων δέ οἱ, οὐ δρά-
στας ὀπαδεῖ.

> since opportunity in men's affairs has a brief span. He has come to know it well. He attends it as a companion, not a slave.

Moreover, on our reading of the reference to Atlas in the passage immediately following this (289-92), the position of power Arcesilaus finds himself in is analogous to Zeus—although Zeus did not free Atlas, the leader of the Titans, he did the rest. Now, Arcesilaus is being asked to do the same. Demophilus is praying that his illness of exile be healed and be granted his return—only Arcesilaus can fulfill it.

Pindar shifts his focus from the exile's present misfortune to his benignity by calling the king's attention to the exile's almost exclusive interest in Cyrene's cultural life (293-6):

ἐπ' Ἀπόλλω-
νός τε κράνᾳ συμποσίας ἐφέπων
θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, ἔν τε σοφοῖς 295
δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων πολί-
ταις ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν.

> That he may participate in symposia by Apollo's fountain, often indulging his heart in youth, and touch upon peace, plucking the ornate phorminx in the company of his cultured citizens.

Given the komastic context in which the poem begins (3) and the sympotic and komastic elements of the scene involving Jason (126-35) we discussed in chapter 4, Pindar's choice to conclude with a representation of Demophilus at the symposium is important. To be sure, as Lucia Athanassaki and Jenny StraussClay have observed, the imaginary sympotic context developed in passages like this form an idealized tranquil space,[438] but given the importance of the symposium in the myth of Jason the choice to conclude with an image of Demophilus at the symposium takes on greater meaning. As we saw in the last chapter, Jason's symposium was immediately followed by the second interview between Jason and Pelias. This is where Jason requests Pelias and he settle their differences and that the king allow him to assume his proper place in the community. It is also where Pelias makes his fatal mistake. Instead of settling the quarrel, Pelias attempts to cheat Jason out of his return by asking the impossible of him. The choice to reference the symposium once more when Arcesilaus was actively thinking about the repatriation recalls the earlier exemplum to highlight the critical moment of the mythical king's failure. Arcesilaus is confronted with a similar challenge—it is incumbent upon him to make the right choice.

---

[438] Strauss Clay 1999, and Athanassaki 2016.

The behaviors the poet describes the exile participating in at the imagined symposium—playing the lyre and singing at the symposium—closely correspond to Pindar's poetic persona. Indeed, the section's strongly poetic thrust led Erich Thummer to argue that Demophilus was not an exile at all, but rather a traveling poet like Pindar.[439] As Christopher Carey has shown, Thummer's argument is untenable on several important points, but the passage still demands we think about why the poet chose to represent the exile as intimately involved in poetic activity.[440]

To answer this question, we must look to the poem's closing lines (298-9): εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς. The concluding spragis underscores the poet's connection to the young exile.[441] Unlike other instances of the sphragis in Pindar where the poet’s persona makes reference to himself in the first person, our passage does so by way of the third person.[442] In this way, the lines are closer to the conclusion of Bacchylides 3:

---

[439] Thummer 1968, 43, 90-1.

[440] Carey 1979, 143. Specifically, Thummer's argument fails to offer a convincing explanation for lines 293-4: ἀλλ' εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦσον διαντλήσαις ποτέ οἶκον ἰδεῖν. Why would Pindar refer to travel abroad specifically as an illness from which Demophilus prayed for healing? Given the concluding sphragis a few lines later highlighting how Demophilus had recently been in Thebes—Pindar's home—this seems an even odder reading—as if he needed to be healed from the illness of visiting the man composing the poem.

[441] Sigelman 2016, 134-5 has argued that this device has no relation to the historical Thebes. I am disinclined to this reading considering how Pindar's reference to his home city occurs in a sphragis. *O.*1, 115-6 offers a valuable contrast: εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν, ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ' Ἕλλανας ἐόντα παντᾷ. In this sphragis, the poet calls attention to his poetic activity and engagement in a wish to always attend to victors. Pindar's fame, talent, and network are all highlighted. Unlike, *Olympian* 1, however, the emphasis of the sphragis in *P.*4 is not on Pindar or his poetry, which would make better sense if, as Sigelman thinks, only poetry is meant. Instead, the sphragis unites the poet and his city with the figure of the exile Demophilus and his relationship to the "spring of song" that is *P.*4. The use of a third-person who will (might) convey the poet's message in a closing *sphragis* is much closer to what we see in Bacchlides 3.96-8, discussed below.

> σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[είᾳ] καλῶν
> καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν
> Κηΐας ἀηδόνος. 98

> And with the truth of your benefactions, someone will sing the gift of the honey-voiced Cean nightingale.
>
> (Bacchylides 3, 96-8)

As commentators have noted, the conclusion of Ode 3 calls Hieron’s attention to the memorializing function of the poet’s song in future re-performance.[443] Bacchylides’ choice to cast the re-performance of his poem as an action undertaken by an indefinite person in the future suggests to Hieron a parallel with Croesus, the figure of Ode 3’s myth: like Croesus, Hieron’s fame for generosity and beneficence will be so widespread, who would not sing of him in the future?[444] However, by specifying Demophilus as the conduit through which Pindar’s poem will be transmitted in future re-performance, the closing lines restrict the dissemination of Arcesilaus’ song. There can be no true report of Arcesilaus’ beneficence without Demophilus in Cyrene. If the king were to deny the exile his return, in re-performance the concluding lines will call attention to Arcesilaus’ refusal, and the falsity of Pindar’s praise of Arcesilaus’ tolerant, healing character, moreover, would undermine the premise of the praise throughout the poem. This could have disastrous consequences. As we have seen, Pindar has gone to great lengths to legitimize the Battiad dynasty. An erosion of confidence in the poet's truth undermines or even subverts the propagandistic function of earlier content and shows Arcesilaus to be callow and insecure in his reign. In this way, I suggest the poet dares the king to consider the danger of the scenario just developed. Either Arcesilaus must repatriate the exile, or, in effect, be forced to jettison the poem which has so intricately and emphatically legitimized his own rule.

---

[442] Cf. *P*.2,3-4: ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων μέλος ἔρχομαι.

[443] Hutchinson 2001, 356-8, Maehler 2004, 100, and Cairns 2010, 214-5 for commentary on the passage. See also Nünlist 1998, 351, and Morrison 2007, 14 for a discussion of re-performance of the passage generally.

[444] Pindar uses a similar device at the conclusion of *P*.1 (94-8) by contrasting the relative fame and reception of Croesus and Phalaris.

The negative consequences of Arcesilaus denying the exile repatriation have caused scholars to reject the notion that the plea is active.[445] But is it reasonable to expect that the king would never have been put in a position to decide on an issue that might reflect badly on him? It is dangerous for us to expect political outcomes to be logical, and therefore also dangerous to predicate our understanding of the ode on the assumption that rulers never act against their own interests or make decisions with negative personal consequences for petty reasons. Andocides is a case in point. In the oration on *His Own Return*, the Athenian begins by expressing his outrage at the resistance of his countrymen to accepting his offer of support: "They must either be the most stupid of mankind or the worst of public enemies. For if on the one hand they hold that when the state is prospering they are better off individually, they are showing extreme stupidity in advocating today a policy which directly conflicts with their own interests; while if they do not identify their interests as individuals with yours as a community, they can only be public enemies."[446] The exile continues his speech by setting out the circumstances of his exile (6-7), calling attention to his maturation and service to Athens during exile (8-16), offering grain in exchange for his return (19-23), expressing his remorse for prior transgressions, and emphasizing his lack of resentment for being exiled (24-8). The structure, themes, and circumstances of

---

[445] Gildersleeve 1892, Braswell 1988, Athanassaki 2014, Sigelman 2015.

[446] Andoc. *De Red. Suo*1.2. Trans. Maidment with modification.

Andocides' plea for repatriation mirror many of the themes we have detected in *P*.4. Yet, despite the tangible benefits he offered his city, the rhetorical pains he takes in emphasizing his transformation in exile, and the desire he expresses to aid his city during the war, Andocides was denied his return on this occasion.[447]

If the Athenians had felt strongly enough to act against their own interests by refusing Andocides' repatriation bid during one of their most desperate stretches of the Peloponnesian War, is there any reason we should accept outright that Arcesilaus would never do the same at a time of relative strength? It is not "politically naïve" to suppose Pindar and/or Demophilus saw the king's victory as an opportune moment to enter a plea for return in the ostensible form of a celebration of his victory, or that Arcesilaus, flushed with success, might have denied the request. We have too little knowledge of ancient Cyrene to know what kind of ruler the king was, or how he might have responded to such a plea—to say nothing of the historical circumstances of the ode's composition. As such, entertaining the notion that plea was an active request for return is not a whim of those "lacking any sense of political reality" but rather an important interpretive alternative we must explore to acquire the fullest view of the ode in an environment where we have precious little information.

---

[447] For a discussion of the historical circumstances see Maidment 1982, 454-7, Albini 1961, 7-32, and Dalmeyda 1930, VII-XI.

Conclusion:

Resetting the Boundaries of Pindaric Lyric

As recent scholarship has weakened the limitations rigid generic expectations imposed on the interpretation of Pindaric lyric, a greater range of possibilities has emerged. Throughout this study I have shown how analysis of the *P*.4 benefits from weakening our expectations of genre and commission and embracing the ode's many problematic features. As we saw of the poetic tradition in Chapters 1 and 3, as a culturally powerful figure, Pindar possessed a high degree of independent cultural authority to press against the propagandistic narratives of tyrants and assert his own cultural authority. While he may have broached his views in gnomai or other distancing devices, the significance of the poet refusing to offer unmitigated praise of the tyrant should not be diminished. Indeed, a final case offers a compelling comparandum.

Much like *P*.4's concluding triade, the final 20 lines of *P*.2 have puzzled scholars for their forceful and apparently independent-minded counseling of Hieron of Syracuse.[448] So great was Basil Gildersleeve's discomfort with the notion of unsolicited advice occurring in a Pindaric ode that he exhorted his fellow Pindarists to "hold fast to the common-sense view that Pindar did not undertake to lecture Hieron."[449] Yet, the "common-sense" view espoused by Gildersleeve and his epigones is predicated on a dangerously narrow expectation of what a poet can do, say, or accomplish with his poetry. The same expectation, for example, led scholars to deny the possibility that Pindar could forceful and directly address Hieron in *P*.1—a view refuted by Adolph Köhnken.[450] Still, Gildersleeve's view inspires a productive question: why would an epinican conclude with such uncharacteristically stern admonishment? Can we be sure *P*.2 is one?

---

[448] The puzzlement over these lines has been consistent since antiquity. For the ancient controversies, see Drachmann 1910, 51-55. For a synopsis of the modern interpretive challenges and approaches, see Lloyd-Jones 1973.

[449] Gildersleeve 1892, 253.

This is precisely the question the Alexandrian scholars who compiled our text asked:

γέγραπται μὲν ῾Ιέρωνι ἅρματι νικήσαντι, ἄδηλον δὲ εἰς ποῖον ἀγῶνα· διεστασίασται γὰρ οὐ μετρίως τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ ὅλως ἐπίνικον αὐτὸν εἶναί φασι· Τίμαιος δὲ θυσιαστικήν, Καλλίμαχος Νεμεακήν, ᾿Αμμώνιος καὶ Καλλίστρατος ᾿Ολυμπιακήν, ἔνιοι Πυθικήν, ὡς ᾿Απολλώνιος ὁ εἰδογράφος, ἔνιοι δὲ Παναθηναικήν.[451]

> While [the poem] was written for Hieron, victorious in a chariot race, it is unclear in what contest. For the disagreements among our predecessors were substantial. Some contend that it is not altogether an epincian, Timaios says it is a sacrificial song, Callimachus a Nemean, Ammonios and Kallistratos an Olympian, while others a Pythian—such as Apollonius the Eidographer—while still more claim it is a Pan-Athenaic song.

Given the range of options considered in antiquity, it is clear little, if any, more information on the poem's context survived to Alexandria than we have.[452] To the ancient options, modern scholars have added their own guesses on the location of the victory: Syracuse and Thebes. Some considerations need to be addressed. First, if the ode were composed to primarily celebrate a major victory, i.e. an Olympian or Pythian, how likely is it that the poet would fail to mention the victory site if it were at one of the two most famous locales in the ancient athletic circuit?[453]

---

[450] Köhnken 1970.

[451] Drachmann 1910, 31.

[452] See Burton 1962, 111-5, for a discussion of the ancient scholiasts' interpretation of the ode.

[453] Robertson, 1924, 35, and Bowra 1953, 66, claim the poem was composed for Hieron's Olympic victory of 468 and is a response to Bacchylides receiving the official commission instead of Pindar—thereby a de facto Olympian—a view partially endorsed by Lloyd-Jones 1973, n.55^a. The weaknesses of the position are well addressed by Burton 1962, 113-4.

Next there is the suggestion of victory in a lesser contest (Isthmia, Nemea, Athens). To judge from our surviving evidence for chariot victories in the early 5th century, the great Sicilian tyrants showed little interest in these for their own sake. As Malcolm Bell has noticed, "The games at Olympia and Delphi, each on a four-year cycle, alternated in the even-numbered years of our calendar; both were held in full summer. The Isthmian contest, on a two-year cycle, was observed in the spring of each even-numbered year of our calendar, perhaps as a kind of trial for the summer games. The Panathenaia were celebrated on a four-year cycle, in the late summer after the contest at Delphi. These four contests--the Olympian, Isthmian, Pythian, and the Panathenaian--were all held in even-numbered years; the only games in the odd-numbered years were the Nemean, which do not appear to have attracted entries from the Syracusan or Akragantine tyrants themselves. Thus, every other year there was a major racing season favored by the Emmenids and Deinomenids."[454] From Bell's chronological considerations on the racing cycle, it looks very much like the participation of tyrants in the Isthmian games was due less to the glory they might acquire there than the opportunity for their teams to condition for the greater contests in the months following them.

The neglect of Nemea deserves attention. As a less prestigious venue than the Isthmian games, should we expect Hieron was interested in them at all? The surviving odes for Hieron's lieutenant Chromios suggest an answer. As Kathryn Morgan has seen, his victories in lesser contests coincide with Hieron's great Pan-Hellenic successes.[455] As such, it may very well have been that Chromios' activity was seen as an extension of Hieron's. This makes practical sense. Through his affiliation with his lieutenant, Hieron might benefit from the victory, while avoiding the direct embarrassment a loss in a lesser contest might entail. This fact may also lie behind why Xenokrates of Acragas could claim victory at the Isthmian games in an Olympic year with his brother Theron's team.[456]

---

[454] Bell 1995, 18.

[455] Morgan 2015, 359-412.

The Theban option rests on the opening lines—ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος—which scholars have taken as a literal pronouncement.[457] This view may be answered in two ways. First, the observations above should apply to any venue on the mainland—unless it were a convenient training ground on the way to one of the two greatest contests, it is unlikely to have attracted Hieron. Secondly, the interpretive problems with reading phrases like this as a personal, historical insight are manifold and well addressed.[458] As Reginald Burton has observed: "Pindar is speaking in his own persona and in his familiar figure of an *angelos* bringing good news *from the place where he is composing the poem*."[459]

This leaves us the Sicilian option. The view is based on the observations of scholiasts to *O.*13, who claim that Hieron founded athletic contests at Aitna, named either the Isthmian or Nemean games.[460] Originating with Farnell,[461] the position has been championed by several prominent scholars in recent decades.[462] Unless we see the poem as the poet's self-introduction to the tyrant on the occasion of a minor victory, as some have taken it,[463] the venue is an unattractive option for several reasons.[464] As Lloyd-Jones has seen, the language of the passage is conventional to describe the victory conferring prestige on the victor's city.[465] Moreover, If Hieron's chariot team won at Syracuse in a contest founded by Hieron, we may reasonably ask who else could be expected to win at such a venue? As such, how likely is it that either Hieron would solicit an ode to celebrate a victory he should never have lost, or that the poet would go out of his way to commemorate such a win?

---

[456] Pindar provides a complete list of Xenokrates' accomplishments at *I.*2.12-24. Bell 1995, 16-8 posits a kind of gentleman's agreement between Hieron and Theron where each would defer to the other to compete in the Olympics as a way to avoid direct competition and defray the cost of transporting teams. I see no reason to embrace this view, however. Given the well-known animosity between Hieron and Theron, it seems more likely that each of the tyrants would relish the opportunity to best the other in competition. Moreover, the alleged cost-cutting measure of the proposed agreement assumes the tyrants had no holdings on the mainland. Perhaps more problematically, it denies the tyrants the political benefits of *megaloprepeia*, for the function of which in tyrannies, see Connor 1987. Kurke 1991, 45-56 offers an exploration of the themes in Pindar.

[457] A view originating with Boeckh, see his commentary ad loc.

[458] Lefkowitz 1991.

[459] Burton 1962, 112-3. Emphasis added.

[460] Drachmann 1903, 385. Two of the three scholiasts prefer the latter to the former.

[461] Farnell 1930 [1964], ad loc.

A closer look at the poem's opening is warranted:

> ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων
> μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος,
> εὐάρματος Ἱέρων ἐν ᾇ κρατέων
> τηλαυγέσιν ἀνέδησεν Ὀρτυγίαν στεφάνοις,

> I have come to you from shining Thebes bearing this song and its news of the four-horse chariot that shakes the earth, in which Hieron, possessor of fine chariots, prevailed and with far shining garlands crowned Ortygia.

The poem opens in typical epinician fashion. The victor, his city, and the event are mentioned, but the poet omits the venue. As Gordon Kirkwood has noticed: "*P*.2 differs from all other epinicians… in this poem alone no specific victory is ever mentioned. The poem is in praise of

---

[462] Lefkowitz 1976, 165.

[463] Oates 1963.

[464] Importantly, the composition of a poem for a minor victory is not in itself a reason to rule out the possibility. *N*.9, for Chromios' chariot victory in Sikyon and *N*.10 for Theaios' wrestling victory at the sanctuary of Hera attest that P. composed poems for local victories as well as the great \pan-Hellenic contests. Bacchylides, too, composed for songs for victories in minor contests if the attribution of the poem 14 to Cleoptolemus of Thessaly's victory in the Petraian games is correct.

[465] Lloyd-Jones 1973 [1990], 118.

Hieron's victorious chariot (4-5), and in line 10 Pindar says that "whenever" Hieron competes with the chariot he achieves victory. This sounds less like poetry for a specific victory than like poetry accommodated to the epinician form."[466] Indeed, after a brief expansion on the tyrant's close oversight of his team's training, the victory is never alluded to again. How are we to understand such neglect of an event as important as the four-horse chariot race?

It is valuable to consider epinicia existing on a continuum ranging from those exclusively interested in a victory to those which engage with it minimally. On the one extreme, a poem like *O*.12, for instance, is so intensely engaged with the victory that it has lead scholars since Thomas Geltzer to hypothesize that they were composed at the site of the victory to serve as a bulletin of the victor's success.[467] Looking to the opposite extreme, *P*.4, as we have seen, only mentions Arcesilaus' victory once over the course of 300 lines. Given that Arcesilaus was only known to have won a single Pythian chariot victory, we may safely agree with ancient scholars that the victory celebrated at length in *P*.5 is the same as the victory reference in *P*.4.66-7. The full elaboration of the victory in *P*.5 would make a second full-length ode on the same victory otiose. However, for a song to have an epinician celebration as its context of performance and not mention the occasion at all would be an odd choice indeed. This does not imply dependence on the epinician so much as contemporaneity with it.

The arrangement of the pairings *O*.2 and 3, *P*.4 and 5, and *P*.1 and 2 suggests a symbiotic relationship between unequivocally epinician poems and the generically problematic was felt by Alexandrian scholars, even if their disinterest in theoretically rigorous generic assemblage precluded a systematic exploration of them.[468] Seen not as epinicia designed to celebrate the victory, but instead as *paranicia* expressing other poetic concerns, the poems make better sense. The range of possible content is extensive. Indeed, it has long been noted that these poems in one way or another feature themes denied to epinicia by Bundy.[469] Yet, if their content is at odds with traditional interpretations of epinician goals, we may reasonably ask why Alexandrian scholars would place them among the epinicia at all.

---

[466] Kirkwood 1982, 141.

[467] Gelzer 1985.

As compositions which were datable to the victory with which they were paired, the odes I have termed paranicia had a greater utility for Hellenistic scholars using the Pindaric corpus for historical research.[470] This should not suggest that these were the only paranicia surviving to Alexandria. Others may have found their way into other books of Pindar's poetry for their resistance to dating. Indeed, Bacchylides frg. 20C offers a compelling case in favor of this interpretation:

Μήπω λιγυαχ[έα—]
βάρβιτον· μέλλ[ω π]ολ̣[υ—˘—]
ἄνθεμον Μουσᾶ[ν Ἱ]έρων[ι˘–] ξαν-
θαῖσιν ἵπποις
[ἱμ]ερόεν τελέσας [κα]ὶ
συμπόταις ἄνδρεσσι π[έμπειν
Αἴ]τναν ἐς ἐύκτιτον, εἰ κ[αὶ
πρ]όσθεν ὑμνήσας τὸν [——˘—
πο]σσὶ λαιψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς Φερ[ένικον ἐπ' Ἀ]λφ[ει]-
ῷ τε ν[ί]καν
ἀν[δ]ρ[ὶ χ]αριζόμενος

---

[468] Harvey 1955, Carey 2009.

[469] Bundy 1962, 35: "We forget this is an oral, public, epideictic literature *dedicated to the single purpose* of eulogizing men and communities; that these eulogies are concentrated upon athletic achievement; that the environment thus created is hostile to personal, religious, political, philosophical and historical references that might interest the poet but do nothing to enhance the glory of a given patron…" (emphasis added). While I would agree that eulogizing the community and victory are the chief concern of the genre, I fail to see in Bundy's work a convincing answer to why we should view it as its exclusive aim.

[470] I am grateful to Hayden Pelliccia for pointing this out to me. This seems an especially strong case for *O*.3 and *P*.4 which were the only chariot victories of the kings in their respective venues.

> Do not put the clear-sounding lyre to sleep just yet. Now that I have completed a new blossom of the melodious Muses—a lovely blossom—I intend to send it to Hieron, glorious in sandy-coated horses, and his drinking companions in well-built Aetna, if ever before I sang the praises of Pherenicus who won the victory with his swift feet both at Delphi and by the Alpheus…

As Cingano observes, the poem's interest in Pherenicus and Hieron's Pan-Hellenic victories looks strikingly epinician.[471] While he and other scholars[472] have attempted to place the composition in the year following Hieron's Pythian chariot victory, the plural reference to Hieron's yellow horses need not be taken as firm evidence for a date of 470. Pherenicus was himself described in similar terms in Bacchlides 5.37, and it is not unlikely that Hieron had other race-horses in his stable that fit the description.[473] The mention of Aetna, however, is helpful for setting a firm *terminus post quem* of 476. Within the range of roughly 476-470, there were numerous occasions at which the song could have paired with an epinician. So why did scholars include it among the encomia/skolia? The issues with dating we just mentioned may have been one reason to bar inclusion in the epinicia.[474] More importantly, the mention of Hieron's drinking companions in line 6 suggests an answer.

As Felix Budelmann has argued, the genres of epinicia and *skolia* shared significant overlap, yet the foregrounding in the symposium, seems to have been a generic prerequisite for inclusion in encomium/skolia.[475] In other words, the sympotic context the poem constructs in its sixth line supersedes the epinician material it contains—especially since no specific, datable victory is named. Yet, Budelmann has noticed that this song may have been part of a wider program of poetic commemoration to celebrate a victory.[476] The poem's opening injunction not to shelf the Μήπω λιγυαχ[έα—] βάρβιτον at least suggests that other songs may be been played before this, and, tantalizingly seems to answer the famous scene in *O*.1 (16-9):

---

[471] Cingano 1991, 32-3.

[472] Cingano 1991, 34: "molto probabilmente stata la solenne resta del 470/469 a.C. nel corso della quale fu eseguita la prima Pitica di Pindaro che consacrava, insieme alla vittoria di Ierone con la quadriga, la fondazione di Etna, l'ascesa al trono di Dinomene e i meriti politici e militari di Ierone." Maehler 1997, 334.

[473] Henderson 2011, 29, sees the passage as a reference to the line of stallions from which Pherenicus was bred.

[474] For the problems with Skolia as a genre generally, see Cingano 2003, and Libermann 2016.

[475] Budelmann 2012, 173-7.

ἀλλὰ Δω-
ρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου
λάμβαν' εἴ τί τοι Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου χάρις
νόον ὑπὸ γλυκυτάταις ἔθηκε φροντίσιν. 19

> Come, take the Dorian lyre from its, peg if the splendor of Pisa and Pherenikos has indeed enthralled your mind with sweetest considerations.

The precise relationship between Bacchylides 20C and other poems cannot be known. However, admitting that complex engagements between epinicia and non-epinicia at victory celebrations were more common than our text immediately admits offers important new views on both the surviving epinicia and problematic odes that accompany them. But how does this change our reading of *P*.2?

Arguably the most problematic passage in *P*.2 occurs in a transition to the poem's final triad:

τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν
μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται·
τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς θέλων
ἄθρησον χάριν ἑπτακτύπου 70
φόρμιγγος ἀντόμενος.

> This song is being sent like Phoenician cargo over the gray sea, but as for the Kastor song in Aeolic strains, may you gladly look upon it with favor—the glory of the seven-stringed lyre—as you greet it.

---

[476] Budelmann 2012, 176. For similar views on the range of propagandistic activity attending Pan-Hellenic victories, see Nicholson 2005, 10-13, and Thomas 2007.

Scholars have debated the referent of the deictic pronoun τόδε since antiquity. Looking over the scholia to the passage, we see that one group of ancient scholars proposed that the opposition between τόδε μέλος and τὸ Καστόρειον δ' references the division between the first 68 lines and concluding 20.[477] A second group contended that the fault-line runs between the entirety of *P*.2 and a second poem external to it.[478] A consideration of the term Καστόρειον is demanded. As Pindar uses it in the surviving corpus, a Καστόρειον is a song for an equestrian victory.[479] As Lloyd-Jones has seen: “Castor and Polyduces are commonly connected with horses and with chariots, so that it seems reasonable to suppose that a Castor-song was one in honour of a victory in a horse-race or chariot race.”[480] So the poet expresses his desire to compose a Kastoreion for his fellow Theban Herodotus in *Isthmian* 1 (15-6):

ἁνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω
ἢ Καστορείῳ˘ ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνῳ.

> I wish to include him in a hymn to Kastor or Iolaos, for they were the mightiest charioteers of the heroes.

Scholars arguing in favor of the first hypothesis have contended that the first 10 lines of the poem suffice to qualify it as a Kastor song. Yet, this interpretation has run against a second challenge; the meaning of the simile κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν. Traditional interpretations of the phrase have taken it to mean one section of the poem was commissioned, while the other was sent gratis.[481] On this view, however, the logical relationships seem reversed. The Kastor song—

---

[477] Drachmann 1910, 51.

[478] Drachmann 1910, 51.

[479] Slater 1969, Lloyd-Jones 1973[1990], 123.n.88.

[480] Lloyd-Jones 1973 [1990]:123.

[481] Originating with the scholiasts to the passage, Drachmann 1910, 51-3.

or epinician proper—should be the one commissioned while the poem sent gratis should refer to the concluding 20 lines. Scholiasts in favor of this view, attempted to resolve the issue by citing the term Kastoreion as the song to which the *Pyrriche* or *enoplios nomos*, a Spartan armored dance, was set and from which the genre *Hyporchema* arose.[482] While this definition may have been active in the 5th century, scholiasts fail to develop from where their information comes. The earliest scholar quoted in the passage was the 3rd century Lakonian antiquarian Sosibius.

The scholiasts' adoption of this definition may be to connect *P*.2 with fragment 105, a *hyporchema*. While nothing precludes the possibility that frg.105 might have been produced alongside *P*.2, Pindar's choice to begin with a chariot victory and drop it all together seems problematic if it were the only epinician song for this victory, whatever it was. Put another way, if it were so trivial a victory as to avoid foregrounding it, why compose for it at all? Conversely, if it were a major victory why not mention it? Something else may be going on.

If we wish to pair *P*.2 with another ode for a chariot victory, *P*.1 is our only choice as the sole surviving Pindaric poem celebrating one of Hieron's chariot victories. Hieron's victory, dated to 470, was, as Bacchylides 4 tells us, the third overall of his athletic career:

Ἔτι Συρακοσίαν φιλεῖ
    πόλιν ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ἀπόλλων,
ἀστύθεμίν θ' Ἱέ[ρω]να γεραίρει·
τρίτον γὰρ π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς
Πυ[θ]ιόνικος ἀ[είδε]ται
    ὠ[κυ]πόδων ἀρ[ετᾷ] σὺν ἵππων.

Golden-Haired Apollo still loves the Syracusan city and honors its righteous ruler, Hieron, since for the third time he is hymned by the navel of the high-ridged land as a Pythian victor, thanks to the excellence of his swift horses.

---

[482] Plutarch, too, seems to have embraced the idea at *Luc*.22. This may be dependent on the Hellenistic historian Sosibius, from whom Plutarch often worked, and since it is quoted in the *Life of Lycurgus*.

A twenty-line composition, Bacchylides 4 celebrates Hieron's victory by contextualizing it in his series of Pythian victories. He then concludes by taking stock of Hieron's two Olympic victories in the single-horse race. Unlike odes for aristocratic victors, the poet fails to mention any victories but Olympian and Pythian.[483] Yet, we may be certain that a team as celebrated and well-exercised as Hieron's must have won at other venues. Why not mention them? With this observation we may be pressing against the propagandistic limits of chariot races. Only the best were valuable propagandistic tools to the king. To explicitly celebrate, e.g. an Isthmian victory, would in effect call attention to the king's failure in that same year at Olympia or Delphi. While winning the Isthmian games for a private citizen like Herodotus of Thebes was an obviously momentous occasion, for tyrants like Hieron with virtually limitless money to invest in the training of their teams, winning only at Isthmia may have even been an embarrassment.

Bacchylides' catalog of Hieron's victories to 470 alerts us to another important point. Of the victories listed, only those of 470 and 476 are accounted for in the extant poetry from the epinician masters (Bacchylides 5 celebrating Hieron's Olympic chariot victory of 468, and *Pythian* 3, a non-epinican, rounds out the surviving poems for Hieron). Should we believe on the basis of our surviving texts that neither composed anything for Hieron's other Pythian victories, or, indeed, his second single-horse race victory at Olympia in 472? We are left with an uncomfortable but likely possibility: the poems which survived to Alexandria may not have been the complete corpus of epinicia for Hieron by Pindar and Bacchylides. As such, we should be aware of the possibility that the piece with which *P.*2 was paired may have perished long before it found its place in the Alexandrian recension of Pindar's epinicia. Yet, even if this were the case, the omission of the venue is deeply problematic. Especially when we can observe in *P.*4

---

[483] See Young 1968, 91-3 who reads these victor lists as functioning like a kind of superlative in the odes, and Boeke 2007, 137-8, in the context of *O.*13, who agrees with Young.

that the victory in Delphi is at least mentioned and the location is given ample attention in the myth.

Bacchylides' reticence on lesser victories, however, is valuable for considering another possibility. Scholars have observed important similarities between *P*.2 and *O*.1 for generations. Despite the parallel, however, none have ventured a serious effort to read the two poems against one another. There are good reasons. First, the two celebrate victories in different contests—the four-horse chariot race and horse and rider. Second, we know Hieron did not win an Olympic chariot race until 468: 8 years after the date of *O*.1. Third, we know Theron of Akragas won the four-horse chariot race in Olympia in 476 and that Pindar composed *O*.2 and 3 for that victory. Nevertheless, an unexplored possibility exists. Let us turn to the parallels.

As Kiitchiro Itsumi has noted of the metrical parallels, "The strophe [of P.2] has the most magnificent structure of all the non-D/e stanza-forms. The only comparable one is the strophe of *Olympian* 1. It is remarkable that P2s and O1s share two impressive but rare types of verse. Both stanza-forms include (i) a verse composed solely of a long sequence in single-short movement (P2s1/O1s8), and (ii) a verse/verses including a long sequence in double-short movement (P2s3, P2s4/O1s2). Moreover, (iii) a verse made up of multiple aeolic phrases (P2s2/O1s1) deserves special notice."[484] The metrical parallels are significant when we return to the disputed passage from *P*.2:

τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν
μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται·
τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς θέλων
ἄθρησον χάριν ἑπτακτύπου
φόρμιγγος ἀντόμενος.

> This song is being sent like Phoenician cargo over the gray sea, but as for the Kastor song in Aeolic strains, may you gladly look upon it with favor—the glory of the seven-stringed lyre—as you greet it.

---

[484] Itsumi 2008, 209-10.

The shared Aeolic meter of *P*.2 and *O*.1 is significant if we see the division as that between *P*.2 (τόδε μέλος) and *O*.1 τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς. On this reading, should we then expect that *P*.2 was the commissioned piece and *O*.1 the poem sent gratis? From our observations on the irregularity of *P*.2’s relationship to the victory it foregrounds, this seems unlikely. Another reading of the passage suggests itself.

The scholarly conviction since antiquity in the mercantile nature of the passage has choked out other potentially fruitful interpretations. Before committing to the commercial reading, it is imperative that we ask what Pindar means by the phrase Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν and what Hieron or those in attendance would have understood it to mean.

To be sure, the Phoenicians were celebrated traders in the ancient Mediterranean. Herodotus was especially interested in the role the Levantine sailor played in the development of Greek history. He even begins his *Histories* with a scene of Phoenician merchants at work (1.1.6):

> Persian authorities of the past claim that the Phoenicians were responsible for the dispute. This is because, after they had come to and settled the land which they still inhabit… they at once undertook long sea voyages and brought back cargo from Egypt, Assyria, and elsewhere, but more to the point they came to Argos… when the Phoenicians came to Argos they set out their wares.”

Herodotus’ passage illustrates an important aspect of Phoenician wares. They were not, strictly speaking, Syrian or Levantine, but a rough assemblage of items procured from all over the eastern Mediterranean, and set out pell-mell. A second passage from the historian confirms these details (4.191):

> “The Carthaginians unload their wares and arrange them on the beach; then they re-board their boats and light a smoky fire. When the native inhabitants see the smoke, they come to the shore and, after setting out gold in exchange for the goods, they withdraw. The Carthaginians disembark and examine what the natives left. If the gold appears to them a worthy price for their wares, they take it with them and depart—if not they get back on their boats and sit to wait while

the natives approach again and set out more gold, until they satisfy the Carthaginians. Neither side wrongs the other, for the Carthaginians do not take the gold until it equals the value of their goods, nor do the natives touch the goods until the Carthaginians have taken the gold away."

Although the passage is primarily interested in the good-faith negotiation between the Carthaginians and a nomadic Libyan tribe, its inclusion of an arrangement of an array of international goods on the beach is nearly identical to the opening scene of the *Histories*. This aspect of Phoenician trade has largely been confirmed by the cargo of the Uluburun shipwreck. The 14th century BC ship, discovered in the 1980s, boasted a staggering geographic range of items and an equally impressive breadth of material quality. While the wreck predates the *Histories* by several centuries, it is very likely that traders like those navigating the Mediterranean at the time the ship went down and later influenced the Greek popular understanding of who the Phoenicians were and what they brought with them when they traded.

With this reading in place, let us re-examine the passage from *P*.2

> τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν
> μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται·
> τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς θέλων
> ἄθρησον χάριν ἑπτακτύπου
> φόρμιγγος ἀντόμενος.

> This song is being sent like Phoenician cargo over the gray sea, but as for the Kastor song in Aeolic strains, may you gladly look upon it with favor—the glory of the seven-stringed lyre—as you greet it.

How does the modification of the phrase "Phoenician ware" change our interpretation of it? Reading the contrast in the μέν and δέ clauses not as economically motivated, but as highlighting the contrasts between the structurally freer *P*.2 and the focused epinician *O*.1 makes better sense of the passage. On this view, the μέν clause acts as a concession. It acknowledges the possibility of an unfavorable reception of the poem's divergent structures and effectively prefaces the concluding section's disjointed string of gnomic admonishments. Moreover, the δέ clause exhorts the king not to reject the second poem should something in the first meet his disapproval. If as I have argued, the paranician offered the poet an opportunity to engage in a freer discourse with the tyrant, the comment is not a purely rhetorical flourish. Given the strikingly negative myth and forcefully direct gnomic content of *P.*2, there may very well have been content in it to which the king took exception. The deprecation of the poem as “Phoenician cargo” 68-9 weakens this blow. But if this reading is to be preserved, we may ask on what grounds *O.*1 might be thought of as the Καστόρειον of line 69.

The metrical correspondences Itsumi detected are our first indication. Both *P.*2 and *O.*1 are composed in the Aeolic meter referenced in line 69. To this, scholiasts added fragment 105. While too little of the poem survives for us to say for certain that the poem was Aeolic, the initial Ionic rhythms at least point to the possibility. Greater parallels between *O.*1 and *P.*2 exist. Pindar’s language at the conclusion of *O.*1 seems to recall that of *P.*2 69:

μὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
Χρή.

My duty is to crown that man with an equestrian tune in Aeloic song.

The essential elements of the passages are shared: τὸ Καστόρειον δ' ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς. The *hippios nomos* is a fitting description of the *kastoreion,* by its definition from *I.*1.[485] Next, the phrase Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ expresses the same idea as Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς in *P.*2. From their shared descriptions of the song, we may now turn to their conclusions.

---

[485] Köhnken 1974, 204, and Gerber 1982,153 see the term as intimately connected to the myth and contest in which Hieron was successful, not a technical musical term, *contra* Wilamowitz 1922, 234: “Aufklären kann ich den Namen nicht, aber daß er technisch musikalisch ist, scheint mir unzweifelhaft.”

P.2 ends with a wish to continue intercourse with noble men (93-6):

φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπαυχένιον λαβόντα ζυγόν
ἀρήγει· ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι
λακτιζέμεν τελέθει
ὀλισθηρὸς οἶμος· ἁδόν-
τα δ' εἴη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὁμιλεῖν.

> It helps to bear lightly the yoke one has taken upon one's neck, and kicking against the goad, you know, becomes a slippery path. May it be mine to find favor with the good and keep their company.

Pindar concludes his long *parainesis,* which began immediately after the transition of *P*.2.68-71, with a warning against resisting fate. From this warning he ends on the aspirational note of a wish to continue associating with noblemen like Hieron. *O*.1 ends with essentially the same wish (115-6):

εἴη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν,
ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις
ὁμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ' Ἕλ-
λανας ἐόντα παντᾷ.

> May you walk on high for the time that is yours, and may I keep company with victors whenever they win—foremost in wisdom among Hellenes everywhere.

The passages share the same optative prayer construction[486]: ἁδόντα δ' εἴη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὁμιλεῖν (*P*.2.96), εἴη ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν (*O*.1.116). The two passages also share the same verb, ὁμιλέω, which, though it occurs elsewhere in the Pindaric corpus,[487] is used only here to refer to the poet's relationship with the subject of his poetry.[488] The conclusion of *O*.1

---

[486] For the breakdown of prayers, see Hamilton 1974, 17-20, who observes that the optative is usually used of unstated divinities and the imperative for specific gods. See Bundy 1962, 76-80 for a discussion of the use and formulae for concluding prayers.

[487] *O*.12.19; *P*.6.53; *P*.7.9; *I*.2.37; *N*.1.61; *N*.10.73; *I*.3.6; frg.43.3. From these other uses, the close intimacy the verb implies in the two passages above is shared with the use at *P*.6.53, which is also found at the conclusion of the ode but deployed in a scene where the poet depicts the victor associating with his friends at a symposium (cf. *P*.4.295).

[488] Although repetitions of short phrases are common in the Pindaric corpus, the re-use of nearly a complete sentence is comparably rarer. The authorship of *O*.5 has been debated, making its parallels to *O*.4 problematic, but if

adds an important feature to the poet's wish for himself. Not only does he hope to maintain his association with victors (νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν), but the parenthetic expansion closing out the ode (πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ' Ἕλλανας ἐόντα παντᾶ) highlights the poet's value to the king[489]—his wisdom is famous among all the Greeks. Given the common Pindaric association of wisdom with the craft of poetry, it is impossible to disentangle the two meanings in this passage.[490] Yet, if the two poems were composed as part of a larger victory celebration, the parainetic content of *P*.2 would provide ample motivation for the poet's choice to highlight his fame for wisdom in the conclusion.

As Adolph Köhnken has seen, the myth of *O*.1 is replete with mythological innovation, but none is greater than Pindar's choice to make Poseidon a major player in Pelops' myth.[491] Köhnken explains the feature through its relation to the single-horse victory of Hieron's which the poem celebrates: "The girl, whose name 'Hippodameia' (line 70: tamer of horses) is significant for Pindar's poem, could only be won by her suitor's beating her father Oinomaos in a horse-racing contest. As a divine helper in a contest such as this Poseidon suggests himself before others, who is normally called upon as patron of horsemanship and horse-racing, and who is worshipped as Poseidon Hippios. For this reason, it seems, Pindar has introduced Poseidon

---

authentic, *O*.5.16 and *O*.4.4 offer a parallel. For the case against Pindaric authorship of *O*.5 involving the parallel sentences, see Gildersleeve 1892, 166-8. The positive case and a list of parallel phrased collected from indisputably Pindaric odes are found at Fennel 1893, 53-4.

[489] Gerber 1982, 177 observes: "a statement of fact, not part of the prayer." While Gerber takes the self-praise strictly as a way of praising the victor again, "the purpose of the statement is not so much to sing his own praises as to repeat the thought of 112—to assure Hieron that his poetic skill is equal to the task of praising those who have been victorious in games," in the context of poetic autonomy we have developed, it is imperative to note that the statement also asserts the poet's power. He, too, is famous among the Greeks—to disregard or alienate him would not go unnoticed in the wider-Greek world and be a critical mistake given his reputation for wisdom.

[490] Slater 1968, 468.

[491] Köhnken 1974.

into his narrative and on the precedent of Ganymede has made Poseidon lover of Pelops.”[492] No doubt Köhnken is right. Yet, the extensive reworking of the myth to include Poseidon seems excessive if Pindar’s sole motivation was to include a scene of Pelops praying to Poseidon for a victory—he might have easily done that without highlighting the earlier relationship to god. Moreover, the choice to develop a myth involving a chariot race seems odd when we consider that if—as seems likely—Hieron competed in the four-horse chariot race at the Olympics of 476, he lost to Theron of Akragas. Köhnken suggests the poem’s closing wish for a future Olympic 4-horse chariot victory motivates the final section of the myth.[493] But is this all that is to be seen in the last third of the myth? An unnoticed innovation in the section is instructive.

In his prayer to Poseidon, Pelops describes the challenge he faces (71-78):

ἐγγὺς δ' ἐλθὼν πολιᾶς ἁλὸς οἶος ἐν ὄρφνᾳ
ἄπυεν βαρύκτυπον
Εὐτρίαιναν· ὁ δ' αὐτῷ
πὰρ ποδὶ σχεδὸν φάνη.
τῷ μὲν εἶπε· ‘Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας
ἄγ' εἴ τι, Ποσείδαον, ἐς χάριν
τέλλεται, πέδασον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον,
ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἁρμάτων
ἐς Ἆλιν, κράτει δὲ πέλασον.

> He approached the grey sea alone at night and called upon the deep-thundering Lord of the Fine Trident, who appeared right by his feet. He said to him, “If the loving gifts of Cypris count at all for gratitude, Poseidon, come! Hold back the bronze spear of Oenomaus and speed me in the swiftest of chariots to Elis and bring me to victorious power.

In Pindar’s representation, the race begins at an undefined place and concludes at Oinomaos’ home of Elis. Where is Pelops when he issues the prayer? The better attested version of the race suggests a possibility. Diodorus Siculus records the most familiar and, arguably, logical version of the myth (4.73.3-4):

---

[492] Köhnken 1974, 203.

[493] Köhnken 1974, 204.

> The contest he (Oinomaos) set was a chariot-race from Pisa to the altar of Poseidon on the isthmus of Corinth, and the starting of the horses he arranged as follows: Oenomaos was to be sacrificing a ram to Zeus, when the suitors should set out, driving a chariot drawn by four horses; then, when the sacrifice had been completed, Oenomaos was to begin the race and make after the suitor, have a spear and Myrtilus as driver, and if he should succeed in overtaking the chariot which he was pursuing he was to smite the suitor with a spear and slay him.

The scholia to Apollonius Rhodius, quoting the 6th century Athenian mythographer Pherecydes agree on the details Diodorus provides[494]—the chariot race ran from Elis to the altar of Poseidon at the Isthmus. Since Oinomaos was the king of Pisa, this makes sense. Moreover, surviving images of the race provide a valuable detail in favor of this trajectory. As Timothy Ganz has observed, the majority of archaic representations of the myth depict Hippodameia as riding in the chariot with the suitor. As such, the myth may represent: "a kind of mock bridal-rape, with the suitor taking the prospective bride in his chariot as if to abduct her, and the father setting out in pursuit."[495] In this scenario, Elis is the most logical for the contest to have begun, and its conclusion at the Isthmus suggests the territory over which Pelops will reign and which will eventually be named for him. So where does Pindar imagine the race began?

Given the few details the passage offers, the Isthmus of Corinth is our best option. Pindar tells us that Pelops approached the sea alone at night (72-4): ἐγγὺς δ' ἐλθὼν πολιᾶς ἁλὸς οἶος ἐν ὄρφνᾳ ἄπυεν βαρύκτυπον Εὐτρίαιναν. From this description, we are only able to rule out locations at the interior of the Peloponnese: the origin must have been near the sea. Though indeed, the Greek seaboard had many shrines to Poseidon, Poseidon’s Isthmian shrine occupied an especially prominent position in the archaic and classical periods as the most celebrated sanctuary to the sea god. Moreover, the traditional endpoint of the race—the altar of Poseidon at Isthmia—supports the option. It is impossible to say for certain where Pelops issues his prayer, but seeing the passage as suggesting the Isthmus simply reverses the direction of the race.[496] But what may have motivated the poet’s choice to invert the mythic track?

---

[494] Phere.frg.37.

[495] Gantz 1995, 542.

As we have noticed, *P.*2 opens with a chariot victory that is never named:

Μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, βαθυπολέμου
τέμενος Ἄρεος, ἀνδρῶν ἵππων τε σιδαροχαρ-
        μᾶν δαιμόνιαι τροφοί,
ὔμμιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων
μέλος ἔρχομαι ἀγγελίαν τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος,
εὐάρματος Ἱέρων ἐν ᾇ κρατέων
τηλαυγέσιν ἀνέδησεν Ὀρτυγίαν στεφάνοις,
ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος, ἇς οὐκ ἄτερ
κείνας ἀγαναῖσιν ἐν χερσὶ ποικιλα-
        νίους ἐδάμασσε πώλους.
ἐπὶ γὰρ ἰοχέαιρα παρθένος χερὶ διδύμᾳ
ὅ τ' ἐναγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς αἰγλάεντα τίθησι κός-
        μον, ξεστὸν ὅταν δίφρον
ἔν θ' ἅρματα πεισιχάλινα καταζευγνύῃ
σθένος ἵππιον, ὀρσοτρίαιναν εὐρυβίαν καλέων θεόν.
ἄλλοις δέ τις ἐτέλεσσεν ἄλλος ἀνήρ
εὐαχέα βασιλεῦσιν ὕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς.

Great city of Syracuse, sanctuary of Ares mighty in war, divine nourisher of men and horses delighting in steel, to you I come from shining Thebes bearing this song and its news of the four horse-chariot that shakes the earth, in which Hieron, possessor of fine chariots, prevailed and with far shining garlands crowned Ortygia, abode of the river goddess Artemis, with whose help he mastered in this gentle hands those fillies with their embroidered reins, because with both hands the virgin archeress and Hermes, lord of the games, places on them the shining harness, whenever he yokes the strong horses to the polished car and to the chariot that controls the bit, and calls upon the wide-ruling god who wields the trident.

---

[496] As Gantz 1995, 541-3 shows, the race was always imagined running across the Peloponnese, but other locations are mentioned as the death place of Myrtilus. As Oinomaos’ charioteer, it would be puzzling if he died outside of the Peloponnese during the race, but the fragments we have offer too little information to know if he was killed during or after the race. Since the only location outside of the Peloponnese (Euboea) is in a fragment of Euripides, the Attic tragedians may have modified the course to favor Attic topography.

The impressive list of deities aiding the development of Hieron's horsemanship—culminating in the recent chariot victory—underscores the divine favor the Syracusan king enjoyed. It is a remarkably intimate portrait of direct divine intercession on behalf of the victor. Pindar bolsters his claim through a mythic parallel (13-20):

ἄλλοις δέ τις ἐτέλεσσεν ἄλλος ἀνήρ
εὐαχέα βασιλεῦσιν ὕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς.
κελαδέοντι μὲν ἀμφὶ Κινύραν πολλάκις 15
φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα προ-
        φρόνως ἐφίλησ' Ἀπόλλων,
ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας· ἄγει δὲ χάρις
        φίλων ποί τινος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζομένα·
σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων
Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει,
        πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων
διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές. 20

> Various men pay the tribute of a resounding hymn to various kings as recompense for their excellence. The voices of the Cyprians often celebrate Kinyras, whom Golden-haired Apollo heartily befriended, the priestly favorite of Aphrodite—for reverent gratitude goes forth in one way or another in return for someone's friendly deeds. But you, son of Deinomenes, the maiden of Western Lokroi invokes in front of her house, after the desperate toils of war she has a look of security in her eyes thanks to your power.

Though a mostly obscure mythological figure for us,[497] Kinyras offers an important comparandum for Hieron. Pindar tells us the Cyprian king enjoyed the favor of Apollo as the result of his good conduct—(τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα προφφρόνως ἐφίλησ' Ἀπόλλων, ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας· ἄγει δὲ χάρις φίλων ποί τινος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζομένα)—and never lost it.[498] He also enjoyed a close relationship with Aphrodite—a goddess native to his home. In this way, as Gildersleeve noted, Kinyras mirrors the characterization of Hieron Pindar developed in his opening lines.[499] Hieron's relationship to Artemis is likely explained by her sanctuary in Syracusan Ortygia—like Aphrodite with Kinyras, Artemis represents the dominant goddess in Hieron's home. Similarly, Hermes, like Apollo, serves as a god whose favor Hieron has acquired through good conduct. In his guise as Master of Games, Hermes is a significant divinity for Hieron's athletic aspirations. Yet, from the standpoint of *P*.2 it is too early to tell if Hieron will successfully maintain the privileged relationship he enjoys with his two divine champions. The myth of Ixion warns against abusing divine favor (21-5):

---

[497] The paltry traces of his myth are collected at Gantz 1995, 730.

[498] Kinyras is also invoked at *N.*8.16-8 as an example of a hero who enjoyed happiness and prosperity which was granted by the gods.

θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς
λέγειν ἐν πτερόεντι τροχῷ
παντᾷ κυλινδόμενον·
τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς
        ἀμοιβαῖς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι.
ἔμαθε δὲ σαφές.

> They say that by the gods' commands Ixion speaks these words to mortals as he turns in every direction on his winged wheel: go and repay your benefactor with deeds of gentle recompense.

As Pindar narrates Ixion's story, his crime of ingratitude and betrayal of his divine host and benefactor is made clear in his sexual aggression toward Hera. Yet, the poet does not conclude the myth with Ixion's punishment; instead he relates the genealogy of the mythic villain's line. Ixion's son, Kentauros, is equally shunned by human and divine communities and driven to mate with a horse. From this coupling, Pindar tells us, the race of centaurs sprung. The conclusion is suggestive. Given the sexual violence of the race's progenitor, the end may suggest another myth: the attempted rape of the Lapith women by the centaurs.[500] On this reading, the inherited flaws and missteps of Ixion continue and are reperformed by his monstrous progeny.[501] Ixion's mismanagement of his divine patronage is mirrored and inverted in *O*.1

---

[499] Gildersleeve 1892, 253-4.

[500] This may be significant from an art historical perspective. If the centauromachy is implied in *P*.2, the myths of *P*.2 and *O*.1 parallel the East (Pelops) and West (Lapiths and Centaurs) pediment sculptures of temple of Zeus at Olympia. Though the construction dates of the temple are usually placed in the 470-60 (See Barringer 2005 for dates and myths) the designated myths may have circulated before or during the construction.

Pindar's innovations in Tantalus' transgressions are significant. Rejecting the apparently traditional view that Tantalus offered Zeus a Lykaion banquet, Pindar roots his mistake in the symposium (54-63):

εἰ δὲ δή τιν' ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποί
ἐτίμασαν, ἦν Τάνταλος οὗτος· ἀλ-
λὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι 55
μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρῳ δ' ἕλεν
ἄταν ὑπέροπ˙λον, ἅν τοι πατὴρ ὕπερ
κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον,
τὸν αἰεὶ μενοινῶν κεφαλᾶς βαλεῖν
εὐφροσύνας ἀλᾶται.
ἔχει δ' ἀ̄πάλαμον βίον τοῦτον ἐμπεδόμοχθον
μετὰ τριῶν τέταρτον πόνον, ἀθανάτους ὅτι κλέψαις
ἁλίκεσσι συμπόταις
νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε
δῶκεν, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον
θέν νιν.

> If in fact the wardens of Olympos honored any mortal man, Tantalos was that one. He, however, could not digest his great fortune, and because of his greed he won an overwhelming punishment in the form of a massive rock which the Father suspended above him; in his constant eagerness to cast it away from his head he is banished from cheer. He has this helpless existence of constant weariness, the fourth toil along with three others, because he stole from the deathless gods the nectar and ambrosia with which they made him immortal and gave it to his drinking companions.

In Pindar's representation, divine patronage of Tantalus emboldened him to act above his station and steal ambrosia to distribute to his sympotic guests. Like Ixion, he failed to recognize his place in the divine hierarchy. Both myths illustrate the dangers of divine patronage. Without concomitant discipline, self-restraint, and self-awareness, the figure enjoying divine favor and success may easily fall from grace.

---

[501] Having Ixion impregnate the cloud to produce Kentauros and the race of centaurs mirrors Zeus' impregnation of Ixion's wife (Hom.*Il*.14.315-8) resulting in Peirithoös. The centaurs' actions at marriage of Peirithoös to Hippodameia develop on the themes of Pindar's Ixion myth in several other ways. The transgression of Ixion which provokes his eternal punishment is mirrored by Centaurs' provocation of the Lapiths—either bringing about their destruction (as in Theog.541-2) or, minimally, their expulsion from Thessaly by Peirithoös and the Lapiths (Hom.*Il*.2.239-42). The context of their transgressions—Peirithoös wedding—also parallels the warning Pindar's Ixion poses to repay benefactor with kindness, or, in other words, not to violate their hospitality. Pindar covered the myth elsewhere (frg.166) making the Centaur's switch from drinking milk to wine the source of their change in behavior at the wedding.

Pindar's Pelops seems to have learned from his father's mistakes. The hero prays to his immortal champion (73-85):

ἐγγὺς δ' ἐλθὼν πολιᾶς ἁλὸς οἶος ἐν ὄρφνᾳ
ἄπυεν βαρύκτυπον
Εὐτρίαιναν· ὁ δ' αὐτῷ
πὰρ ποδὶ σχεδὸν φάνη.
τῷ μὲν εἶπε· "Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας
ἄγ' εἴ τι, Ποσείδαον, ἐς χάριν
τέλλεται, πέδασον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον,
ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἁρμάτων
ἐς Ἆλιν, κράτει δὲ πέλασον.
ἐπεὶ τρεῖς τε καὶ δέκ' ἄνδρας ὀλέσαις
μναστῆρας ἀναβάλλεται γάμον
θυγατρός. ὁ μέγας δὲ κίν-
δυνος ἄναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει.
θανεῖν δ' οἷσιν ἀνάγκα, τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον
γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἕψοι μάταν,
ἁπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος; ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ
μὲν οὗτος ἄεθλος
ὑποκείσεται· τὺ δὲ πρᾶξιν φίλαν δίδοι."

> He approached the grey sea alone at night and called upon the deep-thundering Lord of the Fine Trident, who appeared right by his feet. He said to him, "If the loving gifts of Cypris count at all for gratitude, Poseidon, come! Hold back the bronze spear of Oenomaus and speed me in the swiftest of chariots to Elis and bring me to victorious power, for having killed thirteen suitors he puts off the marriage of his daughter. Great risk does not take hold of a cowardly man. But since men must die, why would anyone sit in darkness and coddle a nameless old age to no use, deprived of all noble deeds? No—that contest shall be mine to undertake—but you, grant that success I desire."

Unlike his father who took what he wanted for himself, Pelops expresses his desired aid in the form of a conditional prayer: (Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας ἄγ' εἴ τι, Ποσείδαον, ἐς χάριν τέλλεται, πέδασον ἔγχος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον, ἐμὲ δ' ἐπὶ ταχυτάτων πόρευσον ἁρμάτων ἐς Ἆλιν, κράτει δὲ πέλασον). In this way, Pelops demonstrates his subordination to the gods. Though Poseidon was his former lover, the hero is not entitled to anything from him. Pelops then proves the god with further justification for his prayer: Oinomaios has prevented his daughter’s marriage by murdering her perspective suitors. Nevertheless, Pelops expresses his intention to compete with or without the god’s assistance. He is not entirely powerless in his request.

Pelops’ prayer shames the god into helping. First, Pelops insinuates the possibility of Poseidon’s ingratitude for their sexual liaisons: (Φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας ἄγ' εἴ τι). Next, his prayer highlights that Oinomaios will continue to murder his daughter’s suitors unless Poseidon aids Pelops—the consequence of which is that without Poseidon’s aid Pelops will likely fall victim to the king’s spear. Such an outcome would surely reflect badly on the god, especially since the contest in which Pelops requests his assistance was an area over which Poseidon had special skill. The god grants the wish and the hero wins the contest.

Pindar makes the central themes of the myths of *P*.2 and *O*.1 conspicuous in his prayer concluding *O*.1 (100-114):

ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
χρή· πέποιθα δὲ ξένον
μή τιν' ἀμφότερα καλῶν τε ἴδριν ἅ-
μα καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον
τῶν γε νῦν κλυταῖσι δαιδαλωσέμεν ὕμνων πτυχαῖς.
θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μήδεται
ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, Ἱέρων,
μερίμναισιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι,
ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι
σὺν ἅρματι θοῷ κλεΐ-
ξειν ἐπίκουρον εὑρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων
παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον. ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν
Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει·
ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔ-
σχατον κορυφοῦται
βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

> My duty is crown that man with an equestrian tune in Aeolic song. For I am confident that there is no other host both more expert in noble pursuits and more lordly in power alive today to embellish in famous folds of hymns. A god acting as guardian makes this his concern: to devise

> means, Hieron, for your aspirations, and unless he should suddenly depart, I hope to celebrate an even sweeter success with a speeding chariot, having found a helpful path of words when coming to Kronos' sunny hill. And now for me the Muse tends the strongest weapons in defense: others are great in various ways, but the summit is crowned by kings—look no further.

Though the poet commonly ends his poems with a wish for further athletic success for the victor,[502] scholars have noticed the wish in *O*.1 is different. In particular, the choice of the comparative adjective ἔτι γλυκυτέραν implies a deficiency in the present victory.[503] Why would the poet's wish come at the diminution of the present victory—especially as it was an Olympic victory?

Reading *P*.2 and *O*.1 together offers an answer. As we have observed, *P*.2 opens with a chariot victory which is never described.[504] Instead the poet quickly moves to the positive exemplum of Kinyras, then on to Ixion. The peculiarity is mirrored in Pelops' speech. Pelops stands beside the ocean to issue his prayer to Poseidon at an undefined place—yet his desired point is emphatic: a chariot victory ending in Olympia. We also saw how the choice to end at Olympia is an inversion of the normal mythic race course. This is significant if we take the beginning of *P*.2 and the prayer for an Olympic chariot victory at the conclusion of *O*.1 as bookending a larger composition. On this reading, the victory at an undisclosed location should not be taken as a failure to achieve an Olympic victory in the same year—as the king likely felt it—but instead a necessary step on the way to Olympic glory.

---

[502] On prayers for future athletic victory at the conclusion, see Hubbard 1995.

[503] Significantly, the poet never offers a clear noun which the adjective modifies, effectively avoiding explicit diminishment of the present victory. See Gerber 1982, 164-5 on the problem and numerous proposed solutions.

[504] There is another possible explanation for the omission of the venue if read in dialog with *O*.1. As Cole 1987 has seen, Pindaric victory lists commonly employ a kind of sleight of hand to encourage hearers to misconstrue the number of victories the victor has achieved. A similar bait-and-switch is possible in the poet's foregrounding a victory at the beginning of *P*.2, moving to a myth, appearing to conclude, issuing admonishment, then highlighting the supremacy of the Olympian Games at the beginning of *O*.1.

As such, the myths and parainetic exhortation serve this larger goal. Hieron is made to enjoy the divine support of Hermes and Artemis at the beginning of *P*.2. The myth of Ixion in the same poem reminds us that such support will not remain unless the victor continues to cultivate his relationship with the divine and recognize that he is beneath divinity. Tantalos extends the theme. Indeed, the rejection of the “traditional myth” offers the poet the opportunity to craft a new one in which Tantalos’ transgression matches Ixion’s in kind but weakens the extent. The choice allows the poet to position Pelops as a victim of his father’s mistakes, yet—unlike the centaurs—retain independence from the flaws that brought him down. As such, Pelops offers Hieron a mythic exemplum to follow. He successfully navigated the path between kingship and divine favor that wrecked Ixion and his own father, Tantalos. He was patient, sought the right moment, and, when he saw it, he sought his divine champion’s aid. This is precisely what Pindar exhorts to do in his prayer for an Olympic chariot victory. A final look is warranted (106-114):

θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μήδεται
ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, Ἱέρων,
μερίμναισιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι,
ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι
σὺν ἅρματι θοῷ κλεΐ- 110
        ξειν ἐπίκουρον εὑρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων
παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον. ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν
Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει·
ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔ-
        σχατον κορυφοῦται
βασιλεῦσι. μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

A god acting as guardian makes this his concern: to devise means, Hieron, for your aspirations, and unless he should suddenly depart, I hope to celebrate an even sweeter success with a speeding chariot, having found a helpful path of words when coming to Kronos’ sunny hill. And now for me the Muse tends the strongest weapons in defense: others are great in various ways, but the summit is crowned by kings—look no further

Pindar encourages Hieron to recognize the gods’ plans for him: θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν τεαῖσι μήδεται ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, Ἱέρων, μερίμναισιν. Hieron’s divine ἐπίτροπος is attempting to bring about his success. However, if the king fails to properly manage the relationship—as in the case of Ixion or Tantalos—he may lose his immortal steward. Pindar’s prayer to celebrate victory brushes aside the negative possibility and imagines the poet completing the path of the chariot Pelops began: ἐπίκουρον εὑρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον. Pindar returns to warning the king: ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι· τὸ δ' ἔσχατον κορυφοῦται βασιλεῦσι. As the new “King of Aetna”, Hieron has reached the summit of human accomplishment. He finds himself in the precarious position of pressing the boundaries of mortality if he actively seeks out more: μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.

Taken as part of a unified project, the conscious choice to omit the location of the chariot victory suggests the incomplete nature of Hieron’s aspirations. The victory, whatever it was, was not an end to celebrate in its own right, but, as the necessary groundwork to Hieron’s desired Olympic chariot victory, was worth acknowledging as part of a larger goal. There were however, hazards on the course to Olympia. Great men like Hieron can and often do fall prey to their own ambitions. Pindar cautions the king to trust in the gods’ guidance and his own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, R. 1904. *Über die Echtheit der platonischen Brief*. Berlin: Wiedmann.

Adkins, A.W. 1985. *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adorjáni, Z. 2014. *Pindars Sechste Olympische Siegesode*. Leiden: Brill.

Agócs, P. 2013. "Review of Lattmann 2010." *JHS* 133: 166-7.

Agócs, P. 2012. "Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar's *Komoi*." 191-223 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. 2012. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ahl, F. 1984. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome." *AJP* 105.2: 174-208.

Albini, U. 1961. *L'Orazione De Reditu*. Florence: Felice le Monnier.

Allen, L. 2005. *The Persian Empire*. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Almeida, J. 2003. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems.* Leiden: Brill.

Aloni, A. and A. Iannucci. 2016. "Writing Solon." 155-173 in Switft, L. and C. Carey. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Anastase, Stéfos. 1975. *Apollon dans Pindare*. Athens: Dissertation.

Anhalt, E. 1993. *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics*. Lanway, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Asheri, D. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus' Histories: Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford Univerisity Press.

Athanassaki, L. 2011. "Song, Politics, and Cultural Memory: Pindar's Pythian 7 and the Alcmaeonid Temple of Apollo." 235-98 in Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie. Eds. *Archaic and Classical Choral Lyric: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

— 2014. "Pindarum Quisquis Studet Aemulari: Greek and Roman Civic Performance Contexts (Pindar's Fourth and Fifth Pythians and Horace's Odes 4.2)." 131-64 in Delignon, B, Le Meur, N, and Thévenaz, O. Eds. *La Poésie Lyricque dans la Cité Antique*. Lyons: Boccard.

— 2016. "The Symposion as Theme and Performance Context in Pindar's Epinicians." 85-112 in Cazzato.V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. Eds *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie. Eds. 2011. *Archaic and Classical Choral Lyric: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

Austin, C. and Olson, D. Eds. 2004. *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Avery, C. 1972. "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus," *AJP* 93.4: 529-46.

Bagordo, A and Zimmermann, B. Eds. 2000. *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wierentdeckung*. Munich: Zetemata.

Baron, T. 2012. *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barron, J. 1980. “Bacchylides, Theseus, and a Wolly Cloak.” *BICS* 27: 1-8.

Barrett, W.S. 2007. *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism: Collected Papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barringer, J. 2005. “The Temple of Zeus at Olympia, Heroes, and Athletes.” *Hesperia* 74: 211-41.

Bell, M. 1995. “The Motya Charioteer and Pindar’s *Isthmian* 2.” *MAAR* 40: 1-42.

Bennett, J. 1620. *Pindari: Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia, et Nemea*. London: Salmurii.

Berve, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*. 2 Vols. Munich: C.H.Beck.

Boas, G. 1948. “Fact and Legend in the Biography of Plato.” *The Philosophical Review* 57: 439-57.

Boeckh, A. 1811-21. *Pindari Opera. 2 Vols*. Leipzig.

Boedecker, D. and D. Sider. 2001. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boeke, H. 2007. *The Vaule of Victory in Pindar’s Ode*. Leiden: Brill.

Bond, G. 1963. *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borza, E. 1999. *Before Alexander: Constructing Early Macedonia*. Clarmont, Ca: Regina Books.

Bosher, K. 2012. “Hieron’s Aeschylus.” 97-111 in Bosher, K. ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bosher, K. 2012. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowden, H. 2005. *Athens and the Delphic Oracle*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bowie, E. 1990. “Miles Ludens? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy.” 221-229 in in Murray, O. Ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2009. “Wandering Poets, Archaic Style.” 105-136 in Hunter, R. and I. Rutherford. Eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

— 2012. “Epinicians and Patrons.” 83-92 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2016. Quo Usque Tandem…? How Long Were Sympotic Songs?” 28-41 in Cazzato.V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

— 2016. B. “Cultic Contexts for Elegiac Performance.” 15-32 in Switft, L. and C. Carey. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowra, C.M. 1934. “Timocreon’s *Skolion* on Themistocles.” *Hermes* 69.3: 350-2.

— 1937. “Pindar’s *Pythian* II.” *HSCP* 48:1-28.

— 1960. “Euripides’ Epinician for Alcibiades.” *Historia* 9.1: 68-79.

— 1961. *Greek Lyric Poetry*^{2}. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Braswell, B. 1988. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

—1992. *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*. Fribourg: Fribourg Univeristy Press.

—1998. *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

Bremmer, J. 2007. “The Myth of the Golden Fleece.” *The Journal of Near Eastern Religions* 6: 9-38.

Briant, P. 2001. *Cyrus to Alexander.* Ann Arbor: Einsbraums.

Brown, C. 2016. “Warding Off a Hailstorm of Blood.” 273-290 in Swift, L. and C. Carey. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Brunt, P. 1993. *Studies in Greek History and Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Budelmann, F. 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2012. “Epinician and the Symposium: A Comparison with the Enkomia.” 173-190 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bultrighini, U. 1999. *Maledetta democrazia': studi su Crizia*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Bundy, E. 1962 [1986]. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Burrow, J.A. 2008. *The Poetry of Praise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burton, R.W.B. 1962. *Pindar’s Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cairns, D. 2010. *Baccylides: Five Epinician Odes*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.

Cairns, F. 1971 [2007]. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.

Calame, C. 2012. “Metaphorical Travel and Ritual Performance in Epinician Poetry.” 303-320 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2013. “The Dithyramb, a Dionysiac Poetic Form: Genre Rules and Cultic Contexts.” 332-352 in Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson. Eds. Dithyramb in Context. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calder, W and J. Stern. 1970. *Pindaros und Bakchylides*. Darmstard: Wissenschaftliche Buchgestellschaft.

Campbell, D. 1967. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection*. New York: Macmillan.

Carey, C. 1980. “The Epilogue of Pindar’s Fourth *Pythian*.” *Maia* 30: 143-52.

— 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*. New York: Arno.

— 1989. “Prospographica Pindarica.” *CQ*^{2} 39:1-9.

— 1999. “Ethos and Pathos in Bacchylides.” 17-29 in Pfeijffer, I, and Slings, G. Eds. *100 Years of Bacchylides*.

— 2007. “Pindar, Place, and Performance.” 199-210 in Hornblower, S. & Catherine Morgan. Eds. *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, & Festivals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2009. “Genre, Occasion and Performance.” 21-38 in Budelmann, F. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2012. “The Victory Ode in the Theater.” Online.

— 2016. “Mapping Iambos: Mining the Minor Talents.” 122-39 in Switft, L. and C. Carey. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Carnes, J. 1995. “Why Should I Mention Aiakos? Myth and Politics in Pindar’s *Nemean* 8 [1].” *QUCC* 51.3: 7-48.

— 1996. “The Ends of the Earth: Farmers, Ephebes, and Wild Women in *Nemean* 4 and 5.” *Arethusa* 29.1: 15-53.

Cartledge, P. 2001. *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History*.² Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2001B. *Spartan Reflections*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Caskey, E. 1974. “Again-Plato's Seventh Letter.” *CP* 69. 3L 220-7.

Cassio, A. 2012. “Kypris, Kythereia and the Fifth Book of the *Iliad*” 413-26 in F. Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., Tsagalis, C. Eds. *Homeric Contexts*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.

Catani, E. and S. Marengo. 1998. *La Cirenaica in Età Antica*. Rome: Poligrafici Internationali.

Cazzato,V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. Eds. 2016. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Centanni, M. 1997. *Atene Assoluta: Crizia dalla Tragedia alla Storia*. Padua: Esedra.

Chamoux, F. 1953. *Cyrene sous la Monarchie des Battiades*. Paris: Boccard.

Champion, C. 2004. *Cultural Politcs in Polybius' Histories*. Berkley: University of California Press.

— 2010. “Timaios. *BNJ* 566.” *Brill's New Jacoby*. Online.

Christensen, P. 2007. *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cingano, E. 1991. “La Data e l'Occasione dell' Encomio Bacchildea per Ierone (Bacchyl. fr. 20 C. Sn.-M).” *QUCC*² 38.2: 31-4.

— 1991 B. “L'Epinicio 4 di Baccilide e la Data della Pitica 3 di Pindaro.” *QUCC*² 39.3: 97-104.

— 2003. “Entre Skolion et Enkomion: Reflexions sur le “genre” et la Performance de la Lyrique Chorale greque.” 17-46 in Jouanna, J, and Leclant, J. Eds. *Colloque: La Poésie Greque Antique*. Paris: Kerylos.

Cole, T. 1987. “1+1=3: Studies in Pindar’s Arithematic.” *AJP* 108.4: 553-68.

— 1992. *Pindar’s Feasts, Or the Music of Power*. Rome: Ateneo.

Connor, R. 1987. “Tribes, Festivals, and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Ancient Greece.” *JHS* 101: 40-50.

Craven, B. 1990. *Dionysius I: War-Lord of Syracuse*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Crotty, K. 1982. *Song and Action*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Csapo, E. 2003. “The Dolphins of Dionysius.” 69-98, in Csapo, E, and Miller, M. Eds. *Poetry, Theory, Praxis*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Culler, J. 1985. “Changes in the Study of the Lyric.” 38-54 in Hošek, C. and P. Parker. *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

— 2015. *Theory of the Lyric*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Currie, B. 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

— 2013. “Epinician Choregia: Funding a Pindaric Corpus.” 269-310 in Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie. eds. *Archaic and Classical Choral Lyric: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

Curtius, E.R. 1953 [1990]. *European Literature in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

D’Alessio, G. B. 2005. “Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry.” 217-38 in Hunter, R. ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

— 2016. “Bacchylides’ Banquet Songs.” 63-84 in Cazzato.V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Dalmeyda, G. 1930. *Andocide: Discours*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

D’Angour, A. 2011. *Greeks and the New*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daude, A. et al. 2013. *Scholies à Pindare. Vol. 1*. Besançon: University Press of French-Comté.

Davies, J. 2007. “The Origins of the Festivals, Especially Delphi and the Pythia.” 47-70 in Hornblower, S. & Catherine Morgan. eds. *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, & Festivals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, M. 1989. *The Greek Epic Cycle*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Davies, M, and P. Finglass. 2014. *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge and New York Cambridge University Press.

Defrades, J. 1962. “Le Banquet de Xenophanes.” *Revue des etudies greques* 75: 344-65.

De Mann, P. 1985. “Lyrical Voice in Contemporary Theory: Riffaterre and Jauss.” 55-72 in Hošek, C. and P. Parker. 1985. *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Denyer, N. 2008. *Plato: Protagoras*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Detienne, M. 1990. *Tracés de Fondation*. Paris: Peeters.

Diltz, M. 1971. *Heraclidis Lembi Excerpta Politiarum*. Duke: GRBS Monographs.

Dobrov, G. 1993. “The Tragic and Comic Tereus.” *AJP* 114: 2: 189-234.

Dodds, E. 1960 [1987]. *Euripides: Bacchae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Dougherty, C. and L. Kurke. 1998. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Dover, K. 1993. *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drachmann, A. 1903. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*: *Vol.I*. Leipzig: Teubner.

— 1910. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*: *Vol. II*. Leipzig: Teubner.

— 1927. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*: *Vol.III*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Duchemin, J. 1955. *Pindare: Poète et Prophète*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—1967. *Pythiques (III, IX, IV, V)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, A. 2012. "A Theseus Outside Athens: Dionysius I of Syracuse and Tragic Self-Presentation." 137-155 in Bosher, K. ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckermann, C. 2010. "The Komos of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration." *CQ* 60: 302-12.

Edmonds, L. 1990. *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Falkner, T. 1995. *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy*. Norman: University of Oaklahoma Press.

Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

— 2011. "The Ceians and Their Choral Lyric: Athenian, Epichoric and Pan-Hellenic Perspectives."

— 2017. *Pindar's Eyes: Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Fearn, D. ed. 2011. *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feeney, D. 2002. "*Una cum Scriptore Meo*." 172-87 in Woodman, T. and Feeney, D. Eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fehling, D. 1971 [1989]. *Herodotus and His 'Sources.'* Leeds: Francis Cairns.

— 1985. *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Studie.* Berlin: Lang.

Felson, N. 1999. "Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian* Four." *HSCP* 99: 1-31.

Fennell, A.M. 1893. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 1899 [2011]. *Pindar: Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finglass, P.J. 2007. *Pindar: Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finglass, P.J., C. Collard, and N.J Richardson. Eds. 2007. *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finglass, P.J. and A. Kelly. Eds. 2015. *Stesichorus in Context*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finkelberg, M. 1990. "A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse." *AJP* 111: 293-303.

Finley, J. 1955. *Pindar and Aeschylus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finley, M. 1968. *Aspects of Antiquity: Discovery and Controversies*. New York: Viking.

Fitzpatrick, D. 2001. "Sophocles' 'Tereus.'" *CQ* 51.1: 90-101.

Fogelmark, S. 1972. *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*. Lund: CWP Gleerup.

Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 2011. *Aristotle as Poet: The Song for Hermias and its Contexts*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

— 2013. "The Poetics of Dithyramb." 313-331 in Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson. eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fornara, C. 1971. "Evidence for the Date of Herodotus' Publication." *JHS* 91: 25-35.

— 1981. "Herodotus' Knowledge of the Archidamean War." *Hermes* 109.2: 149-56.

Forsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy*: *The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 2009. "The Use and Abuses of Tyranny." 231-46, in Balot, R. ed. *The Blackwell Companion to Greek and Roman Poltical Thought*. London and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fowler, R. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography: Vol.1. Text and Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fraccaroli, G. 1894. *Pindaro. Le Odi e i Frammenti.* Verona: Franchini.

Francis, D. 1990. *Image and Idea in Fifth-Century Greece. Art and Literature After the Persian Wars*. London: Rutledge.

Fraenkel, E. 1950. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon. 3 Vols*. Oxford: Oxford Unviersity Press.

Fränkel, H. 1962 [1973]. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. London: Blackwell.

Frost, F. 1980. *A Historical Commentary on Plutarch's Themistocles*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frye, N. 1964 [2000]. *The Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Führer, R. 1967. *Formproblem—Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to the Literary and Artistic Sources* (2 Vols.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Garland, R. 2001. *The Greek Way of Death*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

— 2014. *The Wandering Greeks*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gasperini, L. and S. Marengo. 2007. *Cirene e la Cirenaica Nell'Antichità*. Tivoli: Editioni Tored.

Gelzer, T. 1985. "Mousa authigenês: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien." *MH* 42: 95–120.

Gentili, B. 1985 [1990]. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

— 1995. *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*. Rome: Lorenzo Valla.

— 2013. *Pindaro: Le Olimpiche.* Lorenzo Valla.

Gerber, D. 1969. *A Bibliography of Pindar: 1513-1966*. London: Case Western Reserve.

— 1982. *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gerber, D. Ed. 1984. *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honor of Leonard Woodbury*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

— 1997. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden: Brill.

Gerson, L. 2000. “Plato Absconditus.” 201-10 in Press, G. Ed. *Who Speaks for Plato?* Lantham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Giannini, P. 1979. “Interpretazione della Pitica 4 di Pindaro.” *QUCC* 2: 35-62.

Gildersleeve, B. 1885. *Pindar: Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giuffrida, M. 2004. “I Filaidi e l’annessione di Salamina ad Atene.” 253-68 in Vanotti, G and Perassi. Eds. *In Limine. Ricerche su Marginalità e Periferia nel Mondo Antico.* Milan.

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet’s Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. Eds. 1999. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gomme, A. 1956. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. II: Books II-III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gould, J. 2001. *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange. Essays in Greek Literature and Culture*. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Gray, B. 2015. *Stasis and Stablity: Exile, the Polis, and Political Thought, c.404-146. B.C.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray, V. 2007. *Xenophon on Government*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

— 2011. *Xenophon’s Mirror of Princes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold. 2009. “Greek Lyric and Greek Literary History.” 95-113 in Budelmann, F. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, J. 2012. “Comic Vases in Southern Italy: Continuity and Innovation in the Development of a Figurative Language.” 289-342 in Bosher, K. ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, P. 2010. *Diodorus Siculus: The Persian Wars to the Fall of Athens*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Greengard, C. 1980. *The Structure of Pindar’s Epinician Odes*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Greenwalt, W. 1994. “The Production of Coinage from Archelaos to Perdikas III.” 105-34 in Worthington, I. ed. *Ventures into Greek History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grene, D. 1952. Trans. *Aeschylus Vol. II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Griffith, M. 1983. *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grimaldi, W. 1989. *Aristotle: Rhetoric II. A Commentary*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Grube, G. 1965. *The Greek and Roman Critics*. London: Methuen.

Guthrie, W. 1969 [1977]. *The Sophists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hackforth, R. 1913. *The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles.* Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Hall, J. 1998. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*. The Hauge.

— 1990 “The Pindaric Dithyramb.” *HSCP* 93: 211-22.

Harder, A. 1985. *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*. Leiden: Brill.

Harrison, T. 2000. *Divinity and History: Herodotus' Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haskins, C. 1989. "Kant and the Autonomy of Art." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47.1: 42-54.

— 1990. "Kant, Autonomy, and Art for Art's Sake." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 48.3: 235-7.

— 1998. "Autonomy: Historical Overview." In Kelly, M. ed. *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, A. 1955. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *CQ* 2.5: 157-75.

Harriott, R. 1969. *Poetry and Criticism Before Plato*. London: Routledge.

Heath, M. 1988. "Receiving the Komos: The Context of Epinician Performance." *AJP* 109.2: 180-95.

Henderson, W. 2011. "A Race-Horse Called Phernikos." *Akroterion* 56: 21-30.

Henrichs, A. 2003. "Hieroi Logoi" and "Hierai Bibloi": The (Un)Written Margins of the Sacred in Ancient Greece." *HSCP* 101: 107-66.

Henry, W.B. 2005. *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection*. Munich: K.G. Saur.

Herington, J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Hernandez, P. 2015. "Pindar's Other Sources: Catalogue and Advice Poetry." *Gaia* 18: 197-210.

Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposion in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hölkeskamp, E. 2009. "The Tyrants." in Raaflaub, K, and van Wees, H. Eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Archaic Greece*. London and New York: Wiley Blackwell.

Hordern, J. 1999. “The Cyclops of Philoxenus.” *CQ* 49.2: 445-55.

Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. I. Books I-III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

— 2009. “Greek Lyric and the Politics and Sociologies of Archaic and Classical Greek Communities.” 39-57 in Budelmann, F. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2013. *Herodotus: Histories. Book V*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univerisity Press.

Hornblower, S. & Catherine Morgan. 2007. *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, & Festivals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hošek, C. and P. Parker. 1985. *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

How, W. and Wells, J. 1912. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, T. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind*. Leiden: Brill.

2011. “The Dissemination of Pindar’s Non-Epinican Choral Lyric.” 347-364 in Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie. eds. *Archaic and Classical Choral Lyric: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

Hutchinson, G. 1985. Aeschylus: Seven Against Thebes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2001. Greek Lyric Poetry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hummel, P. 1993. *La Syntaxe de Pindare*. Paris: Peeters.

Hunter, R. 1989. *Apollonius: Argonautica Book III*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

— 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2005. “The Hesiodic Catalogue and Hellenistic Poetry.” 239-265 in Hunter, R. Ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunter, R. ed. 2005. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunter, R. and I. Rutherford. Eds. 2009. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hurst, A. 1985. *Pindare*. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, K. 1964. *The Oldest Irish Tradition: A Window on the Iron Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaeger, W. 1939 [1983]. *Paeidea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jebb, R.C. 1905. *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iannucci, A. 2002. *La Parola e L’Azione: I Frammmenti Dimposiali di Critiza*. Bologna: Nautilus.

Ieranò, G. 1987. “Observazioni sul Teseo di Bacchilide.” *Acme* 40: 87-103.

— 2013. “‘One Who is Fought Over by All the Tribes’: The Dithyrambic Poet and the City of Athens.” 368-386 in Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson. Eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iles-Johnston, S. 2008. *Ancient Greek Divination.* London and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Irigoin, J. 1952. *Histoire du Texte de Pindare*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Irwin, E. 2005. *Solon and Early Greek Poetry*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

— 2011. "*Lest the Things Done by Men Become Exitela*." 426-57 in Fearn, D. ed. *Aegina Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irwin, T. 2009. "The Inside Story of the Seventh Platonic Letter: A Sceptical Introduction." *Rhizai. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy and Science* 6.2: 127-160.

Jouanna, J. 2012. *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*. Leiden: Brill.

Jusdanis, G. 2005. "Three Cheers for Aesthetic Autonomy." *Cultural Critique* 61: 22-54.

Kallet, L. 2013. "Thucydides, Apollo, the Plague, and the War." *AJP* 134: 355-82.

Käppel, L. 1992. *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kelly, J. 1976. *A History of Argos*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kennel, N. 2009. *Spartans: A New History*. London and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kenyon, F. 1897. *The Poems of Bacchylides: From a Papyrus in the British Museum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kimmel-Clauzet, F. 2013. *Morts, Tombeaux, et Cultes des Poètes Grecs*. Bordeaux: Scripta Antiqua.

Kirkwood, G. 1969. "Eteocles Oiakostrophos." 9-25 in Dalzell, A. Ed. *Studies Presented to G.M.A. Grube*. Toronto: Phoenix Press.

— 1974. *Early Greek Monody*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

— 1982. *Sections from Pindar*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Köhnken, A. 1970. "Hieron und Deinomenes in Pindars Erstem Pythischen Gedicht." *Hermes* 98.1: 1-13.

— 1971. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

— 1974. “Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in *Olympian* 1.” *CQ* 24.2: 199-206.

Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performance of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson. 2013. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kowerski, L. 2005. *Simonides on the Persian Wars.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kremmydas, C, and K Tempest. 2013. *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Krumman, E. 2009. “Alcman, Stesichorus, and Ibycus.” 189-203 in Budelmann, F. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kurke, L. 1990. “The Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry.” *TAPA* 120: 85-107.

— 1991 [2013]. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Berkley: University of California Press.

— 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold: the Politics of Meaning in Ancient Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 2011. Aesopic Conversations. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lanata, G. 1963. *Poetica Pre-Platonica*. Rome: La Nuova Italia.

Lardinois, A. 1995. *Wisdom in Context: The Use of Gnomic Statements in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Diss. Princeton.

— 1997. “Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer’s *Iliad*.” *CP* 92: 213-34.

Latacz, J. 1966. *Zum Wortfeld "Freude" in der Sprache Homers*. Heidelberg: BKA.

— 1977. *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung, and Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Lattimore, R. 1939. "The Wise Adviser in Herodotus." *CP* 34.1: 24-35.

— 1948. "Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode." *The Classical Weekly* 42.2: 19-25.

Lattmann, C. 2010. *Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen. Metapher des Sports und Lob des Siegers in Pindars Epinikien.* Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

Lauriola, R. 2015. "Trojan Women." 44-99 in Lauriola, R. And Demetriou, K. Eds. 2015. *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Euripides*. Leiden: Brill.

Lefkowtiz, M. 1991. *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I".* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2012. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*^{2}. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Lesher, J. 1992. *Xenophanes of Colophon: Fragments*. Toronto: Pheonix.

Leven, P. 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liberman, G. 2016. "Some Thoughts on the Symposiastic Catena, Aisakos, and Skolia." 42-62 in Cazzato.V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Lisserague, F. 1990. "Around the Krater: An Aspect of Banquet Imagery." 185-195 in Murray, O. Od. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1990. *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Collected Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loeffler, A. 1993. "La Vaeur Argumentative de la Perspective énonviative dans Solon fr.1." *QUCC* 74: 23-36.

Lowe, N. 2007. “Epinician Eidography.” 167-176 in Hornblower, S. & Catherine Morgan. eds. *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, & Festivals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ludwig, P. 2002. *Eros and Polis: Desire and Community in Greek Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacDowell, D. 1971. *Aristophanes: Wasps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1995. *Aristophanes and Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackie, H. 2003. *Graceful Errors*. Ann Arbor: Univeristy of Michigan Press.

Maehler, H. 1982. *Die Lieder Des Bakchyides: Erster Tiel.* Leiden: Brill.

— 1997. *Die Lieder Des Bakchylides*: Zweiter Teil. Leiden: Brill.

— 2004. *Bacchylides: A Selection*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Malkin, I. 1994. *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, C. 2000. “Der Dichter und sein Auftraggeber.” 29-46 in Bagordo, A and Zimmermann, B. Eds. *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wierentdeckung*. Munich: Zetemata.

Mansfeld, J. 2004. “Democritus, Fragments 68B18 and B21 DK.” *Mnemosyne*^{4} 57: 484-8.

Marcovich, M. 1978. “Xenophanes on Drinking Parties and the Olympic Games.” *ICS* 3: 1-26.

Marinatos, N 1981. “Thucydides and Religion.” *BKP* 129: 47-55.

Martin, R. 1984. “Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes.” *TAPA* 114: 29-48.

— 1998. “The Seven Sages as Performers of Wisdom.” 108-130 in Doughtery and Kurke, Eds. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University.

— 2006. “Solon in No-Man’s Land.” 157-72 In Blok, J. and Lardinois, A. Eds. *Solon the Athenian*. Leiden: Brill.

— 2009. “Read on Arrival.” 80-104 in Hunter, R. and I. Rutherford. eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, T. 1985. *Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mastronarde, D. 2002. *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

McGlew, J. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell Universit Press.

McMullin, R. 2001. “Aspects of Medizing: Themistocles, Simonides, and Timocreon of Rhodes.” *CJ* 97.1: 55-67.

Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis. 1964 [2004]. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merkelbach, R. 1952. “Bettelgedichte.” *RMP* 95: 312-327.

— 1973. “Der Theseus des Bakchylides.” *ZPE* 12: 56-62.

Merkelbach, R. and M.L. West. Eds. 1967 [1999]. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mezger, F. 1880. *Pindars Siegeslieder*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Mitchell, M. 1966. “Cyrene and Persia.” *JHS* 86: 99-113.

Molyneux, J. 1992. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Wauconda, Ill: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Mommson, T. 1864. *Carmina Pindari*. Berlin: Weidemann.

Monoson, A. 2012. “Dionysius I and Sicilian Theatrical Traditions in Plato’s Republic: Representing Continuities Between Democracy and Tyranny.” 156-174 in Bosher, K. Ed.

The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Delphi and Olympia in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, K. 1993. "Pindar the professional and the rhetoric of the Komos." *CP* 87: 1–15.

— 2012. "A Prolegomenon to Perfroamnce in the West." 76-96 in Bosher, K. Ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2015. *Pindar and the Construction of the Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, K. ed. 2003. *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Morris, I. 1996. "The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy." 19-48 in Ober, J. and Hedricks, C. *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Morrison, A.D. 2007. *Performances & Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. London: BICS.

— 2012. "Peformance, re-performance, and Pindar's Audiences." 111-133 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2013. "Narrative and Epistolarity in the 'Platonic' Epistles." 107-131 in Hodkinson, O, Rosenmayer, P, and Bracke, E. Eds. *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden: Brill.

Morrow, G. 1962. *The Platonic Epistles. Indianapolis*: Bobbs-Merrill.

Most, G. 1985. *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*. Gottigen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

— 2012. "Poet and Public: Communiticative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides." 249-276 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mülke, C. 2002. *Solons Politische Elegien und Iamben*. Munich: K. G. Saur.

Murray, O. 1990. "Sympotic History." 3-13 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1990.B. "The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group." 135-148 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, O. 1990. Ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, P. 1981. "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece." *JHS* 101: 87-100.

— 1996. *Plato on Poetry*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Myres, J. 1952. *Herodotus: Father of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nagy, G. 1990.A. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

— 1990.B. "Ancient Greek Poetry, Prophecy, and the Concepts of Theory." 56-64 in Kugel, J. Ed. *The Beginning of a Literary Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nafissi, M. 1980. "A Proposito degli Aigheidai: Grandi ghen ed emporia nei rapport Sparta-Cirene." *Sez. Studi Classici* 18: 185-213.

— 1985. “Battiadi ed Aigheidai.” 375-86 in Barker, G and Lloyd, J. eds. *Cyrenaica in Antiquity*. London: BAR.

Nebel, G. 1961. *Pindar und Die Delphik*. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.

Negri, M. 2004. *Pindaro Ad Alessandria*. Brescia: Paideia.

Nesselrath, H. 2000. “Eupolis and the Periodization of Attic Comedy.” 233-46 in Harvey, F and Wilkins, J. Eds. *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. London: Duckworth.

Newman, J & F. Newman. 1984. *Pindar’s Art: Its Traditions and Its Aims*. Hildesheim and Munich: Weidmann.

Nicholson, N. 2000. "Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric." *CW* 93: 235-59.

— 2001. "Victory without Defeat? Carnival Laughter and its Appropriation in Pindar's Victory Odes." 79-98 in Barta, P and Miller, P. Eds. *Carnivalizing Difference: Bakhtin and the Other*. New York and London: Routledge.

— 2005. *Aristocracy and Atheletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2016. *The Poetics of Victory in the West*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicolai, R. 1992. “La Fondazione di Cirine e I Karneia cirinaici nell’Inno ad Apollo di Callimacho.” *Materiale e Discussioni* 28: 153-73.

Nisetich, F. 1989. *Pindar and Homer*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Nobili, C. 2016. “Choral Elegy: The Tyranny of the Handbook.” 33-35 in Switft, L. and Carey, C. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Norwood, G. 1945. *Pindar*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. 2010. *Solon the Athenian: The Poetic Fragments*. Leiden: Brill.

Nünlist, R. 1998. *Poetologishe Bilder Sprache in der frügriechischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart: Beiträge zum Altertumskunde.

Oats, J. 1963. “Pindar’s Second Pythian Ode.” *AJP* 84.4: 377-89.

Ober, J. and Strauss, B. 1990. “Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy.” 237-70 in Winkler, J, and Zeitlin, F. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos: Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Olson, D. 2002. *Aristophanes: Acharnians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Owen, A.S. 1939 [1963]. *Ion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Page, D. 1938 [1985]. *Euripides: Medea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus*: *An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—1962 [2005]. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parke, H, and Wormell, D. 1956A. *The Delphic Oracle. Vol. I. The History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1956B. *The Delphic Oracle. Vol. II. The Oracular Responses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patten, G. 2009. *Pindar’s Metaphors: A Study in Rhetoric and Meaning.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Patterson, L. 2010. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pavlou, M. 2012. “Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past.” 95- 112 in Marincola, J and Llewellyn-Jones, L and Maciver, C. Eds. *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Pearson, L. 1987. *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaios and His Predecessors*. Oxford: Oxford Univerisity Press.

Pelliccia, H. 1987. “Pindarus Homericus.” *HSCP*. 91. 39-63.

— 1995. *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar*. Gottigen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

— 2009. “Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides.” 240-262 in Budelmann, F. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pelling, C. 2006. “Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus’Lydian Logos.” *CA* 25.1: 141-77.

— 2006. B. “Speech and Narrative in the *Histories*.” 103-121 in Dewald, C and J Marincola. Eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pellizer, E. 1990. “Outlines of A Morphology of Sympotic Entertainment.” 177-184 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Petrovic, I. 2017. “Callimachus, Theocritus, and Ptolemaic Court Etiquette.” 143-164 in Erskin, A., L-Jones, L. Wallace, S. Eds. *The Hellenistic Court: Monarchic Power and Elite Society from Alexander to Cleopatra*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Whales.

Pfeijffer, I.L. 1999. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*. Leiden: Brill.

Pfeijffer, I.L., S. Slings. 1999. *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Philips, T. 2015. *Pindar’s Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1927 [1997]. *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pippin-Burnett, A. 1985. *The Art of Bacchylides*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Pres.

— 2005. *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford and New York.

Podlecki, A. 1966. "The Political Significance of the Athenian Tyrannicide-Cult." *Historia* 15: 129-41.

— 1975. *The Life of Themistocles*. Montreal: McGill University Press.

— 1979. "Simonides in Sicily." *La Prola del Passato* 34: 5-16.

— 1980. "Festivals and Flattery: The Early Greek Tyrants as Patrons of Poetry." *Athenaeum* 58: 371-95.

— 1984. *The Early Greek Poets and Their Times*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Poltera, O. 2008. *Simonides Lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente*. Fribourg: Schwabe.

Potamiti, A. 2015. "The Theme of Hospitality in Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode." *Greece and Rome*: 61.1: 1-11.

Powell, J. 2013. "The Embassy of the Three Philosophers." 219-48 in Kremmyda, C and Tempest, K. Eds. *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, T. 2010. *The Culture of Kitharôidia*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies.

— 2013. "Kyklops Kitharoidos: Dithyramb and Nomos in Play." 237-256 in Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson. eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pownall, F. 2016. "Philistos. *BNJ* 556." Brill's New Jacoby. Online.

Priestley, J. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenstic Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Privitera, G.A. 1982. *Pindaro: Le Istmiche*. Rome: Lorenzo Valla.

Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Pütz, B. 2007. *The Symposium and Komos in Aristophanes*. Exeter: Aris and Phillips.

Raaflaub, K. 2003. "Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth Century Athenian Democracy." 59- 94 in Morgan, K. Ed. *Popular Tyranny*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Race, W. 1987. "Pindaric Encomium and Isokrates' Evagoras." *TAPA* 117: 131-55.

— 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. Atlanta: Scholars' Press.

Radt. S.L. 1958. *Pindars Zweiter Und Sechster Paiain*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Rawles, R. 2018. *Simonides the Poet: Intertexuality and Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rawles, R. 2012. "Early Epinician: Ibycus and Simonides." 3-27 in Agócs, P, C. Carey, and R. Rawles. Eds. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reiter, G. 1962. *Die griechischen Bezeichnugen der Farben Weiss, Grau und Braun*. Innsbruck: Aenipontanae.

Richardson, N. 2012. *Three Homeric Hymns*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robbins, E. 2013. *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Greek Poetry*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Robinson, E. 2011. *Democracy Beyond Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, N. 1980. "Timocreon and Themistocles." *AJP* 101.1: 61-78.

Roman, L. 2014. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*. Oxford an New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosen, R. 2016. “Symposia and the Formation of Poetic Genre in Aristophanes’ Wasps.” 140-158 in Cazzato.V, D. Obbink, and E. Prodi. eds. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Rösler, W. 1980. *Dichter und Gruppe*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

— 1990. “Mnemosyne in the Symposion.” 230-237 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rotstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubenstein, L. 2013. “Spoken Words, Written Submission, and Diplomatic Conventions: The Importance and Impact of Oral Performance in Hellenistic Inter-polis Relations.” 165-99 in Kremmyda, C and Tempest, K. Eds. *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rusten, J. 1989. *A Commentary on Thucydides: Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge Unversity Press.

— 2006. “Who Invented Comedy: The Ancient Candidates for the Origin of Comedy and the Visual Evidence.” *AJP* 127.1: 33-66.

— 2012. *The Birth of Comedy: Texts, Documents, and Art from Athenian Comic Competitions 486-280*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

— 2013. "Δῆλος ἐκινήθη: An “Imaginary Earthquake” on Delos in Herodotus and Thucydides." *JHS*: 135-45.

Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar’s Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Sander, L. 1987. *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London: Croom Helm.

Sansone, D. 1985. "The Date of Herodotus' Publication." *ICS* 10.1: 1-9.

Schröder, O. 1922. *Pindars Pythien*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Scodel, R. 1983. "Timocreon's Encomium of Aristides." *CA* 2.1: 102-7.

— 2012. "Sophocles' Biography." 25-37 in Ormand, K. ed. *A Companion to Sophocles*. London and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

— 2016. "The Euripidean Biography." 27-41 in McClure, L. ed. *A Companion to Euripides*. London and New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Scott, M. 1984. "Charis from Hesiod to Pindar." *Acta Classica* 27: 1-13.

Scott, M. 2010. *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Poltics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Cambridge and New York: Cambrdge University Press.

— 2014. *Delphi: A History of the the Center of the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scullion, S. 2003. "Euripides in Macedon, or the Silence of the Frogs." *CQ*. 53:2. 389-400.

Schadewaldt, W. 1928. *Der Aufbau des pindarishen Epinikion*. Halle: SKGG.

Schmid, W, and Stählin, O. 1929. *Geschichte des griechischen Literatur*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Schubert, P. 2004. "La Seconde Entrevue de Pélias et Jason dans la 4e Pythique de Pindare: Essai d'Interprétation." *L'Antiquite Classique* 73: 15-24.

Sears, L. 2013. *Didaskalos: The Invention of the Teacher in Classical Athens*. Cornell University Dissertation.

Segal, C. 1986. *Pindar's Myth Making: The Fourth* Pythian *Ode*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Seibert, J. 1979. *Die Politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in Der Griechischen Geschichte.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Sevieri, R. 2004. “The Imperfect Hero: Xenophon’s Heiro and the “Self-Taming of the Tyrant.” 277-318 in Tupin, C. Ed. *Xenophon and His World.* Stuttgard: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Shapiro, H. 2012. “Attic Heroes and the Construction of the Athenian Past in the Fifth Century.” 150-62 in Marincola, J. Llewellyn-Jones, L. and MaciverC. Eds. *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Shapiro, S. 1996. “Herodotus and Solon.” *CA* 15.2: 348-64.

Sider, D. 2016. “Simonides’ Personal Elegies.” 140-54 in Switft, L. and C. Carey. Eds. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Sigelman, A. 2016. *Pindar’s Poetics of Immortality*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Slater, W. 1968. *A Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

— 1971. “Pindar’s House.” *GRBS* 12: 141-52.

— 1972. “Simonides’ House.” Phoenix 26: 232-40.

— 1976. “The Symposium at Sea.” *HSCP* 80: 161-70.

— 1979. “Pindar and Hypothekai.” 79-82 in Fossey, J and Schachter, A. Eds. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities.* Montreal: McGill University Press.

— 1979. B. “Pindar’s Myths: Two Pragmatic Explanations.” 63-70 in Bowersock, G., Burkert, W., and Putnam, C.Eds. *Arktouros. Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard Knox*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

— 1981. “Peace, the Symposium and the Poet.” *ICS* 6: 205-214.

— 1982. “Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle.” *ClAnt* 2: 117-32.

— 1989. “Pelops at Olympia*.” GRBS* 30: 485-501.

— 1990. “Sympotic Ethics in the Odyssey.” 213-20 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1991. *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

— 2000. “Gnomology and Criticism.” *GRBS* 41: 99-121.

Smyth, H.W. 1906 [1963]. *Greek Melic Poets*. New York: Biblo and Tannen.

Snell, B. 1953. *The Discovery of the Mind*. New York: Harper and Row.

Snell, B, and Maehler, B. 1987. *Pindarus. Par I: Epinicia*. Leipzig: Teubner.

— 1989. *Pindarus. Par II: Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Solmsen, F. 1937. “The Erinys in Aischylos’ Septem.” *TAPA*. 68. 197-211.

Sommmerstein, A. 2004. “Harassing the Satirist: the Alleged Attempts to Prosecute Aristophanes.” 145-175 in Sluiter, I and Rosen, R. Eds., *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* Leiden: Brill.

— 2014. “The Politics of Greek Comedy.” 291-305 in: Revermann, M. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sordi, M. 1980. “lo Ierone di Senofonte, Dionigi I e Filisto.” *Athenaeum* 58: 1-13.

Sotiriou, M. 1998. *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*. Gottigen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Steiner, D. 1986. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Stanford, W. 1952. “Pelias and His Palid Wits.” 42-46 in White, M. Ed. *Studies in Honor of Gilbert Norwood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stein, H. 1893. *Herodot*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Stewart, E. 2016. “Professionalism and the Poetic Persona in Archaic Greece.” *CJ*. 62: 200-223.

Strauss, L. 1948. *On Tyranny*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Strauss-Clay, J. 1999. “Pindar’s Sympotic Epinicia.” *QUCC* 62.2: 25-34.

Storey, I. 2003. *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stroheker, K. 1958. *Dionysios I: Gestalt und Geschichte Des Tyrannen von Syrakus.* Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Stracca, B. 2011. “Timocreone Contra Temistokle: I Canti Dell’Odio.” *QUCC* 97.1: 11-35.

Sultan, N. 1999. *Exile and the Poetics of Loss in Greek Tradition*. Lanway, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Switft, L. and C. Carey. 2016. *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Takakjy, L. 2017. “Xenophon the Literary Critic: The Poetics and Politics of Praise in *Hiero*.” *GRBS* 57: 49-73.

Taplin, O. 1993. *Comic Angels*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2007. *Pots and Plays: Interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angles: Getty.

— 2012. “How Was Athenian Tragedy Played in the Greek West?” 226-250 in Bosher, K. Ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teegarden, D. 2014. “Acting Like Harmodius and Aristogeiton: Tyrannicide in Ancient Greek Political Culture.” In Verhoeven, C. and Dietze, C. Eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Terrorism*. Online: Oxford University Press.

Thummer, E. 1968. *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte. 2 Vols.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Tigerstedt, E. 1970. "Furor Poeticus: Poetic Inspiration in Greek Literature Before Democritus. and Plato." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31.2: 163-78.

Todd, S. 1993. *The Shape of Athenian Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2000. *Lysias*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Trundle, L. 2004. *Greek Mercenaries: From the Late Archaic Period to Alexander*. London: Rutledge.

Tuplin, C. 2004. *Xenophon and His World*. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

van der Weiden, M. 1991.*The Dithyrambs of Pindar*. Amsterdam: J. C. Grieben.

van Groningen, B. 1960. *Pindare au Banquet.* Amsterdam: Sythoff-Leyde.

Verdenius, W.J. 1987. *Commentaries on Pindar: Vol. I.* Leiden: Brill.

— 1988. *Commentaries on Pindar: Vol. II.* Leiden: Brill.

Versnel, H. 1990. *Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*. Leiden: Brill.

Vickers, M. 2015. *Aristophanes and Alcibiades*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1981. *Le chasseur noir: Formes de pensée et formes de société dans le monde grec.* Paris: Maspero.

Von Eschen, P. 2004. *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Wecowski, M. 2014. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Wees, H. van. 1999. "Tyrtaeus' *Eunomia*: Nothing to do With the Great Rhetra." 1-41 in Hodkinson, S. and Powell, A. Eds. *Sparta: New Perspectives*. London: Duckworth.

West, M. 1966 [1997]. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

— 1978 [1996]. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 1990. "The Anacreontea." 272-288 in Murray, O. ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— 2005. "The *Odyssey* and *Argonautica*." *CQ* 55.1: 39-64.

White, M. 1952 [1980]. *Studies in Honor of Gilbert Norwood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wilamowitz, U. 1922 [1966]. *Pindaros.* Berlin: Weidmann.

Willcock, M. 1995. *Pindar: Victory Odes*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Willi, A. 2012. "Challeging Authority: Epicharmus in the West." 56-75 in Bosher, K. Ed. *The Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willink, C.W. 1986. *Euripides: Orestes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, C. 2013. *The Lyrics of Ibycus*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Young, D.1964. "Pindaric Criticism." *Minnesota Review* 4: 584-641.

— 1968. *Three Odes of Pindar*. Leiden: Brill.

Yatromanolakis, D. 2009. "Alceaus and Sappho." 204-226 in Budelmann, F. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yunis, H. 2003. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Zaccarini, M. 2015. “The Return of Theseus to Athens: A Case Study in Layered Tradition and Reception.” *Histos* 9: 174-98.

Zadorojyni, A. 2006. “Plutarch’s Themistocles and the Poets.” *AJP* 127.2: 261-292.

Zuntz, B. 1955. *The Poltical Plays of Euripides*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.