

# **Family, Community and Divinity in Pindar's Victory Odes**

Familie, gemeenschap en goddelijke macht in Pindarus' epinikia (zegezangen)

(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof.dr. G.J. van der Zwaan, ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties in het openbaar te verdedigen op dinsdag 13 november 2012 des middags te 4.15 uur

door

Robert Clear

geboren op 30 juli 1982 te Gravesend, United Kingdom

Promotoren: Prof. dr. J.H. Blok

Prof. dr. A.P.M.H. Lardinois

## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_ 5

INTRODUCTION: \_\_\_\_\_ 6

### SECTION ONE: IMAGINING GLORY

Panhellenic Perspectives: \_\_\_\_\_ 29

*Pyth.* 6.1–18 \_\_\_\_\_ 33

*Nem.* 7.30–52 \_\_\_\_\_ 43

Family, Duty and Expectation \_\_\_\_\_ 62

(case for the joint performance

of *Isth.* 2 and *Pyth.* 6)

An Elite Family at Aegina

*Nem.* 5: \_\_\_\_\_ 85

*Isth.* 6: \_\_\_\_\_ 112

*Isth.* 5: \_\_\_\_\_ 141

## SECTION TWO: IMAGINING THE DIVINE

Introduction: \_\_\_\_\_ 165

An Example of Communion: *Ol. 7*: \_\_\_\_\_ 175

Communion in the Akragantine odes: \_\_\_\_\_ 186

Communion in the Aeginetan Odes:

*Nem. 5*: \_\_\_\_\_ 202

*Isth. 6*: \_\_\_\_\_ 215

*Isth. 5*: \_\_\_\_\_ 238

CONCLUSION: \_\_\_\_\_ 252

SAMENVATTING (summary): \_\_\_\_\_ 256

BIBLIOGRAPHY: \_\_\_\_\_ 262

CURRICULUM VITAE \_\_\_\_\_ 272

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Many people have contributed to this thesis. Foremost amongst them I would like to thank my supervisors, Josine Blok and André Lardinois, for bringing their considerable experience and insight to bear at every stage. I would also like to thank Greg Nagy, Jo Heirman and Nikoletta Kanavou for their critical comments on various sections of the work, and the Fondation Hardt, where I carried out some of my early research. Special thanks, too, go to my family, in particular to my parents and to John Greenwood.

## INTRODUCTION

In the fifth century BC the elites of Akragas and Aegina were extraordinarily successful in the great athletic contests of ancient Greece. Their success, combined with a propensity for lavish expenditure, provided a steady stream of commissions for the lyric poet Pindar, whose victory odes celebrated the sporting glories of the islands' top families. Andrew Morrison, in his recent chapter in *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*, proposes that there is an interesting comparison to be made between the elites of the island communities.<sup>1</sup> In this thesis I carry out just such a comparison. As I will explore below, each of these societies was dominated by an aristocratic class: at Akragas a single family, the Emmenidai, overshadowed their fellow aristocrats, whilst amongst the Aeginetan nobility no single family enjoyed predominance. By examining a selection of Pindar's victory odes written for patrons from these communities, I will explore how the performances accommodated the needs of very different patrons and audiences, and what they reveal about the social significance of the epinicia, both as specific performances and as a genre.

Bruno Currie has noted that "different odes may present contrasting, even conflicting, political perspectives," whilst David Fearn has proposed that "it should now be well beyond doubt that we need to take very seriously the specifics of individual epichoric conditions when evaluating the socio-cultural meaning of epinician poetry: there is an ever-increasing realization amongst scholars that epichoric conditions provide the key to a rounded understanding of choral lyric."<sup>2</sup> Here I will explore how different performances of the odes, and even different

---

<sup>1</sup> Morrison (2011): 228–229.

<sup>2</sup> Currie (2005: 32); Fearn (2011: 211).

performances of the same ode, occasioned different responses by their respective audiences. In doing so I will discuss how the laudator, by encouraging these responses in the listeners, sought to mediate relationships between them that were unique to each community.

The odes I will focus on fall into two sets: *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2 for Akragas and *Nem.* 7, *Isth.* 6 and *Isth.* 5 for Aegina.<sup>3</sup> I have chosen these groups because each was composed for a single, highly distinguished family: the Emmenidai at Akragas and the Psalychiadai at Aegina. I will compare the odes both amongst and between the two groups. In addition I will examine passages from *Nem.* 7, for Sogenes of Aegina, and *Ol.* 7, for Diagoras of Rhodes. The purpose of this study is not to draw conclusions about the political or social orientation of Akragas and Aegina but rather, by exploring the mental and emotional conditions that allow the sympathy of a community to move in favour of an outstanding individual and his family, to provide a nuanced exploration of a particular aspect of communality and the capacity of epinician performance to foster it.

A patron commissioned an ode in order to consolidate his fame and glory. These qualities, unlike strength, skill, stamina and the other physical traits that brought victory, were not inherent in the victor himself, but existed in the minds of people who observed or thought about him. In this respect they were *extrinsic* to him. The poet's task was thus to marshal the thoughts, feelings and sentiments of the listeners and encourage the latter to attach perceptions of fame and glory to the victor. If we are to understand the way in which the laudator sought to bring glory to his

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this thesis Greek texts and translations will be based on Race's 1997 Loeb edition, unless noted otherwise.

patron, then, we must understand how he marshaled the thoughts, feelings and sentiments of the listeners in favour of his client. In every ode, the laudator makes the case that ‘this man and his family, who stand in your midst, are glorious.’ I will explore how the laudator deployed myths, poetic motifs and emotionally charged words and expressions to persuade the listeners to look favourably on this case, and ask what the implications of their doing so had for their relationship with the patron and his family.

Who, then, were the listeners? On a provisional basis we can say that other than the patron (who was most certainly a listener) and his family (who very probably were), the listeners comprised a number of the patron’s peers, i.e. those amongst whom he was most eager to distinguish himself, and possibly a much wider and more socially varied audience. It is these peers that I principally concern myself with in this thesis (though with some qualifications that I will discuss later). These members of the aristocratic class to which the patron and his family belonged I call the ‘listening community,’ and will consider them in more detail below. Throughout this thesis I will use the word ‘audience’ interchangeably with ‘listening community.’

The other set of listeners, and the most important ones from the perspective of Ancient Greek cosmology, were the gods. They are ubiquitous characters in Pindar’s odes, and recently there has been a growing interest in the religious significance of the performances. Scholars have begun to examine the social significance of the odes by looking at the religious experiences that they fostered.<sup>4</sup> I regard this as one of the most

---

<sup>4</sup> Mark Griffith (2009: 76) has noted that “poets, especially choral lyric poets, were prime promoters of this sense of community; but at the same time, different elements within a particular society might be expected to relate to the deity in significantly different ways, and one of the poet’s functions was to

important developments in Pindaric studies, and will devote considerable space to questions of the religious aspects of the odes. Recent studies, particularly by Josine Blok, reveal that Ancient Greek conceptions of social value were never situated outside a religious conceptual framework.<sup>5</sup> Here I will explore how, by directing the listeners to imagine the divine, the laudator made his case for the glory of the victor and his family.

The approach I take here, examining the social significance of the odes, follows the prevailing trend in Pindaric studies, which traces its origins back to the anti-historicist work of Elroy Bundy. The latter rejected the dominant approach of the day, which favoured treating the odes as sources of historical, and especially biographical, information. Instead his thesis centered around the idea that the odes were informed by “one master principle: there is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent encomiastic– that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron.”<sup>6</sup> The latter he termed the ‘laudandus,’ a label which has maintained its currency ever since.<sup>7</sup>

His approach has had an immense influence on modern Pindaric scholars. In the last twenty five years, however, the scope of scholarly interest in epinician as a poetic genre has broadened to encompass an historical interest (if not the

---

regulate this interface, as an intermediary both (vertically) between human and divine and (horizontally) among the various humans themselves.”

<sup>5</sup> Blok (2013), (2012) and (2011).

<sup>6</sup> Bundy (1987): 3.

<sup>7</sup> A notable criticism of the term is found in Kirkwood’s 1963 review of *Studia Pindarica* (1963: 130-133). Kirkwood accepts the usefulness of certain aspects of Bundy’s terminology, but describes the then new terms *laudandus* and *laudator* as not useful and even ‘monstrosities.’ This would seem to be an objection to the appearance, and perhaps the rhetorical over-use, of the term *laudandus*, rather than an aversion to the concept itself.

methodologies themselves) which Bundy eschewed.<sup>8</sup> The tactics of praise that Pindar used to glorify outstanding individuals are now commonly examined in order to understand the social implications of the performances. The emergence of this approach to Pindar is summarised by Pfeijffer, who in 1996 noted the rising interest in the social and political contexts of the epinician performances. Further to this he identified two schools of thought, the ‘historical’ and the ‘anthropological.’<sup>9</sup> The former, he argued, concerns itself with reconstructing the specific historical and social circumstances of the performances, whilst the second is interested in the “general connections between epinician poetry and archaic Greek rituals and social conventions.”

When Leslie Kurke proposed the proper relationship between genre and performance, she expressed a view that now prevails amongst Pindaric scholars:

“In ancient Greek society, all poetry was composed for public performance – whether at a symposium before a small select group or at a religious festival before an entire city... For such a milieu we must crucially modify the terms in which we conceptualize poetry. To begin with, we correlate genre with performance. If we define genre as a set of audience expectations which shapes and constrains each individual composition, we must take into account the nature of the audience and the occasion that informed their expectations. This re-orientation implicates genre in a whole set of social, political and

---

<sup>8</sup> Lee (1972: 65–70) argues that Bundy’s thesis did not actually preclude historicist analysis, though any such approach should be anchored to an appreciation of the odes as part of the encomiastic genre.

<sup>9</sup> Pfeijffer (1999): 11–12, where he seeks to situate himself somewhere between the two schools, explaining odes in their specific performance setting and their function as epinicia within that setting. See also Gentili (1988), Bernardini (1983) and Cole (1992).

religious issues, since different occasions were designed for audiences of different classes and different political persuasions, and often the occasions were specifically religious in nature. We must also reorient our notion of poetics, the “making” of poetry, the conception that underlies its production, and the function for which it is made. Just as genre depends upon performance, poetics depends upon the broader social context, for given its setting, we must believe that poetry fulfilled a social function.”<sup>10</sup>

Scholars who have recently found Kurke’s approach congenial to their own include Andrew Morrison (*Performances & Audiences in Pindar’s Sicilian Victory Odes*, London 2007) and Anne Pippin Burnett (*Pindar’s Songs for the Young Athletes of Aigina*, Oxford 2005). The work of both of these authors may be situated in the anthropological school of Pindaric studies, which places the performances of the odes in their wider social and cultural milieu. Burnett explicitly notes the importance of the return of the victor theory, i.e. that the odes mediated the reintegration of the victor back into his society, whilst Morrison positions reperformance, the chief concern of his work, in relation to the ‘symbolic capital’ of the victor’s *oikos*.<sup>11</sup> The relationship between performative context and the social consequences of the performance is the major focus in Currie’s *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford 2005), which is an examination of the odes in relation to the phenomenon of heroisation. Currie argues

---

<sup>10</sup> Kurke (1991):1. The broad principle of this was anticipated by Walsh (1984: 3), who wrote that poetry was “an essentially practical art, it was closely linked to the realities of social and political life, and to the actual behaviour of individuals within a community.” This is echoed by Kowalzig (2007: 38) in her discussion of the nature of ritual performance, which she declared gives “a picture of social relations within the worshipping community whose bearing on reality might lie somewhere between full correspondence to reality and total lie. Ritual invents a social reality and hopes that this proposal may appeal. It claims a truth but it defies any means of verification of this truth. The ceremonial invocation of *communitas* is therefore a tool in the creation, maintenance and transformation of social relations between participants”. The term *communitas* was used for this purpose by Turner (1969).

<sup>11</sup> Morrison (2007): 44.

that the odes provided the means by which living individuals were able to achieve heroic status, and that this was facilitated through epinician performance.

Throughout most of this thesis my primary focus will be on debut performances, with the exception of *Pyth.* 6, which I will examine both in debut and in reperformance. Currie has summarised previous debates and bibliography on choral vs. monodic interpretations of the odes, as well as the nature of the first person in Pindar.<sup>12</sup> He notes that the vast majority of first persons in the odes “refer neither to the chorus to the exclusion of the poet nor to the poet to the exclusion of the chorus.” The person leading the chorus in each case may have been the poet himself, the athlete, a member of the latter’s family or some other member of the community. It is not the object of this thesis to speculate about the specific identities of those who sang the odes. It is important to acknowledge, however, that in each case the laudator was an individual who derived authority from his personal status (whatever that may have been in each instance) and from the occasion itself, i.e. as the lead performer at a major social event. Thus for each of the performances I will examine in this thesis (including the reperformed *Pyth.* 6) I will treat the laudator as a man who could be taken seriously by the audience, was backed by a chorus, and who spoke to the listeners in terms framed to accommodate their expectations about athletic victory and glory.

In the first section of the thesis I will examine the principal five odes (*Pyth.* 6, *Isth.* 2, *Nem.* 5, *Isth.* 6 and *Isth.* 5), plus *Nem.* 7, exploring how the laudator treated glory as an *extrinsic* quality and mobilised it in the minds of the listening community

---

<sup>12</sup> Currie (2005): 16–21. For an examination of this issue in relation to Bacchylides, see Calame (2011).

in order to mediate relationships between the patron, his family and his peers. In the second section I will re-examine the principal five odes (plus *Ol. 7*), exploring the *intrinsic* qualities of this sense of glory, and examining how the listeners, including the patron, his family and his peers, were asked to mobilise their thoughts in order to engage with the divine. In doing so I will ask what implications this had for the relationships between the mortal parties and the gods.

My principal interest is thus in the audience's reception of the performance. Simon Goldhill has noted that "to be an audience was not just a thread in the city's social fabric, it was a fundamental political act."<sup>13</sup> Contingent in what he calls "the gaze of the citizens" were the social and political expectations of a society (or at least a section of it). It was within this context of observation and expectation that poetic performances mediated a patron's position and, through rhetorical positioning, secured his social standing. The odes, however, were composed before they were sung, and do not commemorate the reaction of those who listened to them. These reactions therefore cannot reliably be reconstructed. As far as the evidence goes the audience are silent and anonymous, and there is no surviving account of how they responded to the first performances. All we have are the words of the odes and the historical evidence concerning the circumstances in which the audiences lived.

Though I cannot cogently reconstruct the responses of the listeners to the performance, I can, however, hypothetically reconstruct the responses that the performances were *intended* to produce. By examining the semantics of words, the social and political circumstances of the communities in which they were sung and (as

---

<sup>13</sup> Goldhill (1999): 5.

far as it is reasonable to construe) the shared cultural assumptions of those listening, I will attempt to identify the thoughts and feelings that the poet (and his patron) hoped for in the listeners. The intended outcome of the odes was always explicit: lasting glory for the victor and his family. In the rhetorical strategies that the poet deployed to achieve this end, the complexities and limits of this aim reveal themselves.

The meaning of words and expressions must be understood in relation to their ‘internal’ and ‘external’ contexts. In examining the internal context of the ode I will look at how words and phrases are used in relation to each other within the same ode. In examining external context I will, where appropriate, look at other odes in order to gauge how it was intended for the audience to understand the words. This approach naturally encourages a degree of caution. It is a long-established practice amongst Pindarists to determine the meaning of words and *topoi* by placing them in the context of their Pindaric (or Bacchylidean) parallels. Since in this thesis I am interested in the intended effect on specific audiences, the extent to which I will use Pindaric parallels will largely be determined by the likely (or reasonably probable) extent of the audience’s awareness of other performances. In other words, if there is not a strong case that the listeners held the words of ode *x* in their minds while they listened to ode *y*, I will not use a comparison between the two to contextualise the words of *y*. The odes I have chosen to examine lend themselves to mutual comparison. It is reasonable, for example, to suppose that there was a degree of overlap amongst the first audiences of *Nem.* 5, *Isth.* 6 and *Isth.* 5, since the latter are all relatively close together in date and were composed for the same family in a relatively small community. Likewise, I make detailed comparisons between *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2 on the basis of the proposal (for which I will make the case later) that the former was

reperformed at the debut of the latter, and that consequently the audiences in that instance did not simply overlap, but were one and the same.

Another aspect of external context will involve considering, as far as possible, the social and cultural circumstances in which the odes were performed. In doing so I will speculate both on the specific performative conditions of each recital and the wider social and cultural circumstances of the community. The purpose of this will be to make an informed guess as to the social and cultural assumptions that the listeners brought with them to the performance; how they are identified by the poet, and how they were manipulated to engender the best possible reception of the performance. I work on the assumption that as a group the listeners' disposition towards the patron and his family is best determined by examining the latter's position in the community (I emphasise 'as a group' because individual listeners will doubtless have had feelings towards the victor and his family which were conditioned by personal, and thus unknowable, circumstances). The same basic message about the fame and glory of the patron and his family was delivered at Akragas and at Aegina. The fact that different social and cultural circumstances prevailed in each community should prompt us to ask questions about how the odes responded to and accommodated these divergent circumstances. The shared cultural assumptions of the audiences, as well as being distinct, were surely very important for the poet to consider when he determined how best to glorify his patron amongst the latter's countrymen. Here I will use the historical background of the two societies and whatever we can reconstruct from the performances themselves in order to determine the common cultural knowledge of the audience.

Through examining the relationship between these internal and external circumstances of the performance I will determine the meaning and semantic value of the words that were performed in the odes, and use this as the basis for reconstructing the intended reaction of the audiences to what was being performed.

In *Song, Politics and Cultural Memory* Lucia Athanassaki proposes that *Pyth.* 7 counterbalances the negative image of the victor, Megacles, which seems to have been held of him at Athens (the fact of his two ostracisms attest to this, and Athanassaki notes that the ostraca furnish specific grievances held by citizens—adultery, his ‘trendy hairstyle,’ etc.).<sup>14</sup> The ode, she proposes, downplays the image of ostentation, neutralises the fears that led to his ostracism and ensures the successful reception of his song at Athens. Her approach is similar to mine in that she proposes the performance mediated the thoughts and feelings of the listeners towards the patron. It is distinct from mine in two respects. The first is that she offers a more detailed account of the attitude towards Megacles prior to the performance, using the more abundant historical evidence (the ostracism and its archaeological ‘paper’ trail). The second is that, whilst I propose the performances mediated the sentiments of the audiences in order to consolidate the patrons’ high standing in their respective societies, Athanassaki proposes that the performances manipulated the public image of the patron in order to improve his position, i.e. to bring the audience round to a different way of thinking about him.

Her argument is successful in its attempt to create a case for the public perception of Megacles at Athens around the time that the ode was likely to have been

---

<sup>14</sup> Athanassaki (2011): 235–268.

performed. For this, as mentioned above, she relies on historical evidence. In much else she relies on the evidence of the *Pyth.* 7 and comparisons with other odes. In doing so she makes much of what the ode doesn't say. It does not, she notes, urge the citizens to receive Megacles, and it plays down his love of horses. She suggests that this silence was intended to address charges of ostentatiousness.<sup>15</sup> Like me she speculates not only on the nature of the audience's sentiments towards the patron (i.e. generally negative) but on their expectations (i.e. that they might otherwise have expected the mention of horse-loving and a call for festivities). The standard of proof she aims at is one of relative likelihood, and the case she makes is largely hypothetical (she deals early on with the fact that the site and location of the performance is contestable). I hold myself to the same standard, though with less historical evidence about conditions at Akragas and Aegina I cannot aim to create such a detailed picture. Like Athanassaki, though, I consider the political and social realities at the time of the performances, and use them to construct a case for the complexion (if not the composition) of the audiences, their assumptions and expectations. From there I examine the internal evidence of the odes and explore how it sought to appeal to such audiences, as well as making comparisons, where appropriate, with other odes, before drawing broader comparisons between the Akragantine and Aeginetan audiences.

The fact that the audiences to these first performances are silent and anonymous precludes drawing definitive conclusions about them, even when looking at the odes from the perspective of what their intended effect was. Indeed, there are certain assumptions I must make when carrying out this study, which serve to illustrate its limitations and which it is right to make here in the introduction.

---

<sup>15</sup> Athanassaki (2011): 243–245.

The first is that the poet was acutely aware of local political and cultural circumstances, not only of the victor and his family, but of the local community. The second is that the performances were in fact successful in promoting the glory of the patron and his family. Without both of these assumptions the value of the odes as sources of evidence for the dynamics of the communities in which they were first performed would diminish significantly. There is, of course, no way to know for certain how thorough the poet's knowledge of local cultures was, or how great the success of the odes. It may only be observed that the extent of Pindar's fame, the length of his career and the diversity of his clientele attest to a poet whose instincts and ability brought Panhellenic fame of their own.

It is also important to note that whilst the poet may have had hopes for the performance that were distinct from those of his patron (he presumably had future commissions in mind when he composed), I assume that they overlapped with those of the victor. In other words, both parties hoped that the performance would consolidate a positive relationship between the athlete, his family and their peers. In this respect, by 'the intentions of the odes,' I mean the patron's intentions and the intentions of the poet as far as they concerned the patron.

The subject may be an elusive one, and the conclusions drawn may be tenuous, but I believe that such a study both demonstrates and enhances the value of the odes as evidence for the dynamics that prevailed in these communities. Through this study I hope to contribute to the understanding of how the Greeks perceived the relationships between their gods and their community, and how poetic performance

consolidated those relationships. Through close reading of the *epinikia*, and by examining the effects of victory and the role of the gods in helping individuals, families and communities to obtain it, I hope to contribute to the study of Greek religion more broadly, by examining forms of collective piety through poetic performance.

Below I will outline the historical contexts in which odes were performed at Akragas and Aegina, and discuss the listening community of each.

### **Akragas: an outline of the community.**

Having been founded as what may have been a Rhodian colony,<sup>16</sup> Akragas was ruled by Phalaris between c.570–549. His regime was instituted through a coup in which he and his followers seized the acropolis and overthrew the ruling aristocracy. Having consolidated power at home, he subsequently turned his attention outwards. He subdued a large area stretching to the north and acquired Himera, most likely having enlisted mercenary aid, providing a territory that would provide the basis of Akragas's zone of control into the fifth century.

The rise of Phalaris saw not only the emergence of a new regime, but of a new mode of government. The creation of tyranny at Akragas had taken place in circumstances characterised by the coincidence of domestic strife and regional conflict. Similar circumstances were to characterise the fall of the tyranny nearly a

---

<sup>16</sup> Polybius 9.27.7. Timaeus suggests that the Emmenidai were of Rhodian origin: FGH566 F 92 = Σ Pi. O.2.15a.

hundred years later, after c.473. When Theron, the last well-established Akragantine ruler, died, his son Thrasydaeus came to power and subsequently launched a military campaign against Hieron of Syracuse, with whom Akragas had enjoyed a fragile but mutually beneficial entente under Theron. Marshaling around 20,000 cavalry and infantrymen, Thrasydaeus marched on Syracuse.<sup>17</sup> Hieron drew up an army to meet him, and a battle ensued, during which Hieron emerged victorious. Following his defeat, Thrasydaeus was toppled from power at home, and his subsequent expulsion saw him flee to Nisaea. This domestic and regional strife marked the end, not only of Thrasydaeus's short reign, but of the tyranny itself. The establishment of a limited democracy and of peace with Syracuse saw the birth of both a new mode of government at Akragas and a renewed relationship with its important neighbour.<sup>18</sup>

The dramatic events surrounding the birth and death of Emmenidai tyranny at Akragas parenthesise a period of around a hundred years. During this time, strong social order and economic wealth saw the creation of one of the largest and most important cities, not just on Sicily, but in Hellas. It was in this period that Pindar's odes were composed, between approximately 490 and 476. They fall roughly within the rule of Theron, c.489–473, a period remembered later as a golden age in Akragantine history. As well as providing stable rule at home, Theron pursued grand regional diplomacy. The seizure of Himera, c.483, and the subsequent expulsion of Carthaginian Hamilcar's guest-friend, Terillus, led to the latter's invasion of Sicily in 480. Himera's capture was carried out in alliance with Gelon, ruler of Syracuse, whose relationship with Akragas became the defining concern of the tyranny's regional policy. It was this alliance between Theron and Gelon that led to the defeat of

---

<sup>17</sup> Diod. Sic. 11.53.4.

<sup>18</sup> Diod. Sic. 11.53.5

the Carthaginians, securing Sicily from its then most significant external threat. Diodorus reports that Theron was an equitable and just ruler, and that after his death he was honoured as a hero.<sup>19</sup>

Though Theron's rule seems to have been both absolute and unchallenged during his lifetime, it would seem that the exercise of political and social influence, both at home and regionally, was carried out through high-ranking social and political agents. These agents seem to have been chosen on the basis of their kinship with Theron, and proximity to the centre of power at Akragas thus seems to have been conditioned largely by family connection.

There are two important sets of relationships that characterise the exercise of power politics through family connection: those amongst the political elite (i.e. domestic) and those between one political elite and another (i.e. diplomatic). We know from Diodorus that Akragas and Syracuse were the grand counterparts on the Sicilian stage in the first half of the fifth century. Gelon formalised an alliance with Akragas by marrying Theron's daughter, Damarete. Hieron, having inherited Syracuse from his brother in 478/7, was almost driven to armed conflict with Theron over Himera. This was narrowly averted after Hieron married Theron's niece, renewing the alliance between Akragas and Syracuse. These episodes show that the diplomatic relationships between the two communities were, to a great extent, determined by the relationships between those communities' elites. The conflicts over Himera saw the rulers of Syracuse and Akragas looking outwards, each hoping to extend or consolidate their influence in a zone that was not directly subject to their

---

<sup>19</sup> Diod. Sic. 11.53.2

domestic levers of power. Where the interests of each ruler seemed to be divergent, it was with recourse to diplomatic, political and possibly even military levers of power that potential conflicts would be resolved. Such conflicts of interest between absolute rulers fighting to defend their respective regional interests might have wide diplomatic, political and military consequences, both at home and abroad. Thus, where such conflicts occurred, reconciliation and compromise amongst allies was far preferable to armed engagement between two equally matched opponents. The conflicts between Theron and the brothers Gelon and Hieron were resolved through alliance, which in both cases created a shared set of interests between the Akragantine and Syracusan elites. That these mutual interests were expressed through marriage, with the consequent binding of one elite to another, indicates that formerly divergent diplomatic, military and political interests could be reconciled by their inclusion within a wider family structure. Kinship, then, conferred a major stake in the power politics of the Akragantine and Syracusan elites. Given the right circumstances, such as those presented by the possibility of armed conflict, kinship could condition the political orientation of two communities and thus the deployment of their diplomatic and military resources. This was not simply a question of blood shared being better than blood spilled. We know that the Sicilian dictators did not shy from war-making, either amongst themselves or with external enemies (such as the Carthaginians).<sup>20</sup> Rather, the Akragantine reconciliations with Syracuse achieved under Theron demonstrate that family connections were prudent options for mediating the diplomatic, political and social proximity between two elites through the creation of a greater, shared vested interest.

---

<sup>20</sup> See, again, the *hubris* of Thrasydaeus, or even the imperialist impulses of both Akragas and Syracuse with regard to Himera in the first place.

Such family-based power politics was an important feature of inter-communal Sicilian relations in the first half of the fifth century. Just as ties of marriage were an important tool in the exercise of diplomatic influence, so family relationships were used to monopolise the exercise of social, political and military levers of power at home. We have seen from the examples of Thrasydaeus succeeding Theron in c.473 and Hieron succeeding Gelon in 478/7 that this political control was not simply exercised by a dominant individual and his dependent kin, but was transferred from one generation to the next within that kinship group. In other words, during the first half of the fifth century, Akragas and Syracuse functioned as political dynasties.

**Akragas: the listening community.**

Let us consider, then, the audience that may have been present at the performance of *Pyth.* 6. Given their status as addressees, the presence of Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos (and possibly also Theron) at the debut may be reasonably assumed. It seems likely, too, that other members of the ruling family were present. Morrison speculates that the setting for the debut recital of *Isth.* 2, performed twenty years later, may have been sympotic.<sup>21</sup> Though the exact composition of the audience is impossible to determine, it would likely have included the victor, his family and a

---

<sup>21</sup> See Morrison (2007): 41 and 82. I would like to propose the possibility that an ode's *début* may have taken place several times over. The nature of sympotic performance restricted the number of participants that could be accommodated at a single performance. If the circle of peers before whom Xenocrates wished the debut to take place was greater than the capacity of a single symposium then it is possible that, over a number of days, the ode was performed several times in what might reasonably be called 'repeat *débuts*.' Invitation to a debut of a victory ode was surely a privilege and mark of social distinction. In an alternative view, invitation to a first, second or even third debut may have comprised an indication of social grade in a society where proximity to the upper echelons of the Emmenidai conditioned a courtier's place in the elite pecking order. Though highly speculative, I raise the possibility in order to suggest that the limited capacity of sympotic performance need not force a constrained perception of the breadth of the listening community represented by the attendees.

‘listening community’ of high-ranking, powerful aristocrats who were not members of the family. At Akragas, the Emmenidai, though occupying the pole position at the top of the social ladder, did not monopolise power altogether. Below them (possibly only just below in some cases), was a class of wealthy and powerful aristocrats on whose support they would have depended to reinforce their own social position. I treat the latter as the listening community, comprised, if not of equals, then of highly important social inferiors.

### **Aegina: an outline of the community.**

Aegina, in contrast to Akragas, was an aristocracy. There a number of high-ranking families held socio-political power, with none predominating. As with its economic structure, our understanding of Aeginitan society suffers from a relative paucity of substantial evidence. The economically and socially slanted data that are available, however, have prompted some innovative reconstructions of social, political and economic modes. Burnett nicely summarises the debate about the emergence of Aegina’s aristocracy in its fifth century incarnation.<sup>22</sup> In c. 610 B.C. the Aeginetans cast off Epidaurian control, establishing themselves as an independent community. She suggests that this was done by the “commercial nobles” who had locally administered the island on behalf of Epidauros, and who maintained their social dominance at the new top rung of the social and political ladder.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Burnett (2005): 13–28.

<sup>23</sup> Burnett (2005): 14. See also Kirsten (1942): 289–311.

The precise nature of the upper class has been subject to a long and unresolved debate. Figueira argues that the aristocracy of Aegina was commercial in nature, with a heavy involvement in the maritime and trade activities of the island, a view endorsed more recently by Hornblower and Burnett.<sup>24</sup> De Ste. Croix presented a different view, with his insistence that the Aeginitan elite was a traditional aristocratic landed class, a view that Hornblower criticises as too rigid.<sup>25</sup> Hubbard falls on the side of Figueira, arguing that the elite was not a landed aristocracy, but *nouveaux riches* who aspired to the image of traditional landed aristocratic status.<sup>26</sup> I find the arguments in favour of a commercial and mercantile aristocracy most persuasive. On even a cursory reading of the epinicia it is clear that the aristocracy at Aegina led a lavish lifestyle, commanding significant financial resources. This financial security cannot have been guaranteed by landholdings at home, due to Aegina's small land area (and landholdings abroad are unattested and highly unlikely). On this basis, the elite's heavy involvement in the commercial and maritime economy along the lines suggested by Figueira would seem to be the most sensible hypothesis, and is the one that I follow in this thesis.

Hornblower notes that there is a distinct sense in which *patrai* feature in the Aeginitan odes, and who, "to an unusual extent," are credited with the victory.<sup>27</sup> These *patrai* are patrilineal social groups, whose size and scope seem to be greater than that of the *oikos*. Based on their prominence in the odes, they would seem to be highly significant units in the Aeginitan social order, and are described by Nagy as

---

<sup>24</sup> See Figueira (1981): 321–2; Hornblower (2004): 212, and Burnett (2005): 14.

<sup>25</sup> De Ste. Croix (1972): 266–7 and (1981): 120, and Hornblower (2004): 212. For an argument in favour of prominent "*Kaufmannsfamilien*," see Zunker (1988): 35.

<sup>26</sup> Hubbard (2001): 390–2.

<sup>27</sup> Hornblower (2004): 208. 'Tribe' or 'clan' seems a somewhat clumsy rendering, and so the original Greek will be used hereon.

closed, privileged and comprised within the aristocratic community.<sup>28</sup> Burnett argues for ten ruling *patrai*<sup>29</sup> on the basis that ten men each organised the women's choruses for Damia and Auxesia,<sup>30</sup> and that the hostages taken by Kleomenes were ten 'most worthy because of wealth and family.'<sup>31</sup> She goes on to argue that the members of the ruling *patrai*, "filled the various priesthoods, decided on building projects, and maintained the calendar of religious celebrations, while they, or some inner group, also fixed alliances and city policy."<sup>32</sup> I am willing to accept the likelihood of the *patrai* being self-contained social units, whose character was aristocratic and whose identities were well-defined through shared myth and family connections. This much is supported by the odes, which heavily involve the *patrai* in the victory of an individual member, and at the same time explicate both individual and group identity and social status. That they were 'closed' or impermeable to outsiders seems to go too far. At Akragas, as we shall see, membership of the Emmenidai was something that one inherited, and was entirely unavailable to outsiders. Based on the existing evidence, I see no reason to believe that the same was the case with the Aeginetan *patrai*. Burnett's underlying assumption that the *patrai* formed the ruling class seems reasonable, though her suggestion that there were ten ruling *patrai* is more speculative.<sup>33</sup> Kleomenes' selection of captives, which she cites as evidence, need not be read as one man from each of the ruling *patrai*, rather than that those who were most distinguished by wealth and family made better hostages. This might just as well be two brothers from the same family, or ten men from amongst more than ten *patrai*.

---

<sup>28</sup> Nagy (1990): 176. Parker (1996): 63 n.26, who observes that Pindar shifts between praise for the *oikos* including maternal kin, and praise for the *patra*.

<sup>29</sup> Burnett (2005): 15, where she calls them 'tribes,' of which she notes that only seven names have survived.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. 5.83.

<sup>31</sup> Hdt. 6.73. The Spartan king arrived on Aegina for the purpose of hostage-taking after the Aeginetans acquiesced to the Persian demand for earth and water as tokens of submission in 491.

<sup>32</sup> Burnett (2005): 15.

<sup>33</sup> Pavlou (2008) notes, in a more general sense, that Burnett's conclusions in her 2005 book are not supported by strong evidence.

### **Aegina: the *listening* community.**

It seems probable that, as with the Akragantine odes, the listening audiences at the first performances of the Aeginetan odes were composed of high-ranking aristocrats. Unlike at Akragas, however, those who were not members of the victor's close family are likely to have held a social status that was comparable rather than subordinate to that of the victor. This seems to be a reasonable inference given what we know of Aeginetan social structure, outlined above. As I have discussed, there was a ruling class of *patrai* from which the victors who commissioned Pindaric odes were drawn. It is against other members of *patrai* that the victors at the games would thus have measured their social standing at home. They had to encourage these others, their peers, to view them as glorious and famous in order for glory and fame to be corollaries of the victory. These peers comprised the 'listening community' under examination here. If he were to marshal their sentiments in favour of a positive response to the praise for the victor, the laudator would have to adapt the praise to accommodate the culturally determined expectations of these people. This equation of the listening community with the aristocracy, however, is not consistent across all the Aeginetan odes I will examine. As I will discuss, the laudator's portrayal of the battle of Salamis in *Isth.* 5 indicates that this ode was designed to appeal to members of the wider community as well as to the athlete's aristocratic peers, broadening the scope of the listening community itself in comparison with the previous odes. In all cases, however, the positive relationship that the performance engendered between the victor, his family and the listening community was carried out in accordance with the

social norms of Aeginitan society, which followed very different cultural and social norms from those that predominated at Akragas. It is therefore to be expected that the relationship between victor, family and listening community encouraged by *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2 differed considerably from that encouraged by *Nem.* 5, *Isth.* 6 and *Isth.* 5. Both sets of odes, however, use similar imagery to achieve their ends. Below, I will examine how the respective audiences responded to this, how it supported relationships between the listening community, the victor and his family, and what the nature of those relationships were in each case.

## **SECTION ONE: IMAGINING GLORY**

### **Panhellenic Perspectives:**

#### **Introduction**

In her 2002 article, Sarah Harrell discusses the divergent portrayals of the Deinomenids, fifth century rulers of Gela and Syracuse, by examining epinicia and the commemorative sculptures placed in Panhellenic sanctuaries.<sup>34</sup> The former, she argues, were meant primarily for a domestic audience and assimilated the victor's family to a model of Homeric hereditary rulers, construing the Deinomenids as a ruling dynasty. Harrell argues that sanctuary sculptures, on the other hand, which commemorated victories in Panhellenic contexts, bear inscriptions that play down the family's tyrannical status. This, she says, is in line with "conventional" epigraphic practices (i.e. those followed by victors from non-tyrannical regimes, whose epigrams merely mention name, city and occasion). She proposes that this divergence indicates a willingness on the part of the Deinomenids to use different commemorative media (performance and sculpture) to accommodate the expectations of different audiences, one domestic (and fully able to accept the Deinomenids' portrayal of themselves as rulers), the other Panhellenic (which, she suggests, would often be less willing to accept such portrayals). Her theme, exploring the relationship between panhellenism and the portrayal of self-image, is important, and one that I wish to build on.

---

<sup>34</sup> Harrell (2002): 439–464.

In this chapter I will work on a premise that dominates my thesis: in commissioning epinician performances, a victorious patron hoped to engender a positive relationship between himself, his family and the community. By doing so, he hoped that glory and lasting fame would attach itself to him in the minds of people in his community when they thought about him or his family. The kind of relationship that he could hope to consolidate through the performance, and consequently the kind of glory that he could expect as a result, was determined by the social and cultural norms of the patron's society. What was an acceptable relationship between a wealthy patron and his community might be very different in one *polis* than another. In order for epinician performances to be successful, then, they had to accommodate needs and expectations (both on the part of the patron and the other listeners) that were distinctly 'local' in nature. Here I begin my comparison of the Akragantine and Aeginetan odes by exploring how Pindar accommodated the distinctly local needs of the patron and the expectations of the audience by encouraging the listeners to detach themselves from the local circumstances of the performance and place themselves in a wider Greek context. Whereas Harrell examines the creation of carefully managed dialogue between patron and non-local audiences in a Panhellenic setting, I will examine how poetically created Panhellenic settings were used to facilitate dialogue between a patron and his local audience, and to do so I will be comparing *Pyth.* 6 and *Nem.* 7. *Pyth.* 6 was composed for Xenocrates, brother of Theron, chariot victor and senior figure amongst the Emmenidai, though it is his son, Thrasyboulos, who receives most of the laudator's attention. It was first performed in c.490. *Nem.* 7 was composed for Sogenes of Aegina, winner of the boys' pentathlon.

From a linguistic perspective, the mechanics of encouraging audiences to imagine other places and times is well understood, and deictics is now an important feature of Pindaric studies. It is, in essence, the study of how grammar and lexicon were utilised to give the impression that the audience had been resituated in another space or time. Athanassaki has described deictic markers as “among the devices that enabled the chorus to bring before their audience’s eyes distant events featuring distant characters, taking place in different places at different times.”<sup>35</sup> Similarly, according to Segal, “readers and authors shift their deictic center from the real-world situation to an image of themselves at a location within the story world.”<sup>36</sup> The study of deictics can involve the detailed analysis of Pindaric adverbs, pronouns, verbs or any other type of word form. Felson, for example, has written on the use of pronominal deictic markers in the odes, as, more recently, has Bonifazi.<sup>37</sup> Bakker, on the other hand, has focused on verbal deictics.<sup>38</sup>

Here I will focus not on the linguistic means by which the laudator encouraged the listeners to resituate themselves in space and time, but on the emotional responses he hoped to elicit by doing so. I will examine passages from two odes, *Pyth.* 6–18 and *Nem.* 7.30–52. Each shares certain features: both encourage the listeners to detach themselves from the space of the performance and imagine themselves elsewhere in the Greek world; both rely on forward movement that is processional in nature (which I shall explore in depth below), and in both cases this movement heads towards the great international sanctuary at Delphi. The nature of these processional movements, their context and destination, appeals to the audiences’ knowledge and assumptions

---

<sup>35</sup> Athanassaki (2004): 317–341.

<sup>36</sup> Segal (1995) 3-17, especially 14-16. This is discussed by Felson (1999), pp. 1-31.

<sup>37</sup> See Felson (2004: 365–389) and Bonifazi (2004a: 283–99 and 2004b: 41-68).

<sup>38</sup> Bakker (1997).

about places and practices outside their communities. In analysing these passages I will discuss how this knowledge and these assumptions about ‘international’ space and the movement within it were used to mediate a positive relationship between patron and community. In doing so I will compare how this imagery, similar in each case, accommodated different local needs and expectations.

Procession, the type of movement that features strongly in both passages under comparison, was practiced across the Greek world. It was a universal means by which a community articulated its collective identity, demarcated its physical boundaries and delineated its internal social divisions.<sup>39</sup> In the instances that I will explore here the Panhellenic aspect of procession is highly acute. In both *Pyth.* 6 and *Nem.* 7 processions are portrayed as taking place at or towards Delphi, the great international centre of Greek cult. Furthermore, the sacred aspect of the place is emphasised in each ode. In hearing the procession being described by the laudator, each audience was encouraged to create a mental image based on their own experiences or their culturally determined assumptions. In doing so, they would have tapped into the sense that processions bring the community together in its ideal form, emphasising its different social components whilst promoting a general sense of ‘togetherness.’ Thus, in asking listeners to think about a procession, the laudator encouraged them to create an image that was manifestly ‘self-referential.’ In asking them to reconstruct a procession in their minds, he was asking them to engage in the same suspension of disbelief as members of a real procession organising themselves into a ritually sanctioned reflection of communal harmony. By mobilising processional imagery within the context of a work of praise for a victor, the laudator encouraged a sense

---

<sup>39</sup> This is explored by de Polignac (1984), and in its Panhellenic aspect by Parker (2005). See also Bruit-Zaidman and Schmitt-Pantel (1992): 105–107 and Burkert (1985): 99–101.

that the status quo was being maintained, and that his client's glory fitted harmoniously within it.

In making this demand of his audience, however, the laudator faced certain constraints. For the imagery to be acceptable to the listeners and be persuasive in delivering its message it had to reinforce the listeners' expectations and assumptions about their community. If the processional imagery presented by the laudator was inaccurate, overambitious or flawed in any other way, it would fail to be accepted, and the laudator's message of his client's glory would be compromised.<sup>40</sup> Here I will explore how the laudator tapped into the assumptions and expectations that local audiences held about an important international space. In doing so I hope to shed light on how the laudator mediated the sentiments of the listening community in such a way as to encourage them to attach glory to the patron, and will explore what sort of glory this was in each case.

### **Pyth. 6.1–18**

Ἀκούσατ', ἧ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας

ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων

ἀναπολίζομεν, ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου

χθονὸς ἐς νάιον προσοιχόμενοι,

Πυθιονικός ἐνθ' ὀλβίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαίς

---

<sup>40</sup> For a detailed discussion of *koros* and the dangers of excessive praise, see Mackie (2003), in particular p. 21: "As much praise as the victor deserves is likely to seem too much to the audience, and provoke the opposite effect: envious blame. And this will disrupt the community, causing disorder and harm instead of balancing it."

ποταμία τ' Ἀκράγαντι καὶ μὰν Ξενοκράτει

έτοῖμος ὕμνων

θησαυρὸς ἐν πολυχρύσῳ

Ἄπολλωνία τετείχισται νάπα,

τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθῶν

ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας

στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχούς

ἄλὸς ἄξεισι παμφόρῳ χεράδει

τυπτόμενον. φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ

πατρὶ τεῶ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾶ

λόγοισι θνατῶν

εὔδοξον ἄρματι νίκαν

Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ

Listen! For indeed we are ploughing once again

the field of bright-eyed Aphrodite

or of the Graces, as we proceed to the enshrined

navel of the loudly rumbling earth,

where at hand for the fortunate Emmenidai

and for Akragas on its river, yes, and for Xenocrates,

a Pythian victor's

treasure house of hymns

has been built in Apollo's valley rich in gold,

one which neither winter rain, coming from abroad  
as a relentless army  
from a loudly rumbling cloud, nor wind shall buffet  
and with their deluge of silt carry into the depths  
of the sea. But in clear light its front  
will proclaim a chariot victory,  
famous in men's speech,  
shared by your father, Thrasyboulos, and your clan,  
won in the dells of Krisa.

(Race, Loeb edition)

At the opening of *Pyth.* 6 the laudator commands the audience to 'listen as we plough the field of bright-eyed Aphrodite and the Graces, as we proceed to the enshrined navel of the loudly-rumbling earth.' The listeners are directed to imagine themselves as part of a procession moving along the Sacred Way at Delphi past the treasury houses, represented by the treasury of hymns (ὕμνων θησαυρὸς). The latter is said to be at hand (indicated by ἐνθα) for the Emmenidai, for Akragas and for Xenocrates.

It has been argued that the first person plural 'we plough' (ἀναπολίζομεν) is self-referential, i.e. the poet referring to himself and the chorus as the performing party.<sup>41</sup> However, I would like to consider the possibility that the plural also has the intention of encouraging a sense of inclusiveness amongst the listeners. Ploughing

---

<sup>41</sup> See Neumann-Hartmann (2005: 145-62).

imagery occurs elsewhere in Pindar's odes. In *Nem.* 6.32 the poet declares that the Bassidai can supply the Pierians' ploughmen much to sing about, whilst in *Nem.* 10.26 Theaios is said to have given the Muses work for their plough through his victories at the Isthmos and Nemea.<sup>42</sup> The scene that is constructed here, however, is different. Unlike in *Nem.* 6 and *Nem.* 10, where the poet reports the good deeds and songs that the ploughmen might carry, here the scene is one of action, where the audience are asked to conjure up a ploughing movement that occurs at the moment of the performance. Even if 'we plough' is self-referential from the perspective of a modern reader considering the presence of the performer, as a performed word ἀναπολίζομεν would, I argue, have prompted a sense of collective participation in those listening. In other words, it may not 'refer' to the audience, but it surely engaged them in an inclusive and collective way.

For those in the audience, the opening command to listen is attention-grabbing and immediately plunges them into the time and space of a scene that, conceptually, occurs immediately after Xenocrates' victory.<sup>43</sup> The use of the first person plural 'we plough' (ἀναπολίζομεν) could have created an impression both of joint participation and controlled forward momentum. When *Pyth.* 6 was first performed, Xenocrates' victory at Delphi was still fresh in the listeners' minds, and the laudator relied on this

---

<sup>42</sup> *Nem.* 6.32–34: ἴδια ναυστολέοντες ἐπικώμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταις / δυνατοὶ παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων / ἔνεκεν. ('they carry their own shipload of victory songs and can supply the Pierians' ploughmen much to sing about because of their proud accomplishments.'). *Nem.* 10.25–26: ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἑλλανα στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχα τε μολῶν / καὶ τὸν Ἴσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέα στέφανον, Μοῖσαισὶ τ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι... ('before that he also defeated the host of Hellenes at Pytho, and coming with good fortune won the crown at both Isthmos and Nemea and gave the Muses work for their plough...')

<sup>43</sup> Morrison (2007: 42–43) convincingly suggests that the first performance of *Pyth.* 6 took place at Akragas, possibly in a sympotic context, and was designed to evoke a Delphic scene in the listeners' minds. The historicity of a post-victory procession down the Sacred Way is not important for this argument. What is important is the success of the laudator in directing the listeners' mental construction of such a scene, and his use of the latter as a basis to mediate their perceptions of victory and the victor. For arguments in favour of a first performance at Delphi itself, see Burton (1962: 15) and Gelzer (1985: 98–99). It is also possible that the sympotic performance was a grand, semi-public affair, though this would not affect my reading of the ode.

sense of topicality to generate the effect of detaching them from the present moment of the performance and placing them at a point immediately following the chariot race itself (an effect that will be explored later). Similarly, the laudator relied upon the listeners' shared receptiveness to Delphic symbols (e.g. the navel of the earth) to create a deictic effect that would mentally transport them from the location of performance to the Sacred Way. The laudator's description of a spontaneous, processional celebration plays up to the sense of excitement that the original audience would have felt at the recent victory. The listeners' thrill at participating in the epinician commemoration of an 'of-the-moment' athletic success is channeled into the excitement of an imaginary 'on-the-spot' procession. These feelings give an emotive charge to the praise for Xenocrates, enhancing the special quality of the victory and confirming his greatness in the minds of the listeners. Thus the opening lines of *Pyth.* 6 use the audience's awareness of recent events, shared cultural knowledge and emotional state to create a sense of immediacy and joint enterprise, engendering the greatest receptiveness to praise for Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos.

Lines 5–18 describe the treasury of hymns (ὑμνων θησαυρὸς), which the procession passes on its way to the temple of Apollo. Through these lines the laudator prompts the audience to invest the image of the treasury with the emotively charged praise for Xenocrates' victory. In the imagination of the listeners this building is cast as a repository of glory. Comprised of hymns, it is described in lines 10–14 as a substantial structure, resistant to the rain, the wind and silt. This language encourages the audience to associate these monumental qualities with Xenocrates' victory itself, with the consequence that his fame was made to seem everlasting.

In lines 14–18, the building’s frontage is described in a direct address to Thrasyboulos, who is told that it commemorates Xenocrates’ chariot victory. This, as well as being famous in men’s speech (λόγοισι θνατῶν) is shared equally by his father and his clan (πατρὶ τεῶ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ). The laudator’s description of the treasury thus directs both Thrasyboulos and the rest of the audience to associate Xenocrates’ everlasting glory with the entire line of the Emmenidai. In this way the motif acted as a conduit, transmitting this glory from a distinguished individual ‘outwards’ to the family group.

As the audience imagined the procession along the Sacred Way past the treasury of hymns, several significant processes took place, all of which must be analysed in order to create a detailed picture of how their sentiments were appealed to.

The act of mentally transporting themselves to Delphi placed the audience in a very different setting from that of the performance. As I have said above, the performance itself probably took place at Akragas in a sympotic setting. This exclusive setting was one in which social and physical proximity, even intimacy, established the tone of relations. The only people looking at or listening to a member of a symposium, excluding servants and other attendants, would be other symposiasts. By mentally taking themselves from the symposium to the Sacred Way at Delphi, these sympotic listeners entered an environment in which an entirely different code of behaviour prevailed. The Sacred Way, in contrast to the symposium, was an open, public space, where members of processions were exposed to the eyes of the world as they carried out their rituals. Moreover, at Delphi they would have been exposed to

the eyes of the *entire* world. Unlike the semi-privacy of the symposium, Delphi was a forum in which Greeks interacted with Greeks from far away, whether through personal contact, inscriptions or other material commemoration. In this space a set of conventions and expectations prevailed that were not only of an entirely different nature to those of the symposium, but which would have been readily understood by the listeners, as I will explore below.

How would this sense that they were processing past the treasury in the archetypal Panhellenic location have affected their response to the imagery? With regard to the procession itself, it would have prompted the listeners to invest it with a sense of solemnity. Though processions were a universal and frequent practice in all Greek communities, it does not seem likely that the mere mention of one in an ode would have occasioned a special sense of engagement in the listeners. By making it a Delphic procession, however, the gravity of the location would have disarmed any sense of complacency the audience had about the intended force of the image. In other words, when they imagined the procession down the Sacred Way, they would have imparted to it a more heightened sense of occasion than they might otherwise have done.

The second point concerns the treasury itself. This is said to have been made of hymns, and is thus a metaphorical construction. There is no archaeological evidence to suggest the existence of an actual Akragantine treasury at Delphi that the laudator might have been thinking of. As the audience constructed in their minds a building that represented the accumulated celebrations of Emmenidai victories (note the plural ‘of hymns’: ὕμνων), the image would have been strongly coloured by the

international context in which it was being placed. Treasuries were one of the most lavish and conspicuous means by which communities demonstrated their wealth. Though dedications to the gods, they also communicated a strong message to other Greek communities. They were, in effect, the international faces of the poleis that constructed them.<sup>44</sup> In imagining the Emmenidai treasury of hymns in this setting, the listeners conjured up a building that was meant to be seen by other Greeks as a single, international face of their community, and subjugated it to the glory of the ruling family.

The Delphic setting of the treasury of hymns, the assumptions attached to such buildings and the fact that it was assimilated so closely to Xenocrates' commemoration meant that as an expression of the latter's glory it was highly effective, but as a message of Xenocrates' standing at Akragas it was also immensely powerful. The laudator, in taking the listeners to Delphi, tapped into a set of assumptions with which he knew they would be highly familiar. He placed them in a public space where the eyes of the Greek world were ever focused, and in doing so prompted them to conceive of Xenocrates' greatness and the greatness of his family, on a Panhellenic order of magnitude. Delphi was where Greeks not only spoke to the gods, but where they left artistic legacies that spoke to other Greeks. The code of behaviour that this engendered (and which was universally known) was taken up by the laudator and subverted to create the greatest possible spectacle for an audience of Akragantine aristocrats joined together in a symposium.

---

<sup>44</sup> See Neer (2001): 273-336. Also Watrous (1982): 159-172.

What sort of relationship amongst members of the patron's family did this portrayal of the treasury encourage the audience to imagine? As we have seen, the frontage of the treasury proclaims a great chariot victory, cast in terms that emphasise the building's durability and thus the permanence of the glory it embodies. In lines 14–18, Thrasyboulos is said to share in the glory won by Xenocrates and his clan in the dells of Krisa. The ode was commissioned on the occasion of Xenocrates' chariot victory at the Pythian games, and the mention of this and other victories immediately after a description of the treasury's frontage suggests that the glory shared by Thrasyboulos comes from the cumulative athletic successes of his family. It is glory that they have acquired over years, the result of victories that were celebrated in hymns, of which the treasury is the symbol. As I will explore later in the thesis, the addresses to Thrasyboulos and the descriptions of him in *Pyth.* 6 suggest that at the time of the ode's debut he was not an adult, and was probably still in his teenage years. He does not seem to have distinguished himself through athletic glory (though his civic honour is discussed in lines 44–54). Despite this, however, he is portrayed in lines 14–18 as partaking equally in the athletically inspired glory of his family that the treasury proclaims on its frontage.<sup>45</sup> The latter would thus seem to act not only as a focus of Xenocrates' honour, consolidating it in the minds of the listeners, but as a means of encouraging the listeners to conceive of that honour as shared across his family, and in particular with his son and heir.

As well as creating a sense that the honour of individuals was shared alike by the family, the depiction of the treasury also articulates Xenocrates' standing amongst the listening community. The construction of such buildings was, as I have said, an

---

<sup>45</sup> Line 15: πατρὶ τεῶ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινὰν τε γενεᾶ.

expression of communal effort. By imaging the glory of Xenocrates and the Emmenidai manifested through such a structure at the most important cultic site in the Greek world, the listeners would have been encouraged to think of his status as transcending the confines of local society. Here was a structure that was essentially civic in its nature, its purpose to confirm the glory of the ruling family. In detaching it from the context of Akragas, where the social power of the Emmenidai was exercised, and placing it at Delphi, the family's status locally was reflected by their commemoration through a structure that represented the collective exertion of the entire community. The construction of the treasury in this international context, then, would have reinforced in the minds of the listeners the fact of the Emmenidai's social supremacy at Akragas.

The stake in the treasury was not, however, entirely one-sided. This is reflected in line 6, where the treasury that awaits the procession stands not only for the family and for Xenocrates, but for Akragas, the city by the river (*ποταμῖα τ' Ἀκράγαντι*). Its status as a treasure house of hymns, then, does not exclude the community, but explicitly includes it. Though its construction, detailed in the lines following, emphasises the glory of the family, this mention of the city is important. As they imagined the treasury in its Delphic context, the listeners would have thought not just of the appearance of the structure, but how it would have appeared to Greeks from across the world who would have come to such a place to look at it. They would have been aware of how it would have appeared (if it were physical) from the perspective of non-Akragantines traveling up the Sacred Way and towards the temple, as a building that represented Akragas to the rest of the world. By placing the treasury in its Delphic setting the laudator encouraged the listeners to detach themselves not

simply from their own physical location (the symposium), but from their own perspective, and to imagine a route famous for treasuries through which communities ‘spoke’ to one another via politically charged architecture. Exposure to such inter-communal dialogue was an expectation commensurate with travelling along the Sacred Way, and this expectation was tapped into through the processional imagery. It encouraged the audience to attach to the treasure house of hymns the very same expectations, i.e. that even though its decorative scheme was manifest in song and was slanted towards Xenocrates and the ruling family, it was nonetheless a symbol of the community.<sup>46</sup> The procession, then, did not simply act as a means by which the solemn gravity of praise was delivered to the source of the Emmenidai’s glory, it also stimulated the listeners to access their knowledge of the Delphic environment and the manifold assumptions and expectations surrounding it. In this way the laudator gave the fleeting mention of the city’s stake in the treasury a heightened significance: that the listening community itself had a stake in the glory of Xenocrates and the Emmenidai, which, though less explicitly and extensively articulated as the praise for the victor and his family, was nonetheless tangible.

**Nem. 7.30–52**

ἀλλὰ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔρχεται  
κῦμ’ Αἶδα, πέσε δ’ ἀδόκη-  
τον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα, τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται  
ᾧν θεὸς ἀβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων.

---

<sup>46</sup> Line 5–6: ἐνθ’ ὀλβίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαϊς / ποταμίᾳ τ’ Ἀκράγαντι καὶ μὲν Ξενοκράτει.

βοαθοῶν τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου  
μόλον χθονός. ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις  
κεῖται Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πράθεν,  
τᾶ καὶ Δαναοὶ πόνησαν, ὁ δ' ἀποπλέων  
Σκύρου μὲν ἄμαρτε, πλαγχθέν-  
τες δ' εἰς Ἐφύραν ἴκοντο.

Μολοσσία δ' ἐμβασίλευεν ὀλίγον  
χρόνον, ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρει  
τοῦτό οἱ γέρας. ὄχετο δὲ πρὸς θεόν,  
κτέατ' ἄγων Τροΐαθεν ἀκροθινίων,  
ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὑπερ μάχας  
ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνήρ μαχαίρα.

βάρυνθεν δὲ περισσὰ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται.  
ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον ἀπέδω-  
κεν, ἐχρῆν δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ  
Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι  
θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχέα δόμον, ἥροΐαις δὲ πομπαῖς  
θεμισκόπον οἰκεῖν ἐόντα πολυθύτοις.  
εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει,  
οὐ ψευδῆς ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ  
Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διὸς τ' ἐκ-  
γόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἶπεῖν

φαιναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὀδὸν κυρίαν λόγων

οἴκοθεν,

... But to all alike comes

the wave of Hades, and it falls upon the obscure

and the famous;<sup>47</sup> yet honour belongs to those

whose fair story a god exalts after they die.

As a helper, then, I have come to the great navel

of the broad-bosomed earth. For in Pytho's holy ground

lies Neoptolemos, after he sacked Priam's city,

where the Danaans also toiled. When he sailed away

he missed Skyros, but after wandering,

he and his men reached Ephyra.

In Molossia he was king for a short

time, but his offspring have forever held

that privilege of his. He then went to visit the god,

bringing with him items from the finest spoils of Troy.

There, when he became involved in a quarrel over

sacrificial meats, a man struck him with a sword.

---

<sup>47</sup> Compare Gerber (1963), who summarises what he calls the five different interpretations of line 31, δ' ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα: 1) 'on the inglorious and the glorious' 2) 'on him who does not expect it and on him who does' 3) 'unexpected and on him who expects it' 4) 'unexpected even on him who expects it' 5) 'ingloriously even on the glorious.' I follow Race's translation of 'upon the obscure and the famous,' as this follows the sense conveyed in the following line: 'yet honour belongs to those whose fair story a god exalts after they die' (τιμὰ δὲ γίνεταί ᾧν θεὸς ἀβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων). The latter implicitly emphasises the importance of poetic commemoration, which is more aptly expressed through the dichotomy of fame and obscurity than that of being glorious and inglorious.

The hospitable Delphians were exceedingly grieved,  
but he had paid his debt to destiny, for it was necessary  
that within that most ancient precinct  
one of the royal Aiakidai remain ever after  
beside the god's well-walled temple, to dwell there  
as a rightful overseer of processions honouring heroes with  
many sacrifices.

When it comes to his just renown, three words will  
suffice:  
no lying witness presides over his accomplishments.

Aegina, I am emboldened to say

that for the splendid achievements

of your offspring and Zeus' there is a royal road of words  
stretching from your home;

Of indeterminate date, *Nem. 7* was written for Sogenes of Aegina, victor in the boys' pentathlon. Currie suggests that the location of the ode's first performance may have been the Aeginetan thearion, (a proposal supported by Fearn).<sup>48</sup> It is a much-discussed ode, and one of the most salient features of its scholarship concerns its supposed relationship with *Paeon 6*. According to the 'apology theory,'<sup>49</sup> since Neoptolemos is presented in unfavourable terms in *Paeon 6*, whereas in *Nem. 7* he is

---

<sup>48</sup> Currie (2005): 338–339; Fearn (2011): 195.

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion of the apology theory, see Rutherford (2001): 321–323.

cast in a more positive light, the former served to redress the negative portrayal in the latter. This theory relies on *Paeon* 6 preceding *Nem.* 7 and on the listeners actually perceiving the hero's portrayal in the former as negative. I am in agreement with Bruno Currie that the apology theory is unconvincing.<sup>50</sup>

Lines 30–52 are of interest here because, like *Pyth.* 6.1–18, they discuss a journey to Delphi. Below I will explore how, through recounting the life of Neoptolemos and his travels, the laudator proposes a special relationship between the ancient hero and present-day Aegina, and at the same time construes the ideal relationship between the present-day outstanding individual, Sogenes, and the listening community.

With the words, ‘yet honour belongs to those whose fair story a god exalts after they die. As a helper, then, I have come to the great navel of the broad-bosomed earth.’ (τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται / ᾧν θεὸς ἄβρον αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων. / βοαθοῶν τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου / μόλον χθονός.) the laudator creates the expectations that the audience are about to hear such a story (as a ‘helper’ the laudator positions himself as the mouthpiece of the god), and that it will concern such an outstanding individual.<sup>51</sup> Following this, in lines 34–36 we hear the first mention of Neoptolemos, who lies in Pytho’s holy ground after he sacked Priam’s city, where the Danaans also toiled. These lines synopsis the adult life of the hero, covering his performance in the arena of his greatest martial distinction, the Trojan War, and his

---

<sup>50</sup> Currie (2005): 321–330.

<sup>51</sup> I follow Race’s translation of βοαθοῶν, ‘as a helper.’ For a discussion of the three common readings of βοαθοῶν, see Most (1986). Currie (2005: 309–310), contrary to Race’s Loeb but following Most, ends the sentence immediately after βοαθοῶν, making the god the party who gives aid, whilst Neoptolemos subsequently makes the journey to Delphi (contrast Race’s ‘as a helper, then, I [the laudator] have come to the great navel of the broad-bosomed earth.’).

final resting place, the location and status of which emphasise his exceptional and divinely favoured status.

The account of the hero's journey occupies a significant space in the performance, suggesting both that the laudator took for granted the sustained attention of the listeners and that this was an individual of special interest to them. We may assume that the listeners had a ready stock of shared 'memories' of the hero that they brought to bear when they heard his name and achievements exalted, and that the wonder expressed by the laudator was intended both to rouse the sentiments of the audience and to move in sympathy with them.

Following this synoptic account of Neoptolemos' life, the laudator recounts the circuitous journey from Troy to Delphi across lines 36–49. This account, for all it describes a long and irregular route, is methodical, starting at the hero's point of departure from Troy and following him past Skyros to Ephyra, then from Molossia, where he was briefly king, to Delphi, where he meets his end in a quarrel over sacrificial meats. As in *Pyth.* 6.1–18 (where the listeners journey to the treasury of hymns), this account, with its descriptions of Neoptolemos' wanderings, his kingship and his journey to the god, prompt the listeners to detach themselves from the space of the performance and relocate themselves elsewhere. Unlike *Pyth.* 6, however, they are not explicitly asked to imagine *themselves* in a state of momentum. Rather, they are asked to imagine the movement of a third party, Neoptolemos. Moreover, through the imagery the laudator prompts the listeners to detach themselves from the time of the performance and situate themselves in the distant past. This stimulates a different sort of engagement from the one that we saw in *Pyth.* 6. It conjures a world that is

distinct from the one that the listeners were familiar with from their direct experience, and places them in one whose familiarity, though doubtless strong, was based on their experience of myth, and which was temporally remote. Aside from the faculties of association that were put to constant use in the oral poetic culture of the early fifth century, the depiction of the world of Neoptolemos, i.e. that of Homeric heroes (a theme that we will discuss in more detail below), was ubiquitous in Ancient Greek visual media. It comprised scenes from myth painted on pots and ceramic articles; stories told through other kinds of oral performance, as well as the marble and bronze statuary that adorned sanctuaries and public places, and for which heroic exploit was a principal source of inspiration. It would, in other words, have been accessible to the listeners through a collective material and performative culture.

In construing the account of Neoptolemos from Troy to Delphi, then, the laudator could take for granted the associative powers of the listeners and the necessary cultural knowledge necessary to construct what is a visually complex set of scenes. Lines 30–52 not only demanded that the audience mentally detach themselves from the here and now of the performance and relocated themselves to the world of heroes, deep in the mythical past, but also that they move from one place to another within that world. This movement was part of the imagery itself. The preface in lines 33–36, with its synoptic account of the hero who lies in Pytho's holy ground, having sacked Troy, gave both the initial and the terminal point of the journey that followed. As they subsequently listened to the detailed account of these travels in lines 36–49, the audience imparted a sense of momentum not only to Neoptolemos, but to their own mental experience of his journey. This momentum, with its greater sense of

immersion in another place and time than we saw in *Pyth.* 6, and which followed the movements of a third party, was what we might call ‘vicarious momentum.’

In order to understand the significance of lines 34–49, it is important not simply to examine the fact that the audience conjured this momentum in their minds, but to consider what the experience of their doing so would have been, and how it would have informed their sense of the relationship of the outstanding individual, Sogenes, to the listening community.

It seems reasonable, then, to assume that the listeners were familiar with the life of Neoptolemos and his journey to Delphi, and that in imagining it they were, in effect, retreading a well-known course. Indeed, it is this sense of familiarity that lent power to the imagery itself. But by relocating to the mythical past and moving with their great hero on a familiar journey to the great religious site of Delphi in order to reach the tomb of that hero, the listeners were undertaking a movement that was processional in nature.

As I have discussed, procession was a phenomenon that was ubiquitous across the Greek world, and had become, by the fifth century, a fundamental mode of a community’s self-expression. It allowed a *polis* to delineate its physical and social boundaries and, in doing so, to consolidate the relationships that prevailed amongst its citizens. It was an activity that was, in its most important aspect, religious in nature (i.e. it had a cosmic significance that reconciled the vested interests of mortals and gods in the community). The religious significance of the momentum the listeners are asked to imagine across lines 36–49 is suggested by the fact that the destination of

their movement is the *holy ground* at Delphi, where the hero now rests and oversees processions. Currie discusses these words with regard to historical processions,<sup>52</sup> suggesting that Sogenes himself may have been honoured with them.<sup>53</sup> This is an interesting idea, though from the perspective of the audience, the processional movement that would have suggested itself with most immediacy was the one that they made in their minds as they listened to the performance.

Neoptolemos' life is an unsettled one, and the story told here is of a transient hero who wanders without a fixed *oikos*. His time on Ephyra is mentioned without elaboration, though it is prompted by his abortive attempt to return to his original home on Skyros. The subsequent time spent on Molossia sees him establish a stable royal line, but with his departure for Delphi we know that he will once again be permanently detached from this new-found *oikos* too. This sense of transience and continual departure from *oikoi* would have informed the listeners' response to lines 43–47. The latter comprise the opening of the third strophe, which begins after Delphians strike Neoptolemos in anger and thus end the laudator's account of his life. Though the killers were grieved, in dying at Delphi Neoptolemos paid his debt to destiny, and now dwells forever in the ancient precinct as one of the royal Aiakidai. The hero's death has been interpreted by Carey as "a necessary antecedent to his lasting glory."<sup>54</sup> This is probably correct, though here I will consider it from a different perspective. In describing Neoptolemos' lying in the ground beside the god's

---

<sup>52</sup> See Currie (2005): 296–301, where he proposes the historicity of a Delphic cult of Neoptolemos at the start of his analysis of the passage. If this proposal is accurate, then it may well have had a bearing on the audience's response to the imagery. I argue here that despite the references to cult, the account of how Neoptolemos came to oversee processions at Delphi is, as a piece of poetic performance, *sui generis*, and does not have to be viewed through the lens of cult. In other words, I do not interpret the passage with reference to the features of a historical cult. (deleted everything that followed this)

<sup>53</sup> Currie (2005) 307–321.

<sup>54</sup> Carey (1981): 153.

temple, the laudator uses οἰκεῖν, which in this context is best translated as ‘dwell.’<sup>55</sup> By this reading the third strophe provides a strong contrast to the account of Neoptolemos’ life in the previous nine lines. In effect, the movement of the audience in their minds ends when the wanderings of the hero cease. In dwelling forever in the ground of the sanctuary, the hero has effectively found a new and permanent *oikos*. The listeners, having heard the account of his transient life, passing from one *oikos* to another before finally fulfilling his destiny by ‘dwelling’ forever in the ground at Delphi, would, I argue, have seen this space in the sanctuary, in contrast to the spaces he passed through on his journey, as Neoptolemos’ permanent *oikos*.

Let us consider the qualities of this *oikos*. Other than the unusual nature of its situation and establishment, the laudator seems to have encouraged one aspect in particular to stand out in the listeners’ minds: the fact that this was the *oikos* of a mythical hero. This is suggested by his description of Neoptolemos’ status as occupant as κρείων (line 45: κρεόντων) and θεμισκόπος.<sup>56</sup> The first word is translated by Race as ‘royal’ (and also used in *Pyth.* 8.99 for ‘King’ Aiakos).<sup>57</sup> Given its attachment to the Aiakidai, the mythical royal house of Aegina, this is a sensible reading, the word seemingly used to stake an Aeginetan claim to the hero. It bears another aspect, however, as it can also mean ‘lordly,’ which has strong Homeric overtones. It is used to describe Agamemnon in the *Iliad*, conveying his status as ruler.<sup>58</sup> In conjuring up their associations with the term, the listeners would have

<sup>55</sup> Race’s Loeb translation, ‘remain,’ implies that the hero occupied the space. I argue that Neoptolemos’ occupancy would have had connotations of habitation.

<sup>56</sup> Currie (2005: 299) says of the *Nem.* 7.34–5 and 44–7 that “The elucidation of Pindar’s text is critical here. Everything hinges on the interpretation of 46–47 ἡροῖαίς ... πομπᾶς / θεμισκόπον, for which two translations are possible.” He notes that “the element θεμι(σ)- elsewhere in Pindar means ‘in accordance with Right.’”

<sup>57</sup> Slater (1969: 289–290) translates κρέων as ‘royal, king.’

<sup>58</sup> E.g. *Hom. Il.* 1.102.

looked, not to the experiences of their own lives and society, but to the social norms that conditioned the conduct of warriors in Greek epic. In this world, power and authority were vested in individuals such as Agamemnon, who exercised it through networks of prestige, patronage and personal loyalty. In Homeric communities the nexus of a lord's power was his *oikos*, which acted as the space in which law, justice and other forms of social authority were exercised. This role is further suggested by the word θεμισκόπος, which Race translates as 'rightful.' Liddell and Scott translate the word as 'seeing to law and justice,' which I believe comes closest to the sense conveyed by the passage.<sup>59</sup> In this aspect it is highly commensurate with the description of Neoptolemos as a κρείων, one who exercises personal right over law and justice. In its use in the context of lines 43–48 it expresses Neoptolemos' role as overseer of heroic processions to the sanctuary, creating an inextricable tie to the physical space that is his *oikos* and to the exercise of just authority.

To summarise my argument so far, then, I have proposed that the imagery of Neoptolemos' journey to Delphi would have been experienced in the minds of the listeners as an emotionally charged narrative that had strong connotations of processional movement. I argued that the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, the end point of this movement, was depicted in such a way as to encourage the listeners to think of it as the *oikos* of Neoptolemos, and in this light to associate the space with the trappings of social authority redolent of the *oikoi* of Homeric heroes.

---

<sup>59</sup> Note Slater's translation (1969: 232): 'watching over by divine ordinance.'

**How would this have influenced the audience's conception of the relationship between the victor and the listening community?**

By moving across physical space, processions laid claim to it, consolidating the collective impression that it not only belonged to the community, but defined it.<sup>60</sup> Large *polis* processions would thus often move from the city to the country, travelling past significant points on the way before reaching their destination, which would usually be a sanctuary or other sacred place. In doing so, they would often cover large distances. One aspect that lent power to processions was their sense of ritual repetition, that the same path had been travelled for generations, or even time immemorial, and that by doing so once again an ancient stake in the space was reaffirmed. Though I have not argued that the account of Neoptolemos' journey, encouraged in the minds of the listeners, was literally a procession, I do propose that in its movement and in the associations it would have prompted in the minds of the audience it had a corollary function. The story of Neoptolemos' journey would have lent to the account a ritualistic sense of repetition. We may assume that the audience were familiar with the life story of one of their great heroes, and that the account given by the laudator in *Nem.* 7 was not new to them. This familiarity would have lent itself to a sense that, in imagining the movement of the hero's ship across the sea and from island to island, they were retreading a well-worn path. The implications of this ritualised repetition, creating a processional sense of movement, would, I argue, have

---

<sup>60</sup> For the political implications of cultic claims to space, see Hall (1995: 577–613); de Polignac (1984); Osborne (1994: 143–60). For a discussion of processions that take place beyond the boundaries of the *polis*, see Parker's discussion of the Pythais to Delphi (2005: 83–87).

encouraged a renewed sense of the collective stake in the hero's life; a sense that Neoptolemos was one of their own, in whose glory they all partook.<sup>61</sup>

Kurke has argued that the glory of a victor could be shared by the community through the cultural poetics of epinician performance.<sup>62</sup> In the case of *Nem.* 7, casting the end point of the procession, the sanctuary at Delphi, as Neoptolemos' *oikos*, however, took this further, summoning associations between Neoptolemos' *oikos* and his role as the centre of social authority. By making the *oikos* a part of the procession, it was in effect assimilated to the collective identity of the community. In essence, through the processional nature of the imagery the social primacy that was inherent in the *oikos* of the mythical κρείων was appropriated by the listening community.<sup>63</sup> The hero may oversee processions, but within the context of the performance the social primacy of his *oikos* is placed in the hands of the listeners. This had important implications for the way in which the listening audience viewed their relationship with the victor. The passage emphasised to them that it was they, the listening community, that was socially dominant rather than an individual. This makes good sense in the socio-historical context of Aegina in the first half of the fifth century. As I have discussed, it seems that amongst the elite families who comprised the ruling class of Aeginetan society at this time none was dominant like the Emmenidai were at Akragas.

---

<sup>61</sup> Most (1981): 173: "Neoptolemos is thus discovered to be representative as an individual for the race of the Aeacids as a whole, and at the same time that race is honoured as a group by its association with Delphi."

<sup>62</sup> Kurke (1993: 137): "I propose that we understand epinician *kudos* as the civic adaptation of its Homeric precursor, with the city replacing the Homeric king as beneficiary of the victor's *kudos*."

<sup>63</sup> Pavlou (2011) discusses the victory odes' ability "to weld the fragmented, finite and profane human time with the 'sacred'" (Pavlou, 2011: 76).

This passage is exemplary, articulating and reinforcing a principle that would have been held by the audience about the nature of glory and commemoration. Being set within a performance dedicated to an individual, Sogenes, it bore weight on how the audience ought to see him, speaking to their expectations and culturally determined assumptions in order to create a model of praise. In the context of a commemorative poem the idea that social primacy belongs to the listening community rather than any of its members is highly significant. It qualified the glory that Sogenes could expect to receive, creating limits for it that were different from those constraining the Emmenidai at Akragas.

**Lines 50–52:**

Having declared that Neoptolemos, from his *oikos* in the sanctuary, presides over heroic processions, the laudator directs his attention to the community. Addressing Aegina directly at the start of line 52, he makes the following declaration:

Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ' ἐκ-  
γόνων θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἶπεῖν  
  
φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὀδὸν κυρίαν<sup>64</sup> λόγων  
  
οἴκοθεν

---

<sup>64</sup> Janko (1991) has proposed that *κυρίαν* be read as *μυρίαν*, based on the fact that there is no supporting parallel for *ὀδὸν κυρίαν* in the rest of the Pindaric corpus. I do not find this argument convincing. The use of *κυρίαν* does not appear to cause conflict within the passage, grammatically or otherwise, and shows no sign of corrupted transmission. I can see no reason, therefore, to impose a common denominator from elsewhere in the corpus onto a unique verse. Here I treat *κυρίαν* as being what the laudator intended to say.

Aegina, I am emboldened to say  
that for the splendid achievements  
of your offspring and Zeus' there is a royal road of words  
stretching from your home.

In addressing Aegina, the laudator removes the focus from Neoptolemos and his story and turns to the listeners. The offspring of Aegina and Zeus refers to the contemporary Aeginetan victors and the Aeginetan heroes. There are two layers of meaning to the use of 'offspring of Aegina.' The first is that those who win victory at the games today, such as Sogenes, are cast under the label of Aegina's children. Though the victory was Sogenes', it is as a child of Aegina that he treads the path of song, which in lines 31–32 the laudator describes as the means by which honour is attained. Implicitly casting Sogenes as the offspring of Aegina would, in this case, have been particularly resonant with the young man's status as a youth. Leslie Kurke has argued convincingly that one of the most important social functions of commemorative songs for victorious athletes was to revitalise the social standing of the athlete's *oikos*.<sup>65</sup> By casting athletes as the offspring of Aegina in an ode commemorating a boy victor, the listeners would have construed his glory as enriching that of the entire community. The second sense to the metaphor is that it would not only apply to those who won victory at the games, but to all those who

---

<sup>65</sup> Kurke (1991a): chapter 1. See also Kurke (1991b).

listened to the ode. By lines 50–52 the listening community have just jointly travelled the glorious road of words with the son of Achilles on his journey to Delphi. Together, I have argued, they have laid a collective claim to the hero's glory and his heroic social primacy. Whilst including Sogenes, then, 'offspring of Aegina' would also encompass the listening community as a whole.

This interpretation is further supported by the laudator's use of οἴκοθεν in line 52, indicating that the road of words runs from 'your' (Aegina's) home. This I understand as referring to the common home of the Aeginetans, the island itself. It is the shared home both of the community as a whole and the victorious athlete, and is the starting point of the journey along the road of words that leads to glory. This strongly resonates the processional movement that I have examined above. When the listeners heard this passage, it would have echoed the journey that they had just collectively embarked on alongside their hero. It would have confirmed a sense that they were all children of Aegina, and that by processing down the road of song to the holy ground of Neoptolemos' *oikos*, the glory generated from victory would enrich that of their island *oikos*.

The underlying message of *Nem.* 7.30–52, then, seems to be that, unlike at Akragas, social primacy at Aegina resided with the listening community rather than the glorious individual. It is that the glory of individuals, whether mythical like Neoptolemos or contemporary like Sogenes, is encompassed within the collective purview of the community. This message is not spelt out explicitly. Instead, as I have shown, the laudator uses imagery calculated to mobilise the sentiments of the listeners, to rouse them to a state of high emotion as they remembered a shared myth

and to recast that myth as a journey they all took part in. The force of sentiment that this journey evoked lent force to the social model that is evident from other sources, and which I have discussed above: that at Aegina no family or individual was dominant, and that authority was shared amongst a number of kinship groups. This organising feature of Aeginetan elite society is strongly resonant in *Nem.* 7.30–52. On hearing the passage, the listeners, Sogenes, his family and peers alike would have had their expectations about the nature of commemorated glory reinforced, consolidating the terms under which the laudator's praise was received in the rest of the ode. In subsequent chapters I will use this approach to examine other odes, discussing the laudator's manipulation of these sentiments and the relationships they engendered.

In this chapter I have examined two passages where images of Delphi and a sense of processional movement encouraged the audiences to detach themselves from the circumstances of the performance and mentally place themselves outside their own community. I discussed how this was designed to evoke certain sentiments in each audience and how these sentiments affected the listening community's perception of the patron.

In the case of the Akragantine audience, who were transported directly to Delphi with the opening of the ode, I argued that this movement would have encouraged them to tap into the special modes of behaviour and cultural assumptions associated with that space. These comprised a sense that they were observing a treasury that was meant to convey a message to the whole Greek world; that such a structure was a collective expression of effort made on behalf of the ruling family, and that their

presence at Delphi should engender a heightened sense of respect and solemnity. These expectations were utilised by the laudator to engender a specific response to the praise for Xenocrates and his family: that through his victory he had generated glory; that it was shared to an extent with the listening community, though to a much greater degree with the rest of the ruling family. This relationship, I argue, reflected the fact that the Emmenidai's status at Akragas was one in which they had a disproportionately great share of the social capital. This would have been in accordance with the assumptions of the audience, including the patron, his family and the attendees who were not family members. As such, it should be seen as forming the terms under which praise for Xenocrates and his family was received by the listening community, and consequently should inform our understanding of the type of relationships that the praise for the patron and his son engendered in the minds of the listeners.

In the case of the Aeginetan audience, the processional narrative of Neoptolemos' life encouraged them to think of the hero as having made his *oikos* next to the god's temple in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi. I argued that by making his *oikos* the final point in a road of words that led from their island home, the listeners would have been encouraged to assume a collective purview over the traditional social primacy associated with a hero's *oikos*. The result of this was that the sentiment engendered in the audience and consolidated through lines 50–52 would have been commensurate to a relationship between listening community and patron that was quite different from that which I proposed in the case of *Pyth*. 6. It was one in which the patron is not mentioned and where the listening community is the focus. It portrays the latter as having a collective primacy over the glory generated both by a mythical hero and

contemporary athletes. As with *Pyth.* 6, I argued that this set of assumptions cultivated in the minds of the listeners in lines 30–52 would have reflected the Aeginetan audience’s disposition towards the commemoration of individual excellence, and would have set the tone for how they responded to praise for Sogenes. I propose that the terms of glorious fame set out in these lines should form the basis of our understanding of the ode’s praise.

Though similar types of imagery are used in each ode, the terms under which they encourage the audience to respond to the laudator’s praise is strikingly different. The use of Delphic imagery, procession and sanctuary space in *Pyth.* 6 and *Nem.* 7 consolidated relationships between the patron, his family and the listening community that are substantially different at Akragas from those at Aegina. The nature and extent of these differences, however, are highly complex. Although in *Pyth.* 6 the listening community partake in the glory generated by the victory ode for Xenocrates, it is he and his family who have by far the greater share, and this reflects their share of social capital at Akragas. This conclusion, however, hides certain important aspects of the epinician performances, which I will explore below. In the following section I will compare *Pyth.* 6 to another Akragantine ode: *Isth.* 2. In doing so I will provide a more nuanced analysis of the relationship between the Emmenidai and the listening community, exploring how the latter depended on the former to secure lasting fame. In doing so, I will examine a second, corollary theme that will run through my thesis: though the odes for Akragas and Aegina suggest different types of relationship between the victorious family and the listening community at the *social* level, in both cases the relationship between family and community at the *performative* level was, in many respects, similar.

## Family, Duty and Expectation: A Case for the Joint Performance of Pindar's

### Isth. 2 and Pyth. 6.<sup>66</sup>

#### Isth. 2:

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ᾧ Θρασύβουλε,  
φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων  
ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαι-  
νον κλυτᾶ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,  
ρίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,  
ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας  
εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν.

Ἄ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδῆς  
πῶ τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις,  
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-  
αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας  
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰοδαί.  
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τῶργείου φυλάξαι  
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <υ>-> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,

“χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ”

ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεῖς καὶ φίλων.

---

<sup>66</sup> The work in this section of the thesis, as well as that of pages 186–201, forms the basis of an article that is forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*, entitled “Family, Duty and Expectation: A Case for the Joint Performance of Pindar's Isthmian 2 and Pythian 6” (DOI: 10.1163/156852512X585160).

ἔσσι γὰρ ὦν σοφός, οὐκ ἄγνωτ' αἰίδω

Ἴσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,

τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις,

Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμα

πέμπεν ἀναδειῖσθαι σελίνων,

εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων,

Ἄκραγαντίνων φάος.

ἐν Κρίσῃ δ' εὐρυσθενῆς

εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν

καὶ τόθι κλειναῖς <τ'> Ἐρεχθιδᾶν χαρίτεσσι

ἀραρώς

ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθη

ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός,

τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν

νεῖμ' ἀπάσαις ἀνίαις,

ὄν τε καὶ κάρυκες ὦ-

ρᾶν ἀνέγγνον, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα

Ζητὸς Ἄλεῖοι, παθόντες πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον,

ἀδυπνώω τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾶ

χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας

γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν,

τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὀλυμπίου Διός

ἄλσος, ἴν' ἀθανάτοις Αἰησιδάμου  
παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν.  
καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνώτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι  
οὔτε κώμων, ᾧ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν,  
οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν.

οὐ γὰρ πάγος οὐδὲ προσάντης  
ἅ κέλευθος γίνεται,  
εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀν-  
δρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἐλικωνιάδων.  
μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', ὅσον

ὄργαν  
Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν  
ἔσχεν. αἰδοῖός μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὀμιλεῖν,

ἵπποτροφίας τε νομίζων  
ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ,  
καὶ θεῶν δαΐτας προσέ-  
πτυκτο πάσας, οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν  
οὔρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἰστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν,  
ἀλλ' ἐπέρα ποτὶ μὲν Φᾶσιν θερείαις,  
ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι πλέων Νείλου πρὸς ἄκτάν.

μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ  
θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,

μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώαν,  
μηδὲ τούσδ' ὕμνους, ἐπεὶ τοι  
οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.  
ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν  
ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον ἔλθῃς.

(*Isth.* 2.1–48)

The men of long ago, O Thrasyboulos,  
who used to mount  
the chariot of the golden-wreathed Muses,  
taking with them the golden lyre,  
freely shot their honey-sounding hymns of love  
at any boy who was beautiful and had the sweetest bloom  
of late summer that woos fair-throned Aphrodite.

For at that time the Muse was not yet  
greedy for gain nor up for hire,  
nor were sweet, soft-voiced songs  
with their faces silvered over being sold  
from the hand of honey-voiced Terpsichore.  
But now she bids us heed the Argive's adage,  
which comes closest to the truth:

'Money, money makes the man,'

said he who lost his possessions and friends as well.

But enough, for you are wise. Not unknown is

the Isthmian chariot victory that I sing,

which Poseidon granted to Xenocrates,

and sent a crown of Dorian parsley

for him to bind upon his hair,

thus honouring the man of fine chariots,

a light to the people of Akragas.

In Krisa mighty Apollo

beheld him and gave him splendour

there too; and when he gained the glorious favour of

Erechtheus' descendants

in shining Athens, he had no cause to blame

the chariot-preserving hand, which the horse-striking

man

Nikomachos applied fittingly

to all the reins

and whom the heralds of the seasons also recognised,

the Elian truce-bearers of Kronos' son Zeus,

undoubtedly having experienced some act of hospitality,

and they welcomed him with a sweetly-breathing voice,

when he fell on the knees of golden victory

in their land,

the one men call Olympian Zeus'

sanctuary. There the sons of Akinesidamos

were joined to immortal honours.

And so, your family houses are not unfamiliar

with delightful victory revels, O Thrasyboulos,

nor with songs of honey-sweet acclaim.

For there is no hill

nor is the road steep,

when one brings the honours of the Helikonian maidens

to the homes of famous men.

May I make a long throw with the discus and cast the

javelin as far as

Xenocrates surpassed all men with his sweet disposition.

He was respectful in the company of his townspeople,

he practiced horse-breeding

in the Panhellenic tradition,

and welcomed all the feasts

of the gods. And never did an oncoming wind

cause him to furl his sails at his hospitable table,

but he would travel to Phasis in the summer seasons,

while in the winter he would sail to the shore of the Nile.

Therefore, since envious hopes  
hang about the minds of mortals,  
let the son never keep silent his father's excellence  
nor these hymns, for I truly  
did not fashion them to remain stationary.  
Impart these words to him, Nikasippos,  
when you visit my honourable host.

Death leads to change. When, sometime around 470 B.C., Xenocrates died, change was inevitable both for his son, Thrasyboulos, and for the community of Akragas in which he had been so prominent.<sup>67</sup> *Isth. 2* addresses Thrasyboulos' need that the change caused by the death of Xenocrates should take place in the 'right' way, i.e. in accordance with the interests of his deceased father, himself and the wider family.<sup>68</sup> The date of *Isth. 2* falls around the time of the death of Theron, ruler of Akragas, after which Diodorus Siculus notes that the city entered a period of discord under the tyrannical rule of his son, Thrasydaeus.<sup>69</sup> *Isth. 2*, then, would seem to have been performed at a turbulent moment in Akragantine history, when the standing of the ruling family, the Emmenidai, was nearing its end and social upheaval loomed.

---

<sup>67</sup> The fact that *Isth. 2* refers to Xenocrates in the past tense throughout would seem to indicate that he was dead at the time of the performance.

<sup>68</sup> Currie (2005: 34) notes that *Isth. 2* (as well as *Isth. 8* and *Ol. 2*) exhibits features characteristic of dirges.

<sup>69</sup> Diod. Sic. 11.53.1–4. We cannot know the precise context of the first performance of *Isth. 2*, though it seems reasonable to suppose that it debuted at a symposium. Such a gathering would presumably not have been open to the general public, but to those of similarly high rank in Akragantine society to Thrasyboulos and Xenocrates. Further to this, see Morrison (2007): 41 and 82.

Like Pyth. 6, *Isth. 2*'s debut performance was probably made before an audience of Thrasyboulos' high-ranking peers. The price of failing to marshal their sentiments in favour of his position would have been to undermine their memories of Xenocrates, their high regard for Thrasyboulos and, consequently, the standing of the latter and his family. Given the turbulent social climate, such loss of standing would not only have been socially damaging but potentially dangerous.

In this section I argue that *Isth. 2*'s epode (lines 43–48) articulates the social utility of the ode, its brevity belying a complex interplay of duty and expectation between Thrasyboulos and the listeners. In the epode, the poet articulates the duty that Thrasyboulos owes to his father; what he can expect for carrying it out, and the risks he runs by not doing so. At the same time it makes a strong statement about the function of epinician performance in reconciling the audience to the advancement of Thrasyboulos' social interests. I argue that the epode specifically cites *Isth. 2* as part of a performative programme that encourages the audience to consolidate their impression of Xenocrates' former glory, transfer it to Thrasyboulos and, at the same time, to dismiss the envious hopes that might threaten it. I treat the epode as comprising *Isth. 2*'s 'agenda,' where the social and performative expectations held of the ode are laid out.<sup>70</sup> In the first part of this section I will discuss how this agenda is articulated, and, through an examination of lines 12–32, consider its implications for our understanding of the ode.

The subject of reperformance has recently attracted considerable scholarly interest. In general, studies examine how reperformance occasioned changes in the

---

<sup>70</sup> See Nagy (1990: 8–9) for a discussion of the notion that, in performance, word is action and the application of speech-act theory to Archaic Greek poetics. As I will discuss, the fact of stating the ode's agenda in *Isth. 2.43–48* actually serves to advance it.

reception of an ode, and thus affected its transmission and dissemination.<sup>71</sup> Morrison applies the concept of primary, secondary, tertiary and overlapping audiences to his analyses of the Sicilian odes.<sup>72</sup> I wish to add to this discussion by considering the possibility of *Pyth.* 6 being reperformed at the first performance of *Isth.* 2. In doing so, I will argue that such a reperformance would have been highly commensurate with the expectations expressed in the epode of *Isth.* 2, and would have greatly advanced the latter's agenda.

### **Till death do us part?**

Xenocrates' death did not terminate his relationship with Thrasyboulos, but altered the terms under which it continued.<sup>73</sup> The poet addresses the nature of their continuing relationship in the epode. Here, after a sustained volley of praise in the preceding thirty lines, the emphasis actually shifts away from Xenocrates. The poet points, in lines 43–45, to men who harbour envious hopes (φθονεραὶ ἐλπίδες), and says that because of them Thrasyboulos must safeguard his ἀρετὰν πατρώαν and τούσδ' ὕμνους. By juxtaposing these terms, the poet emphasises the dependency of a man's ἀρετή (glory) on its commemoration through song. He ensures that Xenocrates' ἀρετή lives on in the memory of the community thanks to the long encomium of lines 12–42. There he directs the audience to recapitulate mentally Xenocrates' great achievements, and thus renew their impression of his fame and

---

<sup>71</sup> See Currie (2004: 49–69); Hubbard (2004: 71–93); Carey (2007: 199–210), and Morrison (2007 and 2011: 227–253). A notable exception to this trend is found in Pfeijffer (1999: 10), where the first performance is considered to be the most important from the perspective of modern interpretation.

<sup>72</sup> Morrison (2007): 19–23.

<sup>73</sup> Morrison (2007: 89) notes of *Pyth.* 6 that the aim of the ode “is in fact to present Thrasyboulos differently.” Below I explore implications of this with regard to the altered status of father and son.

glory whilst consolidating the fact of his death. By urging Thrasyboulos in lines 44–45 never to let either this glory or this commemorative song fall into silence, the poet credits him with a special responsibility for maintaining this ἀρετή, and says that the way to fulfill this is by continuously restaging epinician performances.<sup>74</sup>

Responsibility for the *post mortem* commemoration of a father’s name and ἀρετή was one of the most serious duties of a son. To carry it out was a reflection of the closeness that was ideally expected to exist between the two. This sense of closeness was underpinned by a nexus of filial duties and expectations. In Archaic aristocratic culture the ἀρετή of a son was highly dependent on that which had been held by his father and predecessors. A man was born with a ‘stock’ of honour, a sense of greatness that members of his community associated with him on account of his membership of a great family or kinship line.<sup>75</sup> By carrying out appropriate funerary rites and maintaining constant ritual commemoration, a son could keep the awareness of his father’s glory-generating achievements alive in the collective memory of the community.<sup>76</sup> Success in carrying out his duty of care of his father’s *post mortem* public image was thus hugely important in influencing the community’s perceptions of a son’s honour.

In line 44, the poet describes the ἀρετή won by Xenocrates (and commemorated through the encomium) as ἀρετάν πατρώαν. This expression

---

<sup>74</sup> Line 46, which declares οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν, implies that not only are Pindar’s odes meant to travel far and wide, unlike statues, but also that they are meant to be repeated indefinitely. Thrasyboulos’ duty to honour his father publicly through song was a life-long one.

<sup>75</sup> This was his φύα, or his ‘inherent excellence.’ For a discussion of φύα see Rose (1992): 159–163.

<sup>76</sup> For a different angle on the role of the son in maintaining the memory of a father, see Kurke (1991b: 290), for the argument that a son’s name locates a man’s identity “at the intersection of his obligations to the past and to the future. Both these obligations constitute individual identity as an aspect of family continuity.”

encapsulates Thrasyboulos’ new relationship with the now deceased Xenocrates, and the duties incumbent on him as a result. Nisetich has argued that it conveys a sense that Xenocrates’ glory is “inherited” by Thrasyboulos, on whom “its survival in this ode and in life now depends.”<sup>77</sup> By this reading, ἀρετάν πατρῶαν suggests that Thrasyboulos has an entitlement to the glory won by his father during the latter’s lifetime and that, moreover, he must uphold that entitlement himself.<sup>78</sup> As I will explore below, in the long encomium to Xenocrates in lines 12–42 the poet tapped into and rekindled the audience’s thoughts of Xenocrates’ ἀρετή. The audience’s response to the poet’s urge that Thrasyboulos should never keep silent his ἀρετάν πατρῶαν or τούσδ’ ὕμνους would have been to recast Xenocrates’ living glory as Thrasyboulos’ ancestral glory. The basis of this was the audience’s perception of the closest possible ties between father and son. It is this, as much as the consequent passage of honour between them, that the mention of ἀρετάν πατρῶαν was designed to evoke in the listeners.

The relationship of Thrasyboulos to his father, and the duties that it entailed, would have been well-known to the audience before the performance of *Isth.* 2. Why, then, did the poet choose to articulate them in lines 44–45, and what would the cost have been to Thrasyboulos of not doing so? The answer can be found in line 43. There envious hopes are said to hang about the hearts of mortals (φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες), which, the poet explains, is why Thrasyboulos must

---

<sup>77</sup> Nisetich (1977: 147). Nisetich uses the term “ancestral” ἀρετή. This reading, however, is opposed by Verdenius, who reads πατρῶαν as “paternal,” and thus conveying no sense of entitlement on the part of Thrasyboulos (Verdenius 1982: 34).

<sup>78</sup> Nisetich (1977: 151). The readiness of the listeners to accept such a meaning would have been dependent on their own cultural assumptions surrounding death, inheritance and filial duty, and these in turn would have been substantially conditioned by their social class. If the audience consisted of Thrasyboulos’ aristocratic peers (of which more below), then it would seem likely that they would have been willing to accept the notion that a man inherited a significant proportion of his honour, i.e. that that honour was πατρῶος.

never keep silent his ἀρετάν πατρῶαν or τούσδ' ὕμνους. These mortals comprise a group of unknown size whose common feature is their envy of Thrasyboulos' ancestral ἀρετή. Following von der Mühl, Nisetich sees these mortals as a typical Pindaric topos; an “epinician commonplace,” rather than a reference to a real group.<sup>79</sup> He argues that their inclusion rhetorically strengthens the poet's advice to Thrasyboulos that he should not keep his father's glory in silence and, at the same time, praises Thrasyboulos for carrying out that advice. Verdenius, however, argued that this expression highlights the threat that envy represented to the greatness of victors and poets, and that it may be neutralised “through emphasising the trustworthiness of his [the poet's] report and the originality of his art.”<sup>80</sup> Rivalry was a prominent feature of Greek society, and he notes that, in this context, there was a strong necessity “of maintaining and augmenting one's κλέος.” Verdenius recognised that the mention of envious mortals was more than simply an “epinician commonplace.” For him, it expressed a recognition that glory had not only to be maintained, but publicly defended through song in an environment whose highly competitive nature left one open to the danger of envious and glory-blunting detraction.

Since Xenocrates had died by the time of the performance, it is highly unlikely that he himself was the one whom these mortals envied. Instead, it would seem that Thrasyboulos was the subject of their envious hopes, since he stood to inherit Xenocrates' glory as his ancestral stock of honour. Envy, Mills argues in his analysis of Aristotelian φθόνος, is contingent on a sense of social propinquity felt by the

---

<sup>79</sup> See Nisetich (1977: 152) and Von der Mühl (1964: 170).

<sup>80</sup> Verdenius (1982: 32–33).

envious towards the envied.<sup>81</sup> Bulman sees in *Isth.* 2.43 an example of envy arising from “unrestrained desire for what belongs to others.”<sup>82</sup> If the mortals who harbour envious hopes in line 43 are a reference to a real group, their envy would have been notionally based on a sense of kinship with Xenocrates, since this would have been the basis of staking a claim to his ἀρετή, as it is for Thrasyboulos. If we assume, therefore, that these mortals based their envious hopes (whether realistic or not) on a sense of social propinquity with the deceased, then they themselves would have had to have been of the same elite social class as Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos.

If, as I have argued, the poet aimed to cast Xenocrates’ glory as Thrasyboulos’ inheritance in the minds of an elite audience, unchecked envy amongst members of the elite would have represented a significant threat to the success of the ode. Considering this, we can make sense of the fact that the epode articulates a bond of kinship between Thrasyboulos and Xenocrates that would already have been known to the audience. By doing so, the performance itself acted as a means of neutralising the threat from potential challengers to Thrasyboulos’ position as heir. *Isth.* 2’s debut, like that of all victory odes, was performed publicly, i.e. before an audience whose ability to recall memories, construct mental imagery and make connections between the two was considerable. The poet relied on these abilities, utilising the epode to direct the listeners’ memories and sentiments towards Thrasyboulos and Xenocrates to generate the perception of a special bond between them. For Thrasyboulos, the corollary of the audience generating such a perception was to make his claim to an especially close kinship with Xenocrates, and, by extension, his filial duties and rights

---

<sup>81</sup> Mills (1985): 1–12. With reference to Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* 1386b–1388a, Mills notes the indiscriminate nature of envy, targeting even that good fortune in others that is deserved. Miller (1983: 210) notes the psychological aspect of envy in Pindar as the “malicious desire to deprive others of what is theirs.”

<sup>82</sup> Bulman (1992): 17.

of inheritance, unassailable. A popular perception that Thrasyboulos was the guarantor of his father's memory and heir to his glory was essential. It would have been no good for Thrasyboulos to praise Xenocrates' ἀρετή without publicly making it his own, nor was it worth staking a claim to it as ἀρετάν πατρῶν whilst diminishing its value through inadequate commemoration. If Thrasyboulos did not reinforce both his father's honour and his own right to inherit it by generating the strongest impression of a filial bond in the minds of the listeners, others might have put forward claims of their own, or at least have attempted to undermine his.

### **The agenda in *Isth. 2***

In lines 28–29, Xenocrates and Theron, referred to as the sons of Ainesidamos, are said to have been joined to immortal honours at Olympia (ἀθανάτοις Αἰνησιδάμου / παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν). In lines 30–32, the poet addresses Thrasyboulos. On account (καὶ γὰρ) of these τιμή-generating victories, he says, revels and acclaim are not unknown to your houses (καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνώτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι / οὔτε κώμων, ᾧ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, / οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν). This scene contains several features that are important for the advancement of *Isth. 2*'s agenda. They comprise: victory commemorated through ritualised celebrations of movement and sound (κῶμοι and ἀοιδαί); physical property as the target of such celebrations and the symbol of τιμή and κλέος, and a direct address to Thrasyboulos.

The κῶμοι and ἀοιδαί of lines 30–32 evoke the ritualised singing and dancing of victory celebrations. Such celebrations are recounted in lines 12–29, where a list of

successes forms the athletic section of Xenocrates' encomium. This list comprises his Isthmian chariot victory (lines 12–17); his victory at Krisa (line 18); his Panathenaic victory (lines 19–23), and his (and Theron's) Olympic success (lines 23–29). Given the elite status of the Emmenidai at Akragas, these achievements were undoubtedly part of the community's collective memory. They would have been familiar to every individual in the audience, either through their own direct experience of past victory celebrations (i.e. original or repeat performances of previous victory odes), or simply as a result of the great renown of the Emmenidai. Upon the retelling of these events in lines 12–29, each individual in the audience would have been stimulated to draw upon their experience (direct or otherwise) of Emmenidai victory celebrations, reactivating previous celebratory experiences in their mind.

Xenocrates' life and achievements are referred to in the past tense throughout *Isth. 2*. Thus each mention of victory not only reactivated the audience's experiences of past celebrations, but also reiterated the fact that Xenocrates was now dead. Whilst he had been alive, his honour, glory and fame would have been physically embodied in his person. After his death this was no longer the case. The emotional resonance of those victories nonetheless remained in the collective memory and was renewed in the minds of the audience through the performance. Thus the athletic encomium brought the power of Xenocrates' achievements to the forefront of the listeners' thoughts, whilst also reinforcing the fact that he was no longer in their midst. In this way the encomium preserved and reinforced Xenocrates' ἀρετή, and at the same time directed the audience to 'disembody' it from the man himself.

The construction of the encomium in lines 12–29, and its ἀρετή-disembodying effect, were of huge importance to Thrasyboulos. When, in lines 30–32, the laudator ends the athletic encomium by telling Thrasyboulos that ‘your houses are not unfamiliar with delightful victory revels nor with songs of honey-sweet acclaim,’ he refers the audience not simply to their original experiences of Xenocrates’ victory celebrations, but to the roll-call of celebrations that they have just mentally re-experienced between lines 12 and 29. By ‘gathering up’ these, now disembodied, victories in the minds of the listeners and then directing them towards the δόμοι of Thrasyboulos in lines 30–32, the poet symbolically attaches them to physical property. In his direct address to Thrasyboulos, the poet says that these properties are ὑμῶν δόμοι, literally ‘your (pl.) houses.’ Verdenius argued that the plural is a rhetorical device used for the sake of amplification.<sup>83</sup> He saw it as a means of poetically inflating the status and wealth of Thrasyboulos. Nisetich, too, reads δόμοι in the singular. He, however, persuasively argues that lines 28–32 are part of a strategy that fuses the praise for Thrasyboulos with the praise due to Xenocrates and Theron for their victories: “we scarcely notice that he [Thrasyboulos] has not the same distinction to his credit as the two ahead of him in the previous generation.”<sup>84</sup> It is clear from the direct address and the use of the possessive pronoun ‘your’ that these δόμοι belong to Thrasyboulos. The use of the plural ὑμῶν, however, is deliberately ambiguous. During their lifetimes the houses of Xenocrates and Theron would naturally have been the focus of celebrations after their respective victories. By using ὑμῶν in a direct address to Thrasyboulos immediately after an account of these

---

<sup>83</sup> Verdenius (1982): 34–35.

<sup>84</sup> Nisetich (1977): 143–144.

victories, these properties are attributed to him.<sup>85</sup> There is no way to know the extent of Thrasyboulos’ property-holdings at the time of the performance, though he would surely have become materially richer upon the death of his father. What is important here is that the *δόμοι* are *poetically* attributed to him, and through this motif Thrasyboulos becomes the living focus of the honour of his father and uncle. The plural ‘your houses’ thus serves as a conduit of honour, collapsing the distinction between father, son and uncle, and channeling the disembodied *ἀρετή* from one generation to the next. Directing the audience’s perceptions of the family in this way served to advance Thrasyboulos’ expectations of inheriting his *ἀρετάν πατρῶαν* as his ancestral right. The description of Xenocrates and Theron as *Αἰνησιδάμου παῖδες* in lines 28–29 lengthens this ancestral line to include Thrasyboulos’ grandfather, Ainesidamos, heightening the familial glory and emphasising its established lineage.

### **The agenda beyond *Isth. 2***

There is a second aspect to *Isth. 2*’s agenda. As mentioned above, in lines 44–45 the poet envisages the continual reperformance of *τούσδ’ ὕμνους*, ‘these hymns.’ Bernardini and Morrison see this as a reference to the future reperformance of *Isth. 2*.<sup>86</sup> I suggest that our understanding of this expression may be enhanced if we suppose that it is a reference both to *Isth. 2* and to other Pindaric odes composed by

---

<sup>85</sup> It may be possible to go further than this. When Xenocrates died it is likely that a substantial sum of money, land, etc. was passed down to Thrasyboulos, who would have been his next of kin. The poetic attribution of the family estate to Thrasyboulos may thus reflect reality, at least in the case of Xenocrates’ property holdings.

<sup>86</sup> Bernardini (1983: 36–37) and Morrison (2007: 13–14). By contrast, see Verdenius (1982: 34–35). The latter interprets *τούσδ’ ὕμνους* as an “amplifying plural,” which refers to *Isth. 2* alone and, in doing so, enhances the poet’s urge that the ode be repeated. Similarly, D’Alessio (2004: 286–287) sees no reference to future reperformance.

Pindar for the Emmenidai, and that these odes were to be reperformed, not in the distant future, but at the debut of *Isth. 2* itself. Prior to 470, Pindar created several such odes: *Ol. 2* and *Ol. 3* were written for Theron in honour of his Olympic chariot victory in 476, whilst *Pyth. 6* was written after Xenocrates' Pythian chariot victory in 490. Individually, the performances of these epinicia, like *Isth. 2*, publicly consolidated the glory of the family by commemorating specific athletic victories. Hearing them reperformed in conjunction with *Isth. 2*, at the latter's debut, the audience's memories of Xenocrates' athletic achievements, evoked in the encomium of *Isth. 2.12–32*, would have been more forcefully recapitulated. In re-activating their memories of these victories, the listeners would have 're-orientated' them in light of the new circumstances presented by Xenocrates' death and under the terms set out in *Isth. 2*.

Of the *τούσδ' ὕμνους* referred to in lines 44–45, *Pyth. 6* is of particular interest. Not only is this ode also addressed to Thrasyboulos, whilst commemorating Xenocrates' athletic success, but it too features the celebration of victory through movement and song and the use of property as a symbolic focus of victory and glory.<sup>87</sup> These themes are found in the first two strophes of the ode, at *Pyth. 6.1–18*. Below, I will examine the dynamics of interaction between *Pyth. 6.1–18* and *Isth. 2.12–32* under the hypothesis of joint performance at *Isth. 2*'s debut, and in relation to the agenda put forth in *Isth. 2.43–48*.

---

<sup>87</sup> Morrison (2007: 89) notes that *Isth. 2* "defined itself against the earlier *Pyth. 6*".

In the original performance of *Pyth. 6* Thrasyboulos was a youth, and thus of junior status in relation to his elders, Xenocrates and Theron.<sup>88</sup> The ode was first staged in 490, following Xenocrates' chariot victory at the Pythian games, and thus as many as twenty years elapsed between its original staging and its reperformance at the debut of *Isth. 2*.<sup>89</sup> During this time the social and cultural circumstances of Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos changed dramatically, as did their respective needs and interests.<sup>90</sup> We have seen how the opening lines of *Pyth. 6* used the audience's awareness of recent events, shared cultural knowledge and emotional state to create a sense of immediacy and joint enterprise, and that this engendered the greatest receptiveness to praise for Xenocrates (and, subsequently in the ode, Thrasyboulos). In the remainder of ode, the poet uses mythical digressions on Cheiron's teachings to Achilles as well as Antilochus' rescue of his father from death (lines 19–42); a brief encomium to Thrasyboulos' noble attributes (lines 43–49), and an address to Poseidon (lines 54) to create a poetic schema through which Thrasyboulos' glory is consolidated in the minds of the audience. This glory depended on honouring his parents, especially his father, as befitted one too young to win honour at the games himself.

The new audience would have shared the same cultural knowledge as the original listeners (and thus presumably have been just as responsive to the ode's

---

<sup>88</sup> Morrison (2007): 89–90. Observations about the youth of Thrasyboulos in *Isth. 2* have often been made as part of longstanding discussions about the possibility of erotic overtones in the epode. Amongst these, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922); Von der Mühl (1964: 168–72); Lasserre (1974); Nisetich (1980), and Kurke (1990: 85–107).

<sup>89</sup> We may presume, though, that it was not left in silence during the interval, and continuous restaging in various circumstances, and before divergent audiences, seems likely.

<sup>90</sup> Morrison distinguishes between “overlapping” and “secondary” audiences (Morrison 2007, 19–20). We cannot know the composition of the *Pyth. 6*'s audience at its reperformance at the debut of *Isth. 2*. Thrasyboulos was undoubtedly a listener in 490, and this may have been the case for many others who attended in 470. It is possible, however, that there were individuals for whom the reperformance of *Pyth. 6* was in fact their first performance. For convenience, I will refer to the audience at the 490 debut of *Pyth. 6* as the ‘original’ audience/listeners. Likewise, I will refer to the audience at the reperformance of *Pyth. 6* at the debut of *Isth. 2* as the ‘new’ audience/listeners.

Delphic imagery), and their awareness of current events would have been equally strong. This awareness, however, would have engendered a very different mood to that which prevailed in 490. For the new audience, the event that occasioned the reperformance of *Pyth.* 6 was Xenocrates' recent death. This determined the emotional state of the listeners and the emotive force that they imparted to the poetic imagery. Unlike in 490, we cannot assume that this involved a sense of jubilation and excitement. On the contrary, the tone of *Isth.* 2 suggests that a mood of dignified retrospection prevailed, which would have conditioned the audience's response to the imagery of the procession.

For the new listeners the opening command, Ἀκούσατ' ('listen!'); the use of the third person plural ἀναπολίζομεν ('we are ploughing'), and the present tense of the passage would have been immediately engaging. Day has noted that, "a ceremony or ritual could... be made repeatable through the functioning of genre in poetic performance. The "generic" force of epinician poetry consisted (at least in part) in the reactivation of ceremony."<sup>91</sup> For the new audience at the reperformance of *Pyth.* 6, the reactivated ceremony of lines 1–4 would have been, as it was for the original audience, one that had only ever been imaginary. As with the original listeners, lines 1–4 would have mentally led the new audience through Delphi and along the Sacred Way, and they too would have responded to this by imparting a sense of joint venture and immediacy to a scene that was set in a physically remote location. At a fundamental level, the listeners' reactions to the recreated images of victory and commemoration would have had the same consequences as for the original audience:

---

<sup>91</sup> Day (2000): 41.

by bringing Xenocrates' success to the forefront of their minds, they consolidated the glory and fame it generated.

For the new audience, the impression of immediacy, of being there at the time, no longer resonated the novelty of a recent victory. Xenocrates' chariot success in 490, like the life of the man himself, was now firmly in the past. This, as we have seen, is emphasised in the encomium of *Isth.* 2.12–32. In directing the new audience to imagine the procession in *Pyth.* 6.1–4, the poet used the same deictic mechanisms to take them to a place that was temporally remote in a way that it was not for the original listeners. In 490, the imagined procession brought the audience as close as possible to the place where victory had been won, and at a time when it was still new, through a relatively small mental leap into the very recent past. For the new audience, the procession prompted them to relive a moment from long ago, commemorating a victor who was now dead. The effect of the imagery was to acknowledge Xenocrates' name whilst commemorating his life, and this was carried out through a ritualised movement across a sacred space. The very sense of immediacy that had lent force to the praise in 490 now emphasised the audience's detachment, not only from the victory, but also from the victor himself. In other words, the effort of mentally removing themselves to the Delphi of twenty years earlier would have consolidated the fact of Xenocrates' death in the minds of the listeners. This process is the same as that which I discussed earlier in the case of the encomium in *Isth.* 2.12–32. There, renewing the praise of one who is dead had a disembodied effect on the glory that that praise generated. The same sense of anachronism would have been created in the minds of the new audience of *Pyth.* 6.1–4, and the disembodied of Xenocrates' glory would have been its corollary.

In lines 5–8, the audience are directed to imagine the ὕμνων θησαυρὸς (lines 5–8). This treasury of hymns was a focus of the procession and the repository of Xenocrates’ victory in the chariot race. For the original and the new listeners, the procession acted as a conduit, passing Xenocrates’ living ἀρετή to the treasury and investing it with associations of glory. This is what gave the latter its power as a symbol of victory. Now that Xenocrates’ glory was disembodied, the ὕμνων θησαυρὸς took on a very different significance for the new audience from that which it had for the audience in 490.

In his address in line 15 to Thrasyboulos (πατρὶ τεῶ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾶ), the poet no longer speaks to a youth who is dependent on his father for his honour. Instead, he speaks to an adult, whom he has already identified, in *Isth.* 2.30–32 and in *Isth.* 2.43–46, as the heir to his father’s glory. The poet’s address to him in *Pyth.* 6.5–18 would have prompted the same set of associations in the minds of the new listeners as the direct address in *Isth.* 2.30–32. There the poet uses images of ritualised sound and movement (κῶμοι and ἀοιδαί) immediately after the commemorative imagery of lines 12–29, to embed Xenocrates’ disembodied glory in the family estate. By describing the latter as ὁμῶν δόμοι in a direct address to Thrasyboulos, the poet credits Thrasyboulos with a ‘proprietary’ stake in Xenocrates’ glory. By doing so, the poet acknowledged the latter’s adult status as a high-ranking member of the Emmenidai and a worthy holder of such a position. Nisetich has convincingly argued that in *Isth.* 2.28–32 the poet carefully attributes to

Thrasyboulos the same credit for Xenocrates' victories as Xenocrates himself.<sup>92</sup> In hearing the chariot victory described as being shared by 'your father and your clan,' the audience would have imparted the same sense of Thrasyboulos' entitlement to his father's glory as they did in *Isth.* 2.30–32.

In their use of ritualised sound and movements; images of property as symbols of glory, and direct addresses to Thrasyboulos, *Pyth.* 6.1–18 and *Isth.* 2.12–32 thus served to commemorate the life of Xenocrates, whilst creating the conditions by which the latter's glory could be transmitted to Thrasyboulos as his ἀρετάν πατρώων. They did so in joint service to the agenda set out in *Isth.* 2, with the poet in each case relying on the listeners' high degree of receptiveness to cultural symbols, their social awareness and their emotional state.

---

<sup>92</sup> Nisetich (1977): 144. See also Kurke (1991b) for a discussion of Pindaric ambiguity in distributing duty and expectation across a family line.

## AN ELITE FAMILY AT AEGINA

### NEMEAN 5: the first ode.

In this section of the thesis I will begin my analysis of the three odes written for an elite family at Aegina: *Nem. 5*, *Isth. 6* and *Isth. 5*, composed for Pytheas and Phylakidas, the sons of Lampon.<sup>93</sup> As I have discussed earlier, this elite family lived in a society whose local culture was very different from that which prevailed at Akragas. Lampon and his sons were not socially dominant over their peers as Xenocrates and Theron were over theirs, and the audience of high-ranking noblemen would not have been receptive to the portrayal of outstanding excellence on the same terms as those that we have seen in *Pyth. 6* and *Isth. 2*. In examining *Nem. 5* and its companion odes, then, I will be exploring how epinician performance mobilised the sentiments of an audience with different assumptions and expectations about the relationship between the outstanding individual, his family and his community.

### The distribution of glory

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-

ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος

ἔσταότ', ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας

ὀλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτω, γλυκεῖτ' ᾠοιδά,

---

<sup>93</sup> See Morrison (2011: 238–239), for the suggestion that “there is substantial overlap between the *primary* audiences” of *Nem. 5*, *Isth. 6* and *Isth. 5* and *Bacchylides 13*. He also suggests that, because Pytheas and Phylakidas are brothers, the secondary audiences too would have overlapped.

στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι  
Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς  
νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον,  
οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τερεΐνας  
ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν,

ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέν-  
τας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηΐδων  
Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν  
ματρόπολιν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν

(*Nem.* 5.1–8)

I am not a sculptor, so as to fashion  
statues that stand on their same base.<sup>94</sup>  
Rather, on board every ship  
and in every boat, sweet song,  
go forth from Aegina and spread the news that  
Lampon's mighty son Pytheas  
has won the crown for the Pancratium in Nemea's games,  
not yet showing on his cheeks late summer,  
the mother of the grape's soft bloom,

---

<sup>94</sup> This declaration has been interpreted as a comparison of poetry with the sculptures on the temple of Aphaia. For recent discussions of the relationship of the Aeginetan odes to the temple of Aphaia see Athanassaki's discussion of *Ol.* 8; Indergaard's discussion of *Isth.* 6, and Hedreen's discussion of *Pae.* 6, (all in 2011 Fearn ed.: 257–369). According to Burnett (2005: 63) “the notion that sculpture must stay in place while an ode can travel seems a bit odd, since the exported work of Aeginetan sculptors was to be seen in many mainland places.” She notes that the wooden figurines of Damia and Auxesia, which were kidnapped from Epidauros (*Hdt.* 5.82ff.) were “notorious for journeys actual and aborted.”

and he glorified the Aiakidai, heroic warriors  
born of Kronos and Zeus and from  
the golden Nereids, and his  
mother city, a land welcoming to foreigners,

There are two important aspects to the declaration in lines 3–8. The first is that Pytheas, son of Lampon, has achieved personal greatness through his victory.<sup>95</sup> The second is that in doing so he has added to the long-established greatness of the community. This is, in effect, a formula expressing the relationship that success creates between the outstanding Aeginetan individual, his family and the community. In *Pyth.* 6. 1–8 we saw a construction intended to do the same thing, with the laudator declaring that the treasury of hymns, the poetic symbol of athletic glory, stands for the Emmenidai, for Xenocrates and for the community (represented by the phrase ποταμία τ' Ἀκράγαντι, 'Akragas on its river'). In my analysis of that ode I argued that the performance encouraged the audience to attribute by far the greatest portion of this glory to the victor and his family. In the case of *Nem.* 5, I will argue that the formula in lines 3–8 also expresses a host of underlying assumptions about the relationships between the participants, but that the disposition of glory implied by the formula points, like *Nem.* 7, to a very different social balance than that which existed at Akragas.<sup>96</sup>

The laudator opens the ode with a description of those who are the recipients of glory. By identifying the victor as 'Lampon's mighty son Pytheas' in line 4, the

---

<sup>95</sup> Pfeijffer (1995) dates *Nem.* 5 to 487 BC.

<sup>96</sup> For a recent and interesting discussion of possible intertextual relationships between *Nem.* 5 and Bacchylides 13, see Morrison (2011): 242–248.

laudator encourages the audience to think of the victor in his filial capacity, bringing Lampon to their attention and associating him with his son's victory. Lines 7–8 encourage the audience to extend the glory generated by Pytheas' victory further. There he is said to have brought honour to the Aiakidai, heroic warriors born of Kronos and Zeus and from the Golden Nereids, and the mother city, which is described as a land welcoming to foreigners. Thus, having started with the athlete and his father, the laudator 'works outwards,' encouraging the audience to include the heroic Aiakidai and then the mother city as recipients of glory.

The images of the Aiakid line and the mother city are quintessentially Aeginetan, demonstrating the divine genealogy of the Aiakids as ancestors of the islanders. By prompting the listeners to conjure them up in their minds, the laudator is asking them to think about motifs that characterise the entire community, i.e. ones that everyone listening had a stake in. Compare this to *Pyth.* 6.14–18, where the appearance of the treasury, and its decoration depicting the success of the Emmenidai, gives it a resonance of the ruling family. In *Nem.* 5 something rather different is happening, which I will discuss below. After bringing Aeginetan images to the forefront of the listeners' minds in lines 7–8, the laudator draws further on the audience's stock of shared cultural knowledge as he moves seamlessly into the ode's first myth, set at the start of Aegina's history and featuring the first of the Aiakid heroes.

τάν ποτ' εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτάν  
θέσσαντο, παρ βωμὸν πατέρος Ἑλλανίου  
στάντες, πίτναν τ' ἐς αἰθέρα χεῖρας ἀμᾶ

Ἐνδαΐδος ἀριγνώτες υἱοὶ

καὶ βία Φώκου κρέοντος,

ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου.

αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν

ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον,

πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον,

καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους

δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν.

στάσομαι, οὗ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων

φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκές,

καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώ-

τατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι.

(*Nem.* 5. 9–18)

which Endais' illustrious sons and mighty prince

Phokos, son of the goddess Psamatheia who bore him on

the seashore,

prayed would one day be a land of good men

and renowned for sailing,

as they stood by the altar of father Hellanios

and together stretched their hands towards the sky.

I shrink from telling of a mighty deed,

one ventured not in accordance with justice,  
how in fact they left the glorious island  
and what fortune drove the brave men  
from Oinona.

I will halt, for not every exact truth  
is better for showing its face,  
and silence is often the wisest thing  
for a man to observe.

The significance of lines 9–18 is often misunderstood by scholars, who tend to focus on this break-off, and devote attention to the laudator’s avoidance of the brothers’ heinous crime.<sup>97</sup> Burnett notes that scholars have found this episode too vulgar for reference in an ode, and Farnell accuses the laudator of capricious carelessness (though this is opposed by Burnett, who considers it a ‘rejected foil’ for the central myth of the ode).<sup>98</sup> I argue that it is in fact the brothers’ prayer to Zeus that is the salient feature of the passage, and that ultimately the break-off can best be understood with reference to it (an issue that I address later). There are two aspects of the prayer that are particularly important, and which I will discuss below.

The first is that the prayer builds on the sense that the audience have a collective

---

<sup>97</sup> Burnett (2005: 21–22) argues that the legend of Phokos articulated the resolution of the islanders’ ambiguous relationship with the sea. She suggests that with the killing of Phokos their status as land-dwellers was immutably established. Bowra (1964: 67–8, 103) argued that the mention of Phokos created a sense of disorder designed to contrast with the following account of the Muses on Mount Pelion. Finley (1955: 47), Gaertner (1978: 34) and Cole (1992: 58) have all based their interpretations of the passage on the sense that an element of discord was introduced into minds of the audience through the reference to the killing. Compare this with Carnes (1996), who argues that “mere reference to the incident would not greatly discomfit an Aiginetan audience.” Pfeijffer (1999: 65–66) proposes that the break-off “is designed to increase their intellectual attentiveness and gives them a feeling of belonging to an incrowd.”

<sup>98</sup> Burnett (2005: 64) and Froidefond (1989: 8). Farnell (1930): 188.

stake in the imagery, noted above, and that it is this sense that would have lent the prayer meaning. In other words, the audience would have understood the brothers to be asking that ‘Aegina as a community will be εὐανδρος and ναυσικλυτός,’ the sense of communality conveyed by this request reflecting the sentiment that the laudator encouraged over lines 1–8.

The second point is that the prayer is made with the expectation of fulfillment ποτε, i.e. at some time in the future.<sup>99</sup> The laudator does not say exactly when Aegina might be considered εὐανδρος and ναυσικλυτός, but since these are characteristics that the Aeginetan listeners would doubtless have attributed to themselves, we may suppose that they considered the prayer still to be in operation at the time of the performance.<sup>100</sup> In other words, the prayer made by Peleus at the dawn of Aeginetan history reflected contemporary Aeginetan self-image.

But what is it exactly that the brothers were asking for? The word ναυσικλυτός is unambiguous, and pertains to skillful sailing, for which the Aeginetans were indeed renowned (though this has important connotations that will be explored later). The sentiment expressed by εὐανδρος, however, is more complex. It might be read as ‘of good men.’ Race translates it as ‘of brave men.’<sup>101</sup> I propose that the audience would have applied the quality both to themselves as a community and to the victor as an individual, and that its meaning would have been qualified by the account of Peleus

---

<sup>99</sup> It is possible to interpret ποτε as going with the act of praying (θέσσαντο). This is a question of interpretation, on which I follow Race. Given the context of the passage it makes more sense to me that the poet would picture the sons of Endais praying for future success, which Zeus subsequently grants them, rather projecting a prayer for success onto an undetermined point in the future. This would seem to fit better with the narrative: 1) the account of their birth to Endais 2) their prayer for success 3) the account of how one of them (Peleus) later gained glory by outwitting Hippolyta.

<sup>100</sup> Pfeijffer (1999: 63) describes the prayer as “fulfilled.” I view it as ongoing covenant between the island community and the god that extends and is renewed across generations.

<sup>101</sup> Race’s Loeb edition.

that followed after line 22.

### The meaning of εὔανδρος

εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ σιδαρίταν ἐπαινῆ-

σαι πόλεμον δεδόκηται, μακρά μοι

αὐτόθεν ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκά-

πτοι τις, ἔχω γονάτων ὀρμὰν ἐλαφράν,

καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί.

πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις ἄειδ' ἐν Παλίῳ

Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις

φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάγλωσσον

χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων

ἀγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων, αἱ δὲ πρῶτιστον μὲν ὕμνη-

σαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν

Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἀβρὰ

Κρηθεῖς Ἴππολύτα δόλῳ πεδάσαι

ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπόν

πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις βουλευμασιν,

ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον,

ὥς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπεῖρα

κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου

εὐνᾶς, τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν, πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ

θυμῷ

παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.

τοῖο δ' ὄργαν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι,

εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν,

ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον

δείσαις, ὃ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευ-

σέν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ

Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς, ὥστ' ἐν τάχει

ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νη-

ρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν,

γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις, ὃς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ

κλει-

τὰν θαμὰ νίσεται Ἴσθμὸν Δωρίαν,

ἔνθα νιν εὐφρονες ἴλαι

σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾶ θεὸν δέκονται,

καὶ σθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θρασεῖ

(*Nem.* 5.19–39)

But if it is decided to praise happiness, strength of hands

or steel-clad war, let someone dig for me

a jumping pit far from this point,

for I have a light spring in my knees,

and eagles leap even beyond the sea.  
Gladly did that fairest chorus of the Muses  
sing for those men on Pelion, whilst in their midst  
Apollo swept his seven-tongued lyre  
with a golden plectrum,  
and led them in tunes of all kinds. And, after a prelude  
to Zeus, they first sang of august Thetis  
and Peleus, telling how elegant Hippolyta, Kretheus'  
daughter, sought to snare him by a trick, after she  
persuaded her husband, overseer of the Magnesians,  
to be an accomplice through her elaborate designs:  
she put together a false tale which she fabricated,  
claiming that he was trying to gain  
her wifely love in Akastos' marriage bed.

But the opposite was true, for again and again  
with all her heart she begged him beguilingly.  
But her precipitous words provoked his anger,  
and he immediately rejected the wife,  
for he feared the wrath of the father who protects  
hospitality. And cloud-driving Zeus,  
king of the immortals, observed it well  
and promised to him from heaven that he would soon  
make a sea nymph, one of the Nereids

of the golden distaffs, to be his bride,  
  
after persuading their kinsman, Poseidon, who often  
goes from Aigai to the famous Dorian Isthmos,  
where joyous crowds receive the god  
to the sound of the pipe  
and compete with the bold strength of their limbs.

In lines 19–39, the laudator portrays the hero receiving the ultimate reward: marriage to a goddess. This is not brought about as a result of athletic or martial glory, but through constancy and giving due honour to Zeus. In lines 26–31, Hippolyta is cast as a trickster so accomplished that she persuades her husband, Akastos, to join her scheme to seduce Peleus. In lines 31–34, however, the hero rejects her entreaties, fearing the anger of the god. Peleus is often treated as an exemplar of ethical behaviour, written into the ode as a didactic motif for the young victor.<sup>102</sup> The use of the hero as a model of behaviour, however, is more complex than is generally understood.

Scholars have tended to cast Peleus and Hippolyta as comparatives: a devious female character pitted unsuccessfully against a virtuous male counterpart.<sup>103</sup> The didactic message of this interpretation stresses the value of piety to Pytheas, the

---

<sup>102</sup> Carnes (1996): 15–55.

<sup>103</sup> Burnett 2005: 71. In his Freudian analysis of the passage, however, Carnes (1996: 42), argues that she is “not in fact a woman, but a fictive, projected male; an example of what Luce Irigaray calls hom(m)osexuality—the projection of male desire and a male Symbolic order onto women.” He characterises Peleus’ struggle with her as a means by which the identity of the female is subverted to the social expectations of a male-dominated social order. Hubbard (1985: 105–106) notes that the description of Hippolyta emphasises her status as an accomplished deceiver.

immature athlete. This, however, ignores a more important comparison between Peleus and Akastos. The latter has allowed himself to be drafted as an ‘accomplice’ (ξυνάων), participating in impious intrigue that would place his wife in the bed of another man. In seeing past the trickery of Hippolyta and her husband, Peleus demonstrates, in addition to piety, a cunning awareness of plots and a fine perception of character. These are the manly virtues of an epic hero. By casting him as superior to the whiles of Hippolyta, the laudator brings Peleus’ possession of this noble quality into striking contrast with the cuckolded Akastos. Having heard this episode, the audience’s perception of εὐανδρος, mentioned in the prayer in lines 11–12, would have been significantly influenced by the hero’s attitude, which combined fast-thought, perceptiveness and piety in an expression of virtuous manliness.

I will now examine how the laudator, having given meaning to the term εὐανδρος through this mythological discourse, attributes it to the victorious members of Lampon’s family, and how, in doing so, he simultaneously attributes the same quality to the community as a whole.

### **Glory shared**

Πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων πέρι  
πάντων. τὸ δ’ Αἰγίναθε δίς, Εὐθύμενες,  
Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων  
ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.

ἤτοι μεταίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει

κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

Ἄ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν

μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὄν φίλησ' Ἀπόλλων,

ἄλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει

Νίσου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ. χαίρω δ' ὅτι

ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις.

ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου

σὺν τύχῃ μόχθων ἀμοιβάν

ἐπαύρεο. χρῆ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖσιν

ἔμμεν.

εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἴκεις

ὥστ' αἰεῖδιν, μηκέτι ρίγει, δίδοι

φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἰστία τεῖνον

πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου,

πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου

φθέγξαι ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδάυρῳ διπλόαν

νικῶντ' ἀρετάν, προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ

ἀνθέων ποιᾶεντα φέρε στεφανώ-

ματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν.

(*Nem.* 5.40–54)

Inherited Destiny decides the outcome

of all deeds. Euthymenes, twice from Aegina

did you fall into Victory's arms

and enjoy elaborate hymns.

Indeed, Pytheas, now too your maternal uncle, following

in your footsteps, glorifies that hero's kindred race.

Nemea stands firm for him,

as well as the local month that Apollo loved.

He defeated those of his age who came to compete at

home

and at Nisos' hill, with its lovely glens. I rejoice

that the entire city strives for noble prizes.<sup>104</sup>

Remember that it was truly through Menander's good

fortune that you won sweet reward

for your toils. A fashioner of athletes ought to be from

Athens.

But if it is Themistios you have come

to sing, hold back no longer: give forth

your voice, hoist the sails to the

topmost yard,

proclaim that as a boxer and in the pancratium

he won at Epidauros a double

victory, and to the portals of Aiakos' temple

---

<sup>104</sup> See Pfeijffer (1999: 176): 'I am glad the whole city fights for noble ends.' This is criticised for being "over-literal" by Fearn (2011: 216, n. 107). See Bury (1890: 96): 'I rejoice that the whole city fights over noble achievements.'

bring the leafy crown of flowers

in the company of the fair-haired Graces.

In her discussion of the heroes mentioned in the Aeginetan odes, Burnett, going against the trend mentioned above, argues that they ‘are not models of behaviour... Instead, like esoteric symbols displayed in an initiation, they cause the celebrating youth to recognize his victory as a link to a further and peculiarly Aeginetan splendour.’<sup>105</sup> She is right to point out that they (in this case Peleus) connect victory to a heroic past, but only in so far as the laudator himself says as much in lines 7–8.<sup>106</sup> Though she is also right to dismiss the rather simplistic idea of the heroes acting as models of behaviour for the victors, in doing so she overlooks an important aspect of the odes. For here in *Nem.* 5 (and, as I shall argue, in other Aeginetan odes) the laudator does indeed use individuals as models of behaviour, but in a sophisticated manner that has far-reaching implications for our understanding of the texts.

The phrase ‘Inherited Destiny decides the outcome of all deeds’ (Πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων πέρι / πάντων), in lines 40–41, is placed between the mythical account of Peleus’ life and the roll-call of victories held by Pytheas’ family.<sup>107</sup> It expresses the dependency of the outcome of actions (ἔργα) upon πότμος συγγενῆς. The expression πότμος συγγενῆς, coming at the end of the mythological digression, conveys a sense that is perhaps best characterised as ‘inborn destiny,’ or

---

<sup>105</sup> Burnett (2005: 49–50).

<sup>106</sup> ‘And he has glorified the Aiakidai, heroic warriors born of Kronos and Zeus and from the golden Nereids, and his mother city, a land welcoming to foreigners.’ – ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῶν Νηρηΐδων / Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρόπολιν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν.

<sup>107</sup> Race’s translation.

destiny being borne out on the strength of noble character.<sup>108</sup> It is this character, of which Peleus is the paradigm, that determines the outcome of fine ἔργα.

The gnomic statement of lines 40–41 is of a kind that can be found throughout the Pindaric corpus, in that it seems to describe a universal truth whose relevance was as strong for the heroes of the mythical past as it is for the listening audience. Its generic appearance, however, should not obscure its significance, and in fact it is the universal applicability of the gnome’s message that makes it so important. By emphasising that all men’s deeds follow from πότημος συγγενῆς, the laudator prompts the listeners to relate the deeds and characters of the victor’s family in a specific way. In lines 41–54, the laudator declares that Euthymenes fell into victory’s arms twice; that Pytheas himself won at Nemea; that his uncle followed in his footsteps, and that Themistios won a double in boxing at Epidaurus.<sup>109</sup> These are the family’s athletic ἔργα. Following the gnomic statement of 40–41, the audience would have conceived of these ἔργα as having been determined (κρίνει) by the same πότημος συγγενῆς that allowed Peleus to fulfill his destiny as the future husband of Thetis, i.e. as a reflection of virtuous manliness characterised by the same piety and sharpness of mind. In other words, whilst the laudator’s account of Peleus provides the terms of an individual’s excellence, the subsequent gnome provides the terms of the relationship between such excellence (πότημος συγγενῆς) and an individual’s deeds. Moreover, it does so through the gnomic language of universal values, which would have prompted the audience to make the same connection between deed and excellence for

---

<sup>108</sup> Boeke (2007: 33), reading ‘inherited destiny,’ notes fr. 38 from the hymns, and argues that strength alone does not guarantee success, as τύχα (‘fortune’ or ‘chance’) is also important: ἐν ἔργμασιν δὲ νικᾷ τύχα, / οὐ σθένος.

<sup>109</sup> This reading is proposed by Burnett (2005: 61), who follows Cole (1987: 564 and n. 15) and is unconvinced by Carey (1989a: 287–95). See Pfeijffer (1995: 318–322) for the suggestion, rejected by Burnett, that Pytheas and Euthymenes could not have competed at the same festival.

the individual victors of Pytheas' family as they did for Peleus himself.

There is a second important corollary to the laudator's treatment of Peleus before the announcement of the roll-call of victories in lines 41–54. As I have discussed, in *Nem.* 5.3–8 the laudator states that by securing victory Pytheas brings glory to the community. This presumably reflected a culturally determined assumption of the listeners about the relationship between the community and outstanding individuals. The audience, having heard this articulated at the start of the ode, would have carried all the way through the performance the expectation that glory for one was glory for all. It is this expectation that they would have held in their minds when they heard Peleus praying that Aegina will be a land εὖανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτάν. The audience would have imagined Peleus, having made this prayer with his brothers, as subsequently bringing this quality to the island community through his own glory-generating deeds, and perceived this as following the terms of the formula in lines 3–8 in which the deeds of the outstanding individual glorified the community. This same set of expectations, formed both by the opening formula in lines 3–8 and the prayer in lines 9–10, would also have been applied by the audience to Pytheas' family as they heard the latter's list of victories in lines 41–54. Peleus' prayer would thus have provided the framework that accommodated the listening community's expectations about their relationship with Pytheas and the victorious family.

In other words, the opening formula of lines 3–8 and the subsequent prayer in lines 9–10 created the expectation (or, rather, heightened the audience's existing assumption) that the outstanding deeds of the individual brought honour to the

community. By using Peleus as an example of how deed and honour relate, and then positing a gnomic formula that could apply this relationship to the actions of present-day men, the laudator encouraged the audience to think of Pytheas and his family as ‘exemplars’ of the community’s glory and its characteristic of being εὐάνδρος. In doing so, the laudator proposes a distribution of glory that is quite different from that which we saw in *Pyth.* 6. There the laudator used the treasury of hymns to express the excellence of the Emmenidai, and in doing so deliberately subverted the communal aspects normally associated with such a building in order to slant the emphasis of the glory towards Xenocrates, Thrasyboulos and his kin. In my analysis of *Nem.* 7, by contrast, I argued that the laudator used the procession to the tomb of Neoptolemos to express the social primacy of the Aeginetan aristocratic community over that of any individual or family. Here in *Nem.* 5, something similar is done, with the victor’s excellence and that of his family being cast in terms that reinforce the collective glory of Aegina, secured early in the mythical past through a prayer to Zeus and maintained ever since by a line of outstanding individuals, of which Pytheas, his uncle and grandfather are the latest incarnations.

### **Glory from across the seas:**

We must not forget, of course, that the other quality Peleus and his brother prayed would be associated with Aegina was that of being ναυσικλυτός.<sup>110</sup> As with being εὐάνδρος, the listeners would have considered this to be one of the defining

---

<sup>110</sup> Pfeijffer (1999: 76–77) notes that εὐρυσθενής (‘mighty,’ line 4) is connected with the Homeric epithet for Poseidon, and proposes that in creating an association between the victor and the god of the seas the laudator creates an association between athleticism and naval power.

features of their community. Indeed, like being εὖανδρος, the islanders' sense of their being ναυσικλυτός was cast as the manifestation of the prayer's fulfillment. As mentioned earlier, it is with reference to the covenant the prayer created between the island community and Zeus that the laudator's conspicuous refusal to discuss the slaying of Phokos in lines 14–18 can be understood.<sup>111</sup> There the laudator declares that he shrinks from telling a deed that was not done in accordance with justice (the famous fratricide); how the brothers left the island, and what fortune drove them from Oinona (ancient Aegina). The salient theme of this episode has often been taken to be the unlawful killing. I argue, however, that it is the departure from Aegina that is the key theme, and that the allusion to Phokos' killing is its corollary.<sup>112</sup>

The fact that Peleus and Telamon left Aegina is mentioned twice in a row: once in line 15 (πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον – ‘how they left the glorious island’) and again in lines 15–16 (καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους / δαίμων ἀπ’ Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν – ‘what fortune drove the brave men from Oinona?’). The impression this would have created in the minds of the audience is not simply one of the heroes' departure, but of their departure from Aegina the *island*. This would have been reinforced by the imagery of lines 19–21. There, the laudator seems to change subject, and says that if he is to praise happiness (ὄλβος), strength of hands (χειρῶν βία) or combat (πόλεμος), then let someone dig a jumping pit, since he has a spring in his knees and eagles leap even beyond the sea. This scene precedes lines 21–39, where the chorus of Muses, led by Apollo, sing of how Peleus rejected Hippolyta. Lines 19–21 are not simply a prelude to the myth, but a joining device between the myth and the break-off

---

<sup>111</sup> I use ‘covenant’ to refer to the manifold obligations and expectations that characterised the relationship between mortals and gods, and will discuss the term in detail later.

<sup>112</sup> Burnett (2005: 69–70) notes that in the context of the narrative the murder was necessary in order to take Peleus ‘towards the central mythic moment.’

in lines 14–18. In the latter, the laudator twice notes the departure of Peleus and his brother from the island before metaphorically leaping across the open sea, landing, with the audience, on Mount Pelion. There the listeners are still mentally situated in the epic past, though the wedding song takes place after the prayer to Zeus Hellanios. For the audience, this is also a leap across time and space, whose effect is to ‘catch-up’ with Peleus in the part of his life where he fulfils his god-given destiny (his marriage to Thetis). This prompts the listeners to situate Peleus’ virtuous deeds (which make him a typically Aeginetan exemplar of being εὐάνδρος) across the seas. In this way the break-off, the subject of scholarly concern discussed earlier, is a means by which the fluent transition across time and space is achieved in the minds of the audience.

This imagery tapped into the listeners’ sense of being an island community in order to bolster their association between travelling abroad and winning glory. In doing so, the laudator could hardly help but allude in lines 14–18 to the shameful event that led to Peleus’ departure from Aegina. This was one of the seminal moments in Aeginetan mythical history, and making an oblique and seemingly obtuse reference to the fratricide seems, in this light, to take into account the fact that the murder would have been drawn to the surface of the listeners’ minds anyway. Noting it in this way may reflect the laudator’s desire to articulate and ‘contain’ the event, i.e. mention it in terms that would not colour the rest of the ode too strongly.<sup>113</sup>

We can see, then, that the journey from the prayer in line 9 to the end of the account of Peleus’ glorious conduct in line 39 reinforced the audience’s sense that

---

<sup>113</sup> Burnett (2005): 165, “It is a story that cannot be told but is nonetheless plainly marked as necessary to the overall enchantment that the ode means to effect...”

travelling across the seas was an integral and glorious characteristic of their community. Throughout these thirty verses, the laudator uses a sophisticated combination of imagery and structural features to cast Peleus as the exemplar of this association between the islanders, the sea and their collective glory. This complex set of associations is contingent in being *ναυσικλυτός*, the quality prayed for by Peleus in line 9, which, like being *εὖανδρος*, is manifest in the present-day exemplars of Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistios, who won glory at the Panhellenic games.

In asking that a jumping pit be built for him so that he (and, by implication, the listeners) might leap across the seas, the laudator seeks to praise happiness (*ἔλβος*), strength of hands (*χειρῶν βία*) or combat (*πόλεμος*). The first quality, *ἔλβος*, undoubtably applies to Peleus, whose marriage to Thetis is cast as a superlative honour. The second and third characteristics of *χειρῶν βία* and *πόλεμος* do not seem to have a place in the account of the hero's life.<sup>114</sup> They are, however, perfectly applicable to the victories achieved by Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistios, whose honour was won through athletic prowess in the form of boxing and Pancratium victories. When the laudator mentions the locations of each of these victories it is no idle note, but a means of construing a Panhellenic aspect to the victors' successes. Euthymenes is said to have fallen twice 'from Aegina' (*Αἰγίναθε*) into Victory's arms; Nemea 'stands firm' (*ἄραρεν*) for Pytheas, whilst for Themistios Pytheas is urged to 'give voice and hoist the sail to the topmost yard' (*δίδοι / φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἰστία τεῖνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου*) in proclaiming his grandfather's double boxing victory. The physical location attached to these achievements would have

---

<sup>114</sup> This is noted by Stern (1971): 172. Pfeijffer (1995: 326), however, connects all three to Pytheas: *χειρῶν βία* is "an apposite description of performing an ode for a victor in the pancration"; *ἔλβος* is open to the athlete through his victory, and *πόλεμος* refers to the state of conflict between Athens and Aegina at the time of the performance.

consolidated the sense that the glorious characteristics of ὄλβος, χειρῶν βία and πόλεμος were to be won across the seas. The victors, who, like Peleus, had achieved glory in its Panhellenic aspect, were exemplars of being ναυσικλυτός, not in its sense of being adept at sailing, but in the sense of casting out to win glory beyond the confines of the island. This is particularly resonant in the sailing metaphor used to urge Pytheas to give due praise to his grandfather in lines 50–51.

### **Glory for all? The relationships amongst the victor's family:**

As we have seen, *Nem.* 5 mentions several individuals other than Pytheas by name: Lampon, Euthymenes, Menander and Themistios. Being singled out for praise would have enhanced, or at least consolidated, the sense that they were all outstanding. Lampon's treatment, however, differs from that of the others, for he alone is not included in the roll-call of victories in lines 41–54. Instead, he is mentioned only at the beginning of the ode, in line 4, as Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας ('Lampon's son, Pytheas'). As we have seen in *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2, glory could be disseminated across families, and the excellence associated with athletic success could attach to those who had never enjoyed victory themselves (i.e. Thrasyboulos). Thus, in response to the laudator's emphasis of the close kinship between the father and his victorious son, the audience would have associated Pytheas' glory with Lampon. We can see something similar happening amongst the victorious members of the family mentioned in lines 41–54. Euthymenes is described as Pytheas' maternal uncle (μάτρως, line 43); Themistios, we know from the scholia, was his maternal grandfather, and the trainer Menander, though no direct relative, is given a special

relationship by being acknowledged as essential to Pytheas' victory (ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχᾳ μόχθων ἀμοιβάν / ἐπαύρεο, lines 48–49). Presumably this network of family connections that revolve around Pytheas was self-reinforcing as far as the family's glory went: the relationship of one victorious individual would have cast a victorious relative in an even brighter light.

From this perspective, *Nem.* 5 seems to operate in a similar way to *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2. In all three odes, the praise given to an athletic victor can be extended to include another family member, whether or not they have won athletic success. There is, however, an important difference. In *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2, the implication seems to be that the family partook equally in glory.<sup>115</sup> In *Nem.* 5, by contrast, there seems to be a distinction between those members of the family who have achieved glory through victory and Lampon, who has not.

I have argued above that the laudator's treatment of Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistios in lines 41–54 construes them as exemplars of those excellent qualities (being εὐάνδρος and being ναυσικλυτός) that characterise the Aeginetan community. This exemplary status is manifest in their respective victories, which derive from inborn destiny and which fulfill the prayer made long ago by Peleus. Being mentioned in line 4, Lampon is not only absent from this group, but is placed as far from them as possible. For the listeners, there would have been little likelihood of attributing the same qualities to him as they did to the athletically distinguished members of the family. It would seem that, whilst being related to a victor might reflect gloriously

---

<sup>115</sup> *Pyth.* 6.14–18: φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ / πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ / λόγοισι θνατῶν / εὐδοξον ἄρματι νίκαν / Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ ('But in clear light its front will proclaim a chariot victory, famous in men's speech, shared by your father, Thrasyboulos, and your clan, won in the dells of Krisa.')

upon an individual like Lampon, it did not, in itself, make one an exemplar of the community's glory. Rather, it allowed such an individual to catch the reflected glory that was generated in the minds of the audience in response to a performance celebrating athletic victory.

In my discussion of *Pyth.* 6 and its reperformance under *Isth.* 2, I argued that quite a different process can be observed at Akragas. Though poetic praise led to public glory there too, this glory was expressed through civic imagery, most strikingly in the treasury of hymns. Unlike the story of Peleus in *Nem.* 5, the treasury of hymns was not a well-known image of common sentimental value for the community. Rather than using a familiar motif that reflected a shared sense of communal identity (as he did with Peleus at Aegina), the laudator directed the listeners to imagine a familiar *type* of image (a Delphic treasury), and to construe it in a form that it would never have had outside of their imagination. Had it really been situated in the physical environment of Delphi, a treasury decorated with the glories the Emmenidai would have been wholly unacceptable to non-Akragantine onlookers. The fact that it was acceptable to the Akragantine audience (at least in the estimation of the laudator and his patron) is telling. It suggests that, for the Akragantine listeners, the glory that was generated in their minds as a result of the performance did not rely on motifs that were held in common by the community; rather, it relied on those that were held in common by the ruling family. I argued that this was a performative expression of the social dominance that we know the Emmenidai to have enjoyed at Akragas during this period.

*Nem.* 5, like the Akragantine odes, acknowledges that glory generated through

athletic victory is shared amongst the family. Unlike the Akragantine odes, however, the motifs used to generate the impression of glory in the minds of the audience, i.e. the story of Peleus and his brothers, are ‘common property’ of the community. In consequence, the community itself is construed as having a common claim to the victory, with the victors being cast as evidence that the community is endowed with those desirable qualities of which the victories are symptomatic (being εὐάνδρος and being ναυσικλυτός). Whilst the family, in this instance the father, has a claim to the glory of individual members based on ties of kinship, it is the listening community that has the more substantial claim.

This, I argue, is the context in which we should understand the statement that Pytheas and Euthymenes glorify Peleus’ kindred race (ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, line 43) and the urge that Pytheas bring leafy crowns to the temple of Aiakos in memory of Themistios (προθύροισιν δ’ Αἰακοῦ / ἀνθέων ποιάεντα φέρει στεφανώματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν, lines 53–54). In the first case, to glorify Peleus’ noble race by displaying the exemplary qualities of being εὐάνδρος and being ναυσικλυτός is to glorify the current island community, since the islanders considered themselves to share a common bloodline with the heroes and, as we have seen, to be characterised by these very attributes.

In the second case, the urge to Pytheas to honour his grandfather by bringing crowns to the temple of Aiakos is striking. Themistios is spoken of in the past tense, just as Xenocrates is in *Isth.* 2. This contrasts with the present tense in which Pytheas and Euthymenes are referred to in lines 43 and (more obliquely) Menander in line 49. Furthermore, the urge to bring crowns has connotations of a commemorative

procession.<sup>116</sup> These elements suggest that Themistios, like Xenocrates, was deceased at the time of the performance. Fearn doubts that this passage gives evidence of the performance context of the ode.<sup>117</sup> We should regard the song itself (or, rather, the creation of the imagery in the minds of the listeners) as a speech-act that fulfills the laudator's command. If Themistios was dead at the time of the performance, and this imagined commemorative act were intended to honour him, its purpose would seem to be to consolidate Themistios' *post mortem* position in the memory of the listening community. The leafy crowns would have had connotations of the two victories mentioned in line 52, whilst Aiakos, to whom the dedication is offered, was the common progenitor in the communal bloodline. Thus, by construing this imagery in their minds, the audience would have imparted to the collective memory of Themistios the sense that, though deceased, he was an ongoing exemplar of their collective excellence. This is in striking contrast to what we have seen in *Isth.* 2. There, as I have argued, the audience's memory of Xenocrates is commemorated through the appropriate performative actions (including the reperformance of *Pyth.* 6), under the purview of Thrasyboulos, the dutiful son. In commemorating his father's memory, Thrasyboulos appropriated the glory attached to it to the exclusion of all others who might also stake a claim. Here in *Nem.* 5 the audience's memory of Themistios is glorified but, as with his living relatives, that glory is qualified as an example of the community's being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός.

In the following chapters, I will examine *Isth.* 6 and *Isth.* 5, which were written for Lampon's other son, Phylakidas. In doing so, I will advance my argument for the

---

<sup>116</sup> For a discussion of funerary imagery see Oakley (2004), who considers evidence from white-ground lekythoi.

<sup>117</sup> Fearn (2011): 187. The referencing of contexts by odes themselves is discussed by Currie (2005): 17–18.

laudator's sophisticated use of exemplars as a means of reconciling the singular glory of the outstanding individual to the collective glory of the community.

## *ISTHMIAN 6: the second ode.*

### The line of heroes

*Isth.* 6 was performed in celebration of Phylakidas' victory at the boys' Pancratium, and is generally dated to 480.<sup>118</sup> As the second victory achieved by one of Lampon's sons it was a boon to the family's honour, and treated as such in lines 1–18, where the brothers and their father are praised. In lines 19–25 the laudator shifts this praise to the community, before moving into an extended account of Herakles' encounter with Telamon, where the hero prays that the latter will be granted a son (lines 26–56). More praise for the family follows in lines 56–75, particularly for Lampon in the final epode. The performance concludes with the laudator offering the father and his sons a drink from Dirke's sacred spring, which the daughters of Mnemosyne made to surge by the gates of Kadmos. Following Dissen, the idea that the ode was performed at a banquet in the house of Lampon has gained currency,<sup>119</sup> and Morrison has persuasively argued that the debut audiences of *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6 overlapped.<sup>120</sup> Below, in exploring how the listeners responded to the ode's imagery I will propose that their reaction to the performance was conditioned to an extent by the imagery contained in *Nem.* 5, as we saw above in *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2.

The ode opens with a sympotic scene. Two images in lines 1–9, which I will

---

<sup>118</sup> Burnett (2005: 81, n. 1); Nicholson (2005: 255–6, n. 18) and Indergaard (2011: 295). The reference to the battle of Salamis in *Isth.* 5 suggests that the latter preceded *Isth.* 6, where Salamis is not mentioned.

<sup>119</sup> Dissen (1830), ii.572. Followed more recently by Krummen (1990: 276); Kurke (1991a: 138–139); Clay (1999: 29), and Indergaard (2011: 298). Carey and Indergaard view the κῶμος mentioned in line 58 (in the context of ταμίας κῶμων, 'dispenser of revels') as the performing chorus. See Carey (1989b: 549, n.6, and 1991: 192–194); Fearn (2011: 298). Against this, see Heath and Lefkowitz (1991: 175–176).

<sup>120</sup> Morrison (2011): 238.

explore below, are of particular importance: the second mixing bowl and the request for a third victory.

Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὅτε συμποσίου  
δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων  
κίρναμεν Λάμπωνος εὐαέθλου γενεᾶς ὕπερ, ἐν  
    Νεμέα μὲν πρῶτον, ᾧ Ζεῦ,  
τὴν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων,  
νῦν αὖτε Ἴσθμοῦ δεσπότη  
Νηρεΐδεσσί τε πεντήκοντα παίδων ὀπλοτάτου  
Φυλακίδα νικῶντος. εἷη δὲ τρίτον  
σωτήρι πορσαίνοντας Ἦ-  
    λυμπίῳ Αἴγιναν κάτα  
σπένδειν μελιφθόγοις ἀοιδαῖς.<sup>121</sup>

(*Isth.* 6. 1–9)

As when a drinking party of men is thriving,  
so we are mixing a second bowl of the Muses' songs  
in honour of Lampon's prize-winning offspring,  
for first at Nemea, O Zeus,

---

<sup>121</sup> Indergaard (2011: 299) argues that the chorus is comprised of, and represents, the Aeginetan community, suggesting that line 9, line 21 ('this island,' τάνδ'... νᾶσον) and lines 65–6 ('this city beloved by the gods,' τάνδε πόλιν / θεοφιλή) are "reminiscent of passages in other epinicians where it seems natural to identify the *persona loquens* with the listening community." These passages include *Ol.* 5.13–14, *Ol.* 13.25–28, *Nem.* 8.13–16 and *Pyth.* 8.98–100. He argues, though (2011: 301), that "it is Pindar himself, the Theban laudator and *xenos*, rather than the chorus alone or an impersonal *laudator* and narrator, who is speaking in the poem." In this he follows D'Alessio (1994): 127.

by your favour they received the choicest of crowns,  
and now again, since by the grace of the Isthmos' lord  
and the fifty Nereids the youngest of the sons,  
Phylakidas, is victorious. May there be a third bowl  
for us to prepare  
for the Olympian Saviour and pour upon Aegina  
a libation of honey-voiced songs.

The second (δεύτερος) draught of song conveyed to the audience a number of different messages about the victor. With the mention of a second draught alongside 'for first at Nemea...' (ἐν Νεμέα μὲν πρῶτον...), the listeners are encouraged to imagine a previous draught, mixed at the time that Pytheas' victory was celebrated, i.e. the first performance of *Nem. 5*.<sup>122</sup> Thus, by construing the present victory as the second draft of song, the laudator encourages the audience to imagine the two performances as part of the same sympotic celebration, drawing their memories of the earlier celebration to the surface of their minds. The effect of this would have been to impart the present performance with the imagery and levity associated with the previous one.<sup>123</sup>

Race notes that the imagery of a second bowl of mixed song at a symposium would have had connotations of the customary toast for heroes, and in his analysis of the ode Kirkwood also notes that the third bowl at a symposium was traditionally

---

<sup>122</sup> Indergaard (2011): 300.

<sup>123</sup> André Lardinois has pointed out to me that the reference to a second draught may also refer to the reperformance of *Nem. 5* preceding the performance of *Isth. 6*.

offered to Ζεὺς σωτήρ.<sup>124</sup> The individuals mentioned in connection with the toast are not heroic figures, but the offspring of Lampon. Yet it is for them that the bowl of song is raised, and in doing so the laudator recounts their praiseworthy victories. I will show that by making Pytheas and Phylakidas the recipients of a toast that was traditionally reserved for mythical heroes, the laudator attributes to them a special status. I will argue that this status is not literally heroic, but analogous to that which we have seen before in *Nem.* 5: as virtuous exemplars of communal excellence, of which the ‘real’ heroes were early models.<sup>125</sup>

The second important image in the opening stanza is in lines 7–9, where the laudator asks that a third bowl may be poured over Aegina as a libation of honey-voiced songs. The hope expressed here is that one of Lampon’s sons will enjoy another victory at some point in the future. On hearing this, the audience would have perceived an extra dimension to the imagery, tied to their memories of *Nem.* 5’s opening lines. In the latter, Pytheas’ victory is said to have brought glory to Aegina, with the words ‘not yet showing on his cheeks late summer, the mother of the grape’s soft bloom, and he has glorified the Aiakidai, heroic warriors... and his mother city.’<sup>126</sup> Both *Nem.* 5.6–8 and *Isth.* 6.7–9 are components of an opening ‘formula’ that articulates the relationship between the outstanding individual, his family and the listening community. Each discusses the glory of the city immediately after praise for the victor and his father. Moreover, not only do each of the motifs occur at similar points in their respective odes, but both conjure images relating to grapes: promised blooms on the one hand, and the liquid product of those blooms on the other.

<sup>124</sup> Race (1997: 185, n. 3) and Kirkwood (1982: 291).

<sup>125</sup> For the proposal that the odes literally heroised the patrons see Currie (2005).

<sup>126</sup> *Nem.* 5.6–8: οὐπω γένυσι φαίνων τρεΐνας ματέρ’ οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν, / ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῶν Νηρηΐδων / Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρόπολιν τε...

Libation was a ubiquitous religious act across the Greek world, not only sealing prayers, but symbolically confirming the Olympians' primacy over mortals in the cosmic order. By pouring a libation upon Aegina to seal a prayer that Lampon's offspring will enjoy future success, the laudator construes Aegina as a crucial component of the prayer's ritual performance and suggests that the island is integral to the future success of Lampon's sons. Compare this with what we saw in *Nem.* 5. 9–13, where the prayer made by Peleus and his brothers to Zeus was the basis of personal success, but which, due to its construction (a request that Aegina be εὐανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτάν), construed his success within a framework of glory for the community. Here in *Isth.* 6, it is through the libation being poured upon the community that the covenant between the outstanding family and the god can lead to success for the individual.

εἰ γὰρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεῖς  
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτων ἀρετάς  
σύν τέ οἱ δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐ-  
σχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου  
βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἑών.  
τοῖαισιν ὄργαῖς εὐχεται  
ἀντιάσαις Αἴδαν γῆράς τε δέξασθαι πολίων  
ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς, ἐγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον  
Κλωθὴν κασιγνήτας τε προσ-  
εννέπω ἐσπέσθαι κλυταῖς  
ἀνδρὸς φίλου Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς.

(*Isth.* 6. 10–18)

For if a man, delighting in expenditure and hard work,  
accomplishes divinely fashioned deeds of excellence,  
and in addition fortune plants lovely fame for him,  
at the limits of happiness he has already  
cast his anchor as one honoured by the gods.<sup>127</sup>

The son of Kleonikos<sup>128</sup> prays  
that with feelings such as these he may meet Hades  
and welcome grey old age, and I myself call upon  
Klotho enthroned on high and her sister Fates  
to follow the noble  
commands of the man who is my guest friend.

The declaration in lines 10–18, following the sympotic opening stanza, that a man who delights in expenditure and god-ordained practices finds divinely inspired fame has reached the limits of happiness, is a theme that occurs in similar form elsewhere in the odes (later we will examine an example of this in *Isth.* 5.12–16). In expressing the idea that human expectations should be tempered by the recognition of mortal limits, and that hard work, expenditure and fame are the basis of divinely granted honour and happiness, the laudator provides ‘terms’ for the attainment of

---

<sup>127</sup> Indergaard (2011: 306) notes that this image resonates the common Pindaric motif of the Pillars of Herakles as the limits of human distinction. See Perón (1974): 72–84 and Race (1990): 191–5. For examples of this see *Ol.* 3.43–45, *Pyth.* 10.28–29, *Nem.* 3.22, *Nem.* 4.69, *Isth.* 4.11–12.

<sup>128</sup> Lampon.

individual glory. Cast as a gnome, this is a message that is universally applicable, though in lines 14–16 the laudator applies it specifically to Lampon, who wishes to hold it in mind as he approaches Hades and grey old age.<sup>129</sup>

ὔμμε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαί,  
τέθμιόν μοι φαμί σαφέστατον ἔμμεν  
τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις.  
μυρία δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέ-  
τμανθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῶ κέλευθοι  
καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους,  
οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος  
οὔτε παλίγγλωσσος πόλις,  
ἄτις οὐ Πηλέος αἶει κλέος ἤ-  
ρωος, εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν

(*Isth.* 6.19–25)

And as for you, O Aiakidai with your golden chariots,  
I declare that I have the clearest mandate,  
when coming to this island, to shower you with praises.  
Countless roads, one after another, one hundred feet  
wide, have been cut for their noble deeds  
beyond the springs of the Nile and through the  
Hyperboreans,

---

<sup>129</sup> For discussions of gnomai in Pindar, see Boeke (2007) and Payne (2006). For broader discussions of gnomai in Greek literature, see Lardinois (1997 and 2001).

and there is no city so alien  
or of such backward speech  
that it does not hear tell of the fame of the hero Peleus,  
the blessed son-in-law of the gods...

In lines 19–25, the laudator moves his attention from Lampon to the Aeginetan community, shifting the focus of the ode outwards. In doing so, he follows a trend that we saw in *Nem.* 5.4–8, where the opening lines describing the glory won by Lampon’s ‘mighty son Pytheas’ (Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς) were followed by the declaration that the latter had also brought honour to the Aiakidai. Here in the first epode of *Isth.* 6, the laudator addresses the Aeginetans as ‘O Aiakidai with your golden chariots’ (ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαί). This seems to be a calculated appeal to the listening community (i.e. the aristocratic element of Aeginetan society) as the descendents of Aiakos, and is resonant of *Nem.* 5.7–8, where the laudator declares that the Aiakidai are ‘heroic warriors born of Kronos and Zeus and from the golden Nereids’ (ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῶν Νηρηίδων / Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν). Comparing the Aiakidai to charioteers has another aspect. For the laudator notes, in lines 22–25, that he has the clearest mandate to shower the community with praises; that countless roads have been cut for their noble deeds from the Nile to the land of the Hyperboreans, and that no *polis* is so backwards as not to have heard of her heroes. In conjuring this imagery in their minds, the audience are encouraged to imagine roads that run physically across the Greek world, and (as the laudator moves into an account of the heroes in line 25ff.)

from the depths of the mythical past into the present.<sup>130</sup>

Despite Kirkwood's proposal that "the transition to myth is syntactically abrupt," the use of ὅμμε τ' ('as for you') at the beginning of this stanza signals a shift in focus from Lampon to the community that is not a break in the laudator's line of thought, but a continuation of it.<sup>131</sup> Having used the gnome to construe the terms of greatness for the outstanding individual (in this case Lampon), the laudator does the same for the Aeginetan community. In doing so, he implicitly invites the listeners to compare individual and communal glory, and to striking effect. As we have seen in lines 10–18, Lampon's capacity to achieve fame and plant happiness is constrained by the limits of his own expenditure and hard work as well as the limits of his lifetime. In other words, his potential for glory is determined by his agency as an individual and his mortality. By contrast, the glory of the Aeginetan community consists in the achievements of its many distinguished members, both past and present, with its fame stretching back into the heroic past and extending across the Greek world. The effect of moving from the gnome in lines 10–18 into praise for Aegina's timeless honour is to emphasise the fact that, in contrast to Lampon, the Aeginetan community is by its very nature collective and perpetual, and Panhellenic in scope. The message planted in the minds of the audience is that Aegina, the birthplace of heroes and contemporary athletes alike, has a capacity for fame and glory that is substantively greater than that of any individual, but whose honour is consolidated by individual success. This message is sharpened by the fact that the terms of Lampon's greatness are conveyed

---

<sup>130</sup> The 'road of words' motif occurs elsewhere in the odes, for example at *Isth.* 4.1 and *Nem.* 6.45. In both those cases, as here, the image prompts the listeners to conceive of the praise in its broadest, i.e. Panhellenic aspect.

<sup>131</sup> Kirkwood (1982): 292. Indergaard (2011: 307) notes that the distinction between what is achievable by Lampon (lines 10–18) and the Aiakidai and Herakles (line 19ff.) is marked. He construes this, however, as the distinction between the mortal and heroic capacity for fame.

through a gnome, whose use would have suggested to the audience that the terms of his success might apply to any aspiring or outstanding individual, in which case the same relationship between that individual and the Aeginetan community would apply.<sup>132</sup>

οὐδ' ἄτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα  
καὶ πατρός, τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον  
ἄγε σὺν Τιρυνθίοισιν πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς  
Τροίαν, ἥρωσι μόχθον,  
Λαομεδοντιᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀμπλακιᾶν  
ἐν ναυσὶν Ἀλκμήνας τέκος.  
εἶλε δὲ Περγαμίαν, πέφνεν δὲ σὺν κείνῳ Μερόπων  
ἔθνεα καὶ τὸν βουβόταν οὐρεῖ ἴσον  
Φλέγραισιν εὐρῶν Ἄλκυο-  
νῆ, σφετέρας δ' οὐ φείσατο  
χερσὶν βαρυφθόγγιο νευρᾶς  
  
Ἡρακλῆς. ἀλλ' Αἰακίδαν καλέων  
ἐς πλόον <—> κύρησεν δαινυμένων.  
τὸν μὲν ἐν ῥινῶ λέοντος στάντα κελήσατο νε-  
κταρέαις σπονδαῖσιν ἄρξαι  
καρτεραίχμαν Ἀμφιτρωνιάδαν,

---

<sup>132</sup> The accessibility of the family's fame is also implied in *Isth.* 5.54–56, where the laudator says 'let a man strive to perform in the games after thoroughly learning about the family of Kleonikos,' (μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων / ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου / ἐκμαθών).

ἄνδωκε δ' αὐτῷ φέρτατος  
οἶνοδόκον φιάλαν χρυσῷ πεφρικυῖαν Τελαμών.  
ὁ δ' ἀνατείναις οὐρανῷ χειῖρας ἀμάχους  
αὐδάσε τοιοῦτον ἔπος,  
    “Εἴ ποτ' ἐμῶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ,  
θυμῷ θέλων ἄρᾶν ἄκουσας,  
  
νῦν σε, νῦν εὐχαῖς ὑπὸ θεσπεσίαις  
λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας  
ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ξεῖνον ἄμὸν μοιρίδιον τελέσαι,  
τὸν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυάν, ὥς-  
    περ τόδε δέρμα με νῦν περιπλανᾶται  
θηρός, ὃν ἀμπρωτον ἀέθλων κτεῖνά ποτ' ἐν Νεμέα  
θυμὸς δ' ἐπέσθω.” ταῦτ' ἄρα  
    οἱ φαμένῳ πέμψεν θεός  
ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν μέγαν αἰετόν, ἄ-  
    δειᾶ δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις,  
  
εἶπέν τε φωνήσαις ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ,  
    “Ἔσσεταί τοι παῖς, ὃν αἰτεῖς, ὦ Τελαμών,  
καί νιν ὄρνιχος φανέντος κέκλευ ἐπώνυμον εὐ-  
    ρυβίαν Αἴαντα, λαῶν  
ἐν πόνοις ἔκπαγλον Ἐνυαλίου.”  
ὥς ἦρα εἰπὼν αὐτίκα  
ἔζετ'. ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας <ἀν>αγήσασθ' ἀρετάς,

Φυλακίδα γὰρ ἦλθον, ᾧ Μοῖσα, ταμίας

Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμέ-

νει τε, τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον

εἰρήσεταιί που κὰν βραχίστοις.

ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου

τρειῖς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας,

ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρως. ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς

φάος οἶαν μοῖραν ὕμνων,

τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων

ἄρδοντι καλλίστα δρόσῳ,

τόν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε πόλιν

θεοφιλῆ ναίοισι.

(*Isth.* 6.26–66)

or of Telamonian Aias

or of his father, whom Alkmene's son led

as an eager ally into bronze-loving war, when he went

with his men from Tiryns in ships to Troy,

that labour for the heroes,

on account of Laomedon's crimes.

He took Pergamos, and with that man slew the tribes

of the Meropes and that cowherd great as a mountain,

Alkyoneus, when he encountered him

at Phlegrai, and did not hold back  
his hands from his deep bow-toned bowstring,  
  
Herakles, that is. But when he came to summon Aiakos'  
son  
to the voyage... he found them dining.<sup>133</sup>  
As Amphytryon's son, a mighty spearman, stood there  
in his lion's skin, matchless Telamon bade him  
pour out the first libations of nectar  
and handed up to him  
the wine-receiving bowl bristling with gold.  
And he, stretching his invincible hands upwards to  
Heaven,  
spoke out such words as these:  
"If ever, O father Zeus,  
you have heard my prayers with a willing heart,  
  
now, now with holy prayers  
I entreat you to bring to term from Eriboia for this man  
a bold son to be my destined guest-friend,  
one with a body as impenetrable as this hide  
now wrapped around me from the  
beast I once slew in Nemea as the very first of my labours,  
and may he have a heart to match." Then, after

---

<sup>133</sup> For the suggestion that the meal Herakles interrupts is a wedding feast see von der Mühl (1957: 130–132); Privitera (1982: 208); Burnett (2005: 82), and Indergaard (2011: 311).

he had said this, the god sent him  
the king of birds, a great eagle.

Sweet joy thrilled him within,

and he spoke out like a seer and said,

“You shall have the son you request, O Telamon;  
and call him, as a namesake of the bird that appeared,  
mighty Aias, awesome among the host  
in the toils of Enyalios.’

After speaking thus, he immediately  
sat down. But it would take me too long to recount all  
their deeds,

since I have come, O Muse, as steward  
of the revel songs for Phylakidas, Pytheas

and Euthymenes. In the Argive manner  
it will be stated, I think, in the briefest terms:

these boys and their uncle took away three  
victories in the Pancratium from the Isthmos and others  
from leafy Nemea. And what a portion  
of hymns they brought to light!

They refresh the clan of the Psalychiadai  
with the finest dew of the Graces;  
having exalted the house of Themistios, they dwell  
in this city beloved by the gods.

In lines 25–56, the laudator moves from consideration of Aegina’s greatness into a mythological digression detailing the deeds of its heroes. This is similar to the movement we saw in *Nem.* 5.9ff., where the declaration that Aegina and the Aiakidai are the recipients of glory is followed by two mythological digressions on the deeds of Peleus and his brothers. Here in *Isth.* 6.25–56, the laudator gives an account of Herakles’ meeting with Telamon. In lines 27–35 their travels across the Greek world are noted, and in lines 35–36 Herakles finds Telamon dining. For the listeners, the congenial familiarity of the scene, in which one old comrade stumbles upon another and joins his repast, would have resonated the sympotic atmosphere that the laudator created at the opening of the ode.<sup>134</sup> At Telamon’s request, Herakles raises a brimming cup to pour out a libation to Zeus, and asks that if the god has ever heard his prayers before, he will bring a son to term for Telamon. Once again we have imagery of a prayer and a libation. In the previous chapter I argued that audiences exercised a highly developed faculty of association as they connected the imagery from different parts of the ode. Here, in listening to the laudator’s description of the meeting between Herakles and Telamon, they would have recollected the libation imagery of the opening stanza. When they imagined Herakles raising a bowlful of wine to Zeus they would have recalled lines 1–9, where the laudator declared that ‘we’ are mixing a second bowl of the Muses’ song, whilst expressing hopes of a third. This resonance would have been all the greater for the fact that in both passages the subject of the libation is offspring: the sons of Lampon in the opening lines and the son of Telamon here in the digression.

---

<sup>134</sup> Herakles, of course, is not Aeginetan, but here the laudator gives the audience a stake in his glory through the portrayal of his association with Telamon, and the closeness that existed between the two.

What was the significance of this resonance? Having made his prayer and observed the sacred eagle, Herakles declares that his request to Zeus will indeed be fulfilled, and that Aias will be born. The latter, however, never makes an appearance in the ode. Immediately after Herakles has finished his prophecy he sits down, marking an abrupt end to a mythological digression that has proceeded at a relatively measured pace across twenty nine lines.<sup>135</sup> Indergaard notes that this resembles the break-off in *Nem.* 4.33, which also terminates an account of the exploits of Herakles and Telamon.<sup>136</sup> Of the break-off here in *Isth.* 6 he says, “the fact that there is no time to narrate an epic poem is expressed by breaking off and reminding the audience of the limitations set by the occasion.”<sup>137</sup> He suggests that the effect of this was to emphasise that the poem is framed by mortal, as opposed to epic, limitations, and relates this to the opening libation by saying that this is especially pertinent because the laudator has no way of knowing whether the prayer for another victory will be successful.

Speaking of the role of the hero in the conception of Aias, Burnett suggests “the old fantasy of making a child by a purely masculine process seems to have been fulfilled.”<sup>138</sup> Indergaard, with the allusion to the libation of the ode’s sympotic opening in mind, rightly says that “in *Isth.* 6 Herakles speaks not only to Zeus, Telamon, and the guests at the wedding, but also, through the embedded speeches, to

---

<sup>135</sup> Privitera (1982: 211) notes that this resembles the epic formulation ὧς εἰπὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔζετο (‘having spoken thus he sat down’). See Hom. *Il* 1.68 and 101, 2.76, 7.354 and 365; *Od.* 7.153; *H.H.Herm.* 365. Carey (1981: 5) notes that breaking off from an epic tale in this way emphasises the lack of space for retelling the entire story.

<sup>136</sup> Indergaard (2011): 319. *Nem.* 4.33: τὰ μακρὰ δ’ ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός (‘but the law of song keeps me from telling the long tale’).

<sup>137</sup> Indergaard (2011): 319.

<sup>138</sup> Burnett (2005): 85. She refers to Eur. *Hipp.* 618–24 and compares *Isth.* 6.62, where the two young victors and Euthymenes “bring marvelous songs ‘into the light’ like midwives.”

the audience of Pindar's poem, as a parallel for Pindar's own prayers for future successes for Lampon's family."<sup>139</sup> The termination of the mythological account, however, would have prompted another association in the minds of the audience. Immediately following the break-off in line 56, and the omen from Zeus that Herakles' prayer has been heard, the laudator gives an account of the athletic glories won by Pytheas, Phylakidas and Euthymenes, their maternal uncle. In other words, at the point when the audience are assured that a heroic offspring is forthcoming, when the assurances of Herakles have primed them to look forward to the birth of Aias, the hero sits down and the offspring of Lampon (Λάμπωνος γενεᾶς, as they are called in line 3) along with Euthymenes are brought to the fore. Thus, at the moment that their expectations of glorious offspring are conceived, the audience are carried forward from the mythical past to the present day, where their expectations are fulfilled by a glorious image of the victors.

This would have had a dramatic impact on the listeners, prompting them to place the brothers in the closest possible proximity to the great heroes of the past, and virtually making them the fulfillment of Herakles' prayer. This abrupt temporal movement prompted the audience to conceive of the victors in terms of the highest possible praise, and should be seen in relation to the first epode, which introduced the mythological account. There, as we have seen, the community is glorified through praise for the Aiakids and their golden chariots, which cut paths of fame across the Greek world. In lines 60–62 the laudator declares that 'these boys and their uncle took away three victories in the Pancratium from the Isthmos and others from leafy Nemea' (ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου / τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ'

---

<sup>139</sup> Indergaard (2011): 320.

εὐφύλλου Νεμέας). The audience are thus asked to conjure an image of victory in its relationship to geography, with the victors being mentioned in connection with the places where they won success. The laudator prompts the listeners to cast their minds across the Greek world, just as they imagined the chariots carrying Aiakid fame from the Nile to the Hyperboreans, the effect of which would be to imagine not only that outstanding Aeginetans achieved Panhellenic fame in the mythical past, but that they continued to renew that fame in the present. In essence, through the break-off, the ‘substitution’ of Phylakidas, Pytheas and Euthymenes and the descriptions of their victories taken from the Isthmos and Nemea, the laudator places them at the end of the line of outstanding Aeginetans who, as we have seen in lines 19–25, stretch from the mythical past and across the Greek world, carrying Aegina’s fame with them.

Whilst seeming to evoke the performance of *Nem.* 5, as I discussed above, I propose that, having imagined the mythical scene in lines 27–56, the audience would have construed a close association between the first draught of wine, mentioned in the sympotic context of line 3, and the libation of Herakles in lines 37–40. This, as Race has noted, was traditionally reserved for Zeus. If this is accurate then this allusion comprises a highly sophisticated rhetorical manoeuvre, utilising the dynamics of oral performance and demanding an extremely high associative capacity on the part of the listeners. In essence, the ode opens with a reference to a first toast, the effect of which is to bring a former celebration to the minds of the listeners. Later in the ode, Herakles, in the distant past, pours a libation that places the victors at the end of a long line of outstanding Aeginetans. Having heard how Herakles poured wine and water in his prayer to Zeus, the listeners would then have associated this action with the first bowl of their imaginary symposium, giving the latter the quality of stretching

across time and space and encompassing the stories of ancient heroes and present-day athletes. In effect, the prayer that the hero makes on behalf of Telamon through the act of pouring nectar is renewed by the prayer at the beginning of the ode and fulfilled in the form of Phylakidas and Pytheas. The laudator's uses of this complex and resonant imagery has the effect of collapsing the distinction between past and present in the minds of the listeners in order to build a framework of praise for the young victors. Just as in *Nem.* 5, where the prayer of Peleus, Telamon and Phokos is made to apply to contemporary Aegina, so in *Isth.* 6 the liquid falling from Herakles' raised bowl in the promise of a future hero is shown to deliver a new set of offspring to carry Aeginetan fame across the Greek world along the long-established paths of glory.

**What were the consequences of placing the victors at the end of the line of Aeginetan heroes?**

The first consequence of placing the Phylakidas and Pytheas at the end of the line of outstanding Aeginetans concerns the sense of glory that the listeners associated with the victors. The laudator's use of a sophisticated framework of association, taking advantage of libation and sympotic imagery, served, as I have argued, to place the victors in the same heroic line as Telamon and Aias. In *Isth.* 6.56–66, the victories of Pytheas, Phylakidas and their uncle Euthymenes are recounted, and cast as a portion of hymns. Here, then, is yet another instance of libation imagery, echoing that of the opening stanza. The association with liquid is reinforced in lines 63–64, where the victors, having brought to light their portion of hymns, 'refresh' (as Race convincingly renders ἄρδοντι) the clan of the Psalychiadai, to which the brothers and

their uncle belong. Thus, in recounting their victories through the performance, the laudator casts the victors as metaphorically drawing out wine and water from a krater and quenching the thirst of their clan. Now, declares the laudator, the victors dwell in the city beloved by the gods, having ‘affirmed’ (ὀρθώσαντες) the house of Themistios, their maternal grandfather, whose glory is commemorated at the end of *Nem.* 5. In being cast in the line of outstanding Aeginetans, the glory of the athletes is vaunted, whilst in the re-use of libation imagery, this glory is transmitted across the family, through both the clan and the *oikos*.

The second consequence of casting the victors in the line of Aeginetan heroes is that by doing so the laudator attributes glory to Aegina itself. This glory, however, is of a very different kind from that which is enjoyed by the victors and their family. As discussed above, lines 19–25 not only act as a prelude to the mythological discourse, but comment on the nature of community. Unlike Lampon, for whom hard work, good deeds and fame comprise the limits of glory, Aegina is shown to have a capacity for greatness that is on a different order of magnitude altogether. Its fame stretches from Egypt to the Hyperboreans, extends into the distant past and is known to every city. Moreover, it travels on paths cut by the noble deeds of heroes. Having noted this, the laudator, in line 24, begins a mythological account that retreads these paths. As the listeners imagined the deeds of Herakles and Telamon in lines 27–34, they would have conjured images of the heroes travelling across the Greek lands, achieving glory in a Panhellenic setting. Furthermore, they would have associated this Panhellenic glory with their own community, imagining that, through these heroic journeys, Herakles and Telamon cut paths through across the world along which the fame of Aegina would travel. When, through the use of libation and sympotic imagery,

Pytheas, Phylakidas and Euthymenes were placed in this heroic line, their glory, won at the great games, would have been interpreted by the audience in this Panhellenic light. As they heard the account of the victories at Nemea and the Isthmos in lines 57–66, the listeners, their thoughts having been cast outwards across the sea, would have imagined the fame of their community spread to the sites of the victories, where they would be spoken of by other Greeks. Though these athletic successes might have enhanced the standing of the Psalychiadai and the house of Themistios *within* the community, for the community as a whole these victories would have been seen as consolidating the stake that Aegina had in the wider glory of Greece. In this sense, then, the effect of placing the victors in this heroic line was to make them vehicles for the greater, Panhellenic glory of the community.

In *Isth.* 6, then, glory for Pytheas, Phylakidas and Euthymenes depended on their being associated with an outstanding line that was quintessentially Aeginetan, and in promoting the greatness of the victors, the laudator also promoted that of the community itself. Aegina's capacity for greatness was superior to that of any individual, as is made clear in the comparison between the gnomic statement of the second stanza and the Panhellenic message of the third. Its greatness was geographically wider, substantively deeper and established since time immemorial. As with the treasury of hymns in *Pyth.* 6, here we have an example of imagery that has a Panhellenic dimension being endowed with a peculiarly local significance. If Aegina is portrayed as having Panhellenic glory, it is not in order to prove her greatness over other Greek cities, but over those individuals and families who comprise the Aeginetan community itself. In creating images of heroes forging paths across Greece, the laudator relies on the preconceptions of the listeners and their deep

appreciation of the special quality of fame that is to be found abroad. This quality is present in Pytheas, Phylakidas and Euthymenes, and evident in their athletic successes. But their glory and the praise that follows it could not, under the terms of the ode, challenge that which fell on Aegina, only supplement it.

Concerning the mythological account in lines 27–56, Indergaard argues that “when seen in connection with the praise of the Psalychiadai that surrounds this narrative section, it is clear that the Aiakidai are portrayed as the mythical parallel and paradigm for this Aeginetan clan, and that the role of their Theban *xenos* Pindar parallels that of Herakles.”<sup>140</sup> Through lines 63–65 the laudator clearly attributes great distinction to the family: ‘they [the brothers and their uncle] refresh the clan of the Psalychiadai with the finest dew of the Graces, having exalted the house of Themistios,’ (τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτρην Χαρίτων / ἄρδοντι καλλίστα δρόσῳ, / τὸν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε...). I propose, however, that the mythological discourse prompts the listening community to think of the outstanding family in a different light. Through references to the opening section, the laudator uses the relationship between Herakles and Telamon (the latter as one of the principal Aiakids) to suggest that the young victors and their family (especially their father) have brought glory to the community. I have already shown how, in the prayer that Peleus and his brothers made to Zeus Hellanios in *Nem.* 5.9–12, the glory of the great Aiakids was assimilated to a wider communal glory that is renewed and consolidated with each new generation of outstanding Aeginetans. It is this sense of collective glory and its renewal across the generations that is implicit in the term ‘countless roads, one after another, have been cut for their noble deeds’ (μυρία δ’ ἔργων καλῶν

---

<sup>140</sup> Indergaard (2011): 306.

τέτμανθ' ἐκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῶ κέλευθοι). Though the Aiakidai are used as comparatives for the victorious family, the effect of this is in fact to construe the Psalychiadai as exemplars of Aegina's honour. The status of exemplar is the basis of their individual and familial distinction but, on the evidence provided by the ode, this is subsumed within a wider glory that is the collective stake of the listening community. In the use of Panhellenic imagery to create a framework of praise that appeals to a domestic audience, then, *Isth.* 6 follows the same trend that we have seen in the performances (primary and secondary) of *Pyth.* 6. Here, however, as in *Nem.* 5, this imagery is used to stress the social primacy of the community over its members by giving it a greater capacity for glory and a more established claim to fame than the victors and their family.

### **What about Lampon?**

Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν  
ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιό-  
δου μάλα τιμᾶ τοῦτ' ἔπος,  
υἱοῦσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ,  
  
ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἐῶ προσάγων  
καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται,  
μέτρα μὲν γνώμα διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων,  
γλῶσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν, φαί-  
  
ης κέ νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν

Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν.

πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕ-

δωρ, τὸ βαθύζωνοι κόραι

χρυσοπέπλου Μναμοσύνας ἀνέτει-

λαν παρ' εὐτειχέσιν Κάδμου πύλαις.

(*Isth.* 6.66–75)

... Lampon holds in particular

honour that saying of Hesiod

which he quotes and recommends to his sons,

as he brings to his own city an adornment all share

and is beloved for his acts of kindness to foreigners,

pursuing due measure in judgment and holding fast to it;

his tongue does not stray from his thoughts; you would

say that among athletes he is a bronze-taming

whetstone from Naxos compared to other stones.

I shall offer him a drink of Dirke's sacred water,

which the deep-bosomed daughters

of golden-robed Mnemosyne made to surge

by the well-walled gates of Kadmos.

One of the most conspicuous differences between *Isth.* 6 and *Nem.* 5 is the

laudator's treatment of Lampon. In the latter ode, the father of Pytheas and Phylakidas is mentioned only once, at the very beginning. The effect of this, I argued, was to confer on him a portion of his son's glory whilst withholding from him the status of exemplar of the community's greatness. In *Isth.* 6, Lampon is far more prominent.<sup>141</sup> His sons are mentioned in the first stanza through the label 'Lampon's prize-winning offspring' (Λάμπωνος εὐαέθλου γενεᾶς), and he alone is the subject of the second stanza. He makes yet another appearance at the end of the ode, where, in lines 66–73, he is given extensive praise. There, the laudator declares that he follows the Hesiodic paradigm of hard work (which he recommends to his sons); that he brings a κόσμος (the meaning of which I discuss below) that all share; that he pursues straight judgment; that his tongue does not stray from his thoughts, and that he is as a Naxian whetstone to athletes. How can we account for this treatment of Lampon, and how should it affect our understanding of the ode?

The most obvious way to explain the differences with *Nem.* 5 is that when *Isth.* 6 was performed Lampon was the father of not one but two victorious sons. This gave him an unusual and highly distinguished status, and one that few men are known to have shared. The elevated praise in *Isth.* 6 would seem to reflect this, particularly the references in lines 72–73 to his position as a bronze-taming whetstone amongst athletes. I will argue, however, that in bringing Lampon to greater prominence in the performance, the laudator used him as a special means of qualifying the glory of the

---

<sup>141</sup> Burnett (2005: 82) argues the odes create an association between Lampon and Herakles, and this is also the view of Indergaard (2011: 307–308), who says, with reference to the myth's focus on Telamon's role as the father of Aias (lines 26–27), that "within the present context of celebration, this also suggests the relationship of Lampon to his victorious son Phylakidas." He also proposes that in the historical context of Aeginetan-Athenian rivalry, the fact that the passage emphasises the Aeginetan roots of Aias acts as a "counterclaim to Athenian attempts to appropriate Ajax." See Kron (1976: 171–176); Shapiro (1989: 154–157); Fearn (2007: 91–93); Scodel (2006: 65–71), and Kowalzig (2006: 85–91).

victors in relation to that of the listening community.

In lines 66–68, Lampon, who devotes industry to deeds, is portrayed as recommending ‘that saying of Hesiod’ to his sons (the commonly attributed quote is from Hes. *Op.* 412: μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει– ‘industry advances work’). This saying echoes the advice contained in the ode’s second stanza. There, as I have discussed above, the limits of individual, mortal glory are reached when a person combines hard work and good deeds with god-given fame. This similarity would have been obvious to the audience, who are encouraged to impart the substance of the second stanza’s gnomic statement to Lampon’s fatherly advice to his sons. This has important implications for our interpretation of the ode, and for the role of Lampon.

That athletic success came from industrious hard work can hardly have been a revelation to the listeners, and the fact that Pytheas and Phylakidas followed this principle would have been evident from the victories themselves. The fact that the boys hold this principle dear at all, however, is attributed in lines 66–68 to their father’s judicious advice. Hearing that he recommended to them the hard-working attitude that they have followed to such good effect conveyed to the listeners the impression that Lampon had a direct hand in his sons’ success, and a greater personal stake in their victories than he is shown to have had in *Nem.* 5. Now, rather than enjoying vicarious honour simply through a close blood-line with a victor, Lampon is shown to have directly benefitted them with his skillful advice. The laudator’s success in making such a case for Lampon’s influence may well have rested on the audience’s natural impression that, since both of his boys had achieved victory, their father was the source of their outstanding qualities.

Another implication of the association between the second stanza and lines 66–68 would have been to consolidate the distinction between individual and communal glory. In the second stanza, the gnomic statement about the limits of human greatness are said to be known and accepted by Lampon, who prays to reach them when he welcomes grey old age. Implicit in Lampon’s lesson about the value of hard work is the lesson about the limits of individual glory in lines 10–13. There the laudator places hard-won success within a conceptual framework in which it comprises the limits of mortal greatness. In other words, the limits of success are conditioned by the mortal capacity for hard work and exertion (which, however great, are limited). By using the Hesiodic principle in lines 66–68 to create an association with lines 10–13, the laudator encourages the audience to place these victories within this framework. The corollary of the listeners’ impression that Pytheas and Phylakidas followed their father’s Hesiodic advice and won their victories through expenditure and industry was thus the impression that these victories engendered the most elevated form of greatness of which individuals are capable. This consolidated the impression that the greatness achieved by these young victors was of an entirely different nature to that which their victories conferred on the community. Whilst Pytheas and Phylakidas have achieved mortal distinction that they will take with them to their deaths, Aegina, not being bound by the mortal passage of time, enjoys a fame that not only cuts across the Greek world and deep into the ancient past, but subsumes the victories and great deeds of her citizens, including those of the young athletes (‘countless roads, one after another, one hundred feet wide, have been cut for their noble deeds’ – *μυρία δ’ ἔργων καλῶν τέτμανθ’ ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῶ κέλευθοι*).

In this light we can understand the declaration, immediately following in line 69, that Lampon brings a κόσμος shared by all (ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἐῶ προσάγων). Race translates κόσμος as ‘adornment.’<sup>142</sup> I argue, however, that ‘good behaviour’ or ‘good conduct’ would be more accurate.<sup>143</sup> The implications of this phrase are several, and may be understood both with reference to lines 66–68, just discussed, and to the encomiastic praise that follows in lines 70–72. In the latter, the laudator declares that Lampon is beloved for his kindness to strangers; that he solidly pursues good judgment, and that his tongue does not stray from his thoughts. These are ‘civic’ qualities, comprising a code of conduct suitable to life in the community, and which is distinctly non-athletic.<sup>144</sup> Immediately following this praise, however, is the declaration that one would call Lampon a bronze-taming Naxian whetstone amongst athletes. The fact that this image concludes the long encomiastic clause suggests that the civic attributes explain the metaphor, i.e. it is *because* he is generous, judicious and straight-speaking that he is like an athletic whetstone.

Let us examine this curious metaphor. A whetstone is used by a smith to shape metal into objects such as swords and spears. If Lampon is the whetstone, whose function is to tame bronze, then the bronze would seem to stand for the athletes. The laudator seems to presume that the audience, hearing his civic praises sung in lines

<sup>142</sup> He is thus in agreement with Slater (1969: 287).

<sup>143</sup> Indergaard (2011: 298–9), accepting ‘adornment,’ believes this may suggest that the symposium at which the ode was performed was a public occasion (so Thummer (1968–9), ii.110), against the view of the scholia that it refers to Lampon’s coaching of his sons (Σ Pind. *Isth.* 6.97 (iii.259 Dr)).

<sup>144</sup> Compare this to the civic praise for Xenocrates in *Isth.* 2.35–42: ‘May I make a long throw with the discus and cast the javelin as far as Xenocrates surpassed all men with his sweet disposition. He was respectful in the company of his townsmen, he practiced horse-breeding in the Panhellenic tradition and welcomed all the feasts of the gods. And never did an oncoming wind cause him to furl the sails at his hospitable table, but he would travel to Phasis in the summer seasons, while in the winter he would sail to the shore of the Nile.’ (μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ’, ὅσον ὄργαν / Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν / ἔσχεν. αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὀμιλεῖν, / ἵπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ, / καὶ θεῶν δαίτας προσέπτυκτο πάσας, οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν / οὖρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ’ ἰστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν, / ἀλλ’ ἐπέρα ποτὶ μὲν Φᾶσιν θερείαις, / ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι πλέων Νείλου πρὸς ἄκταν.)

70–72, would have been quite prepared to imagine Lampon as a shaper of victors, since this has already been implied in lines 66–68. Moreover, coming at the end of the ode, this role is attributed to him at the point in the performance that is regularly reserved for praising the victor’s trainer (as in *Nem.* 5.48–49, with Menander, and *Isth.* 5.59–61, with Pytheas himself as Phylakidas’ trainer). There may, then, have been some expectation on the listeners’ part that the person who was responsible for getting the athletes into shape would be mentioned here. It is, however, the father and his knowledge of civic conduct that is praised, rather than a professional coach. In casting Lampon as a civic paradigm and a whetstone that tames bronze, he and his non-athletic virtues are attributed the strongest possible role in creating athletes ready for victory. Hearing this, the listeners are encouraged to form the impression that victory depended not simply on hard, physical work, but on those civic virtues of which Lampon is a great exemplar. Any attribution of these virtues to Pytheas and Phylakidas, however, is oblique, as they are not mentioned by name anywhere after line 58. Instead, the focus now is on Lampon, whose wonderful character not only accounts for his sons’ approach to hard work, and thus to victory, but encompasses an approach to relations with the community that are harmonious and virtuous. Through his exemplary code of conduct, he has produced two victorious sons, whose successes enhance the long-established glory of the island. It is in this way that he brings a *κόσμος* that all share. Now, like his sons in *Nem.* 5, he is held up as an exemplar of good behaviour that the listeners would have imagined characterised, indeed glorified, their community as being *εὐάνδρος*.

## ISTHMIAN 5: The third ode.

### Similarities and differences

Μᾶτερ Ἁελίου πολυώνυμε Θεία,  
σέο ἕκατι καὶ μεγασθενῆ νόμισαν  
χρυσὸν ἄνθρωποι περιώσιον ἄλλων,  
καὶ γὰρ ἐριζόμεναι  
νᾶες ἐν πόντῳ καὶ <ύφ> ἄρμασιν ἵπποι  
διὰ τεάν, ὤνασσα, τιμὰν ὠκυδινά-  
τοις ἐν ἀμίλλαισι θαυμασταὶ πέλονται,

ἐν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι ποθεινόν  
κλέος ἔπραξεν, ὄντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι  
χερσὶ νικάσαντ' ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν  
ἢ ταχυτάτι ποδῶν.  
κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.  
δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαί-  
νοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον, εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ,

εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούη.  
μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι, πάντ' ἔχεις,  
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν.  
θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.  
τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά,

Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέα δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν  
Πυθέα τε, παγκρατίου. τὸ δ' ἔμόν  
οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται,  
σὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς

τάνδ' ἐς εὖνομον πόλιν. εἰ δὲ τέτραπται  
θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἄν καθαράν,  
μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾶ  
κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων.

καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ  
λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγ-  
γεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὀμοκλαῖς

μυρίον χρόνον

(*Isth.* 5.1–28)

Mother of the Sun, Theia of many names,  
because of you men value gold as mighty  
above all other things;  
then too, when ships contend  
on the sea or horses yoked to chariots,  
it is through your honour, O queen, that they become  
wondrous to behold in swiftly turning encounters;

and in athletic competition a man gains  
the glory he desires, when thick crowns  
wreath his hair after winning victory with his hands  
or the swiftness of his feet.

But men's valour is determined by the gods.

There are truly two things alone that foster

sweetness of life in blossoming prosperity:

if a man succeeds and hears his praises sung.

Do not seek to become Zeus, you have all there is

if a share of those blessings should come to you.

Mortal things befit mortals.

For you, Phylakidas, a flourishing double achievement

is stored up at the Isthmos, and at Nemea for both you

and Pytheas in the Pancratium. But my heart

tastes no hymns without including the Aiakidai,

for I have come with the Graces at the bidding of

Lampon's sons

to this law-abiding city. If someone has entered

into the clear road of divinely granted deeds,

do not grudge to blend into your song a fitting vaunt

in return for toils, for among the heroes brave warriors also

gained praise and are celebrated on lyres

and in the full range of pipes' harmonies

for time beyond measure

At 63 lines, the third and final ode for the family of Lampon (and the second for Phylakidas) is halfway in length between *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6. In lines 48–50 (which we will examine below) reference is made to the battle of Salamis, suggesting that the ode was composed after 480.<sup>145</sup> As I will argue below, it shares many of the features that we saw in *Isth.* 6, and, indeed, I will suggest that here the laudator uses a strategy of praise that derives from that which we saw in the previous two odes. I will also argue, however, that there are important differences in the way that the glory of the outstanding individual and his family is reconciled with that of the community, and that understanding these differences will lead to a nuanced appreciation of how epinician performance regulated social relations amongst the elite at Aegina.

In lines 7–10 the laudator declares that in athletic success a man gains the glory he desires when crowns wreath his hair and after winning victory with his hands or feet.<sup>146</sup> In lines 12–16 the laudator states that there are two things that foster sweetness of life and blooming prosperity: when a man succeeds and when he hears his praises sung. This is followed by the exhortation *μη μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι, πάντ' ἔχεις, / εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν. / θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει* ('do not seek to become Zeus; you have all there is if a share of those blessings should come to you.

---

<sup>145</sup> Though, as Hornblower (2004: 223) and Morrison (2011: 238) note, this need not have been immediately after, and the time that elapsed between the martial victory and the performance is unknown.

<sup>146</sup> Lines 1–6 praise the power of Theia. Burnett (2005: 93) notes the eclipse that occurred in the months before the Isthmian games of 478 (see Mucke and Meeus (1983)), and that Pindar viewed such events as portentous (she compares *Paeon* 9, composed after the eclipse of 463), and proposes that this accounts for the poet's praise of the goddess.

Mortal things befit mortals.’). Following this, in lines 17–19, is an account of Phylakidas’ Isthmian victory and that of his brother at Nemea.

Lines 7–10 are, in effect, a gnome, and recall that which we saw in lines 10–18 of *Isth.* 6. There the laudator declared that the limits of mortal happiness are determined by deeds of excellence and the honour of the gods, before voicing a prayer that Lampon would meet these criteria in grey old age. Here in *Isth.* 5, very similar limits to mortal greatness are also declared. Glory, the audience is told, is conferred by the gods on the fortunate individual, and if it lives on in the memory of others it is the greatest measure of a man’s success.<sup>147</sup> In expounding the limits of mortal glory, the laudator counsels against hubristic assumptions that athletic success confers divinity on the victor. In *Isth.* 6 the gnome was applied to Lampon, and here in *Isth.* 5 it is applied to Phylakidas and Pytheas.

Also similar to *Isth.* 6 is the fact that, following the praise for Phylakidas and Pytheas, the laudator mentions Aegina.<sup>148</sup> After declaring the importance of praising the Aiakidai, the laudator notes that he has come at the behest of Lampon’s sons to ‘this law-abiding city.’ He then urges that fitting songs be sung in return for toils, as brave warriors have gained praise amongst heroes and are celebrated on lyres and pipes (καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ / λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ’ ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς / μυρίον χρόνον). This praise through melody endures forever, and thanks to Zeus has provided a theme for wise poets. This passage is similar to *Isth.* 6.19–25 in its concern with fame and song. In

---

<sup>147</sup> In *Isth.* 6 this is said explicitly, whilst in *Isth.* 5 it is suggested through the image of a man’s praises being sung (i.e. encomiastic commemoration).

<sup>148</sup> Lines 19–20: τὸ δ’ ἐμόν / οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται.

singing of individuals who have entered into the clear road of divine deeds, the laudator echoes the language used in *Isth.* 6.22–23, where countless roads, one hundred feet wide, have been cut for noble achievements.<sup>149</sup> Coming immediately after the praise for Phylakidas and Pytheas, and with the mention of Lampon’s sons having invited the laudator to the city, it seems likely that the audience would have assimilated the imagery of this passage, the commemorative song on pipes and lyre, to the performance itself. When the laudator, in lines 22–27, urges that song be sung in return for ‘toils,’<sup>150</sup> and notes that ancient warriors gained similar praise, he is suggesting to the listeners that they imagine the current performance in honour of Phylakidas and Pytheas as being part of a long line of performances for honoured individuals, which stretches back into the ancient past. The laudator thus encourages the listeners to place the victors’ achievements in this long line of heroic deeds, just as I have argued was the case in *Isth.* 6.<sup>151</sup>

In *Isth.* 6.19–25 we saw the laudator extol the greatness of Aegina by declaring that her fame stretched from the Nile to the land of the Hyperboreans, and that there was no city so backward that it had not heard the name of her heroes. Coming immediately after the gnomic statement of *Isth.* 6.10–18, in which the limits of mortal greatness are laid out, the laudator suggests that the island community enjoys fame of a different nature and scope to that of Lampon and his family. Here in *Isth.* 5, despite the fact that a similar gnomic statement is posited in lines 7–10 and that Aegina’s greatness is extolled immediately after, there is no sense that such a comparison is made between the two. This is an important observation whose

<sup>149</sup> Lines 22–23: εἰ δὲ τέτραπται / θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἄν καθαρὰν.

<sup>150</sup> Expressed by πόνοι, a reference to the athletic victories.

<sup>151</sup> Again, this does not suggest that the audience literally conceived the victors as having heroic status. There is no suggestion in the ode that worship, sacrifice or the other trappings of heroic veneration would be attached to Phylakidas or Pytheas through or as a result of the performance.

implications I will explore later.<sup>152</sup>

**Praise for Achilles and praise for Aegina: the role of memory.**

μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς  
Διὸς ἕκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι,  
ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαενναῖς  
Οἰνεΐδαι κρατεροί,  
ἐν δὲ Θήβαις ἵπποσόας Ἴολαος  
γέρας ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ' ἐν Ἄργει, Κάστορος δ' αἰχ-  
μὰ Πολυδεύκεός τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ρέεθροις.

ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνῶνα μεγαλήτορες ὄργαι  
Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε, τοῖ καὶ σὺν μάχαις  
δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, ἐσπόμενοι  
Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,  
καὶ σὺν Ἀτρεΐδαις. ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν,  
λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἔκτορα πέφνον,  
καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθιοπῶν ἄφοβον  
Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν, τίς ἄρ' ἐσλὸν Τήλεφον  
τρῶσεν ἐῷ δορὶ Καΐκου παρ' ὄχθαις;

---

<sup>152</sup> It is important to note at this point, however, that I do not suggest *Isth.* 5's conceptual departure from *Isth.* 6. The difference is rhetorical, with the laudator choosing not to emphasise a feature of the relationship between individual and community which he made emphatic in the previous ode.

τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτρων,  
διαπρεπέα νᾶσον, τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι  
πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν.

(*Isth.* 5.28–45)

... and, thanks to Zeus, reverence  
for them has provided a theme for wise poets.  
In the splendid sacrifices of the Aitolians  
the mighty sons of Oineus have their honour,  
while in Thebes it is horse-driving Iolaos;  
it is Perseus in Argos, and the spearmen Kastor and  
Polydeukes by the streams of the Eurotas;  
but in Oinona it is the great-hearted spirits  
of Aiakos and his sons, who twice in battles  
destroyed the Trojans' city, first  
as followers of Herakles,  
then with the Atreidai. Drive me now up from the plain;  
tell me which men slew Kyknos, which ones slew Hektor  
and the fearless general of the Ethiopians,  
Memnon of the bronze armour? Who then wounded noble  
Telephos  
with his spear by the banks of the Kaikos?

One's mouth proclaims Aegina as their homeland,  
that illustrious island. From of old she has been built  
as a bastion for men to scale with lofty achievements.

In lines 30–33 the laudator prepares the audience for a mythological digression by noting the heroic sacrifices that other cities observe. The Aitolians make offerings to the sons of Oineus; the Thebans honour horse-driving Iolaos, whilst the citizens of Argos revere Perseus and the Spartans worship Kastor and Polydeukes by the streams of Eurotas. In lines 34–38 he reaches Aegina, and praises Aiakos and his sons for being great-hearted before giving an account of how they destroyed the Trojans twice in battle, first as followers of Herakles and then with the Atreidai. This account of the mythical founders of Aegina, in its position subsequent to the gnome, once again echoes what we saw in *Isth.* 6. There in line 26ff., after the account of Aegina's capacity for glory, the laudator discusses the partnership of Telamon and Herakles, and how the latter successfully prayed that his comrade would be given a son. As with the account of Neoptolemos' journey to Delphi in *Nem.* 7, these deeds would have been familiar to the audience, who would readily have reconciled the laudator's account with their existing preconceptions of their founding dynasty's heroism.

In lines 38–42, the laudator continues to appeal to the audience's preconceptions of their heroic past, though using a different method. Now that the listeners have cast their minds back in time, he asks a series of questions: Which men slew Kyknos? Which ones slew Hector? Which slew the general of the Ethiopians? Who wounded Telephos with his spear by the banks of the Kaïkos? The answer in

each case is ‘Achilles,’ and would easily have been provided by the listeners.<sup>153</sup> In posing these questions, the laudator relied on the audience’s high familiarity with myth. Here, however, he prompts them to access it in a different way to lines 34–38. By listing heroic deeds and encouraging the audience to attribute them to an *unnamed* hero, the laudator gives the listeners a greater sense of agency in the construction of the poetic image. The success of the laudator’s description of Aiakos and his sons in their battles against the Trojans relied on the audience simply recognising those events. In order to answer the laudator’s questions about Achilles’ accomplishments, however, the audience were required to recognise unattributed deeds and then to attribute them to a particular hero. None of the listeners, of course, had witnessed Achilles’ conduct at Troy first-hand, and any sense of familiarity came from mythological accounts in various media: folk-tales, sculptures, paintings, epic recitals, other poetic performances, etc. In hearing the questions, recognising the deeds and answering ‘Achilles,’ the audience would have created a dynamic set of interactions between their experience of the performance and their experiences of these other media.<sup>154</sup> In doing so, they furnished themselves with a composite image of the hero. Though this process would have been instantaneous and, given Achilles’ fame, carried virtually no possibility of error, it nonetheless required a different mental

<sup>153</sup> Burnett (2005: 96–98) notes that in his first three battles (against Kyknos, Hector and Memnon respectively) he is a mature warrior, but in the fourth and final one, against Telephos, the audience are asked to imagine him back on the verge of maturity, scoring his first victory. She refers back to the opening declaration about god-given glory (line 11), and argues that “the wounding of Telephos qualifies as an outward sign of inner *alka*, discerned by daimonic powers, interpreted by song, and preserved in good report (11–13) as men’s tongues assign it to the invisible tower of Aeginetan achievement (44–5).” With reference to the heroic families mentioned in lines 30–33 (the sons of Oineus; horse-driving Iolaos; Perseus, and Kastor and Polydeukes), which preceded the Achilles questions, Currie (2005: 77–78) proposes that the ode suggests the possibility of “inclusive immortality,” since in lines 22–27 the laudator declares that the victors deserve a ‘fitting vaunt in return for toils’ as ‘among the heroes brave warriors also gained praise’: εἰ δὲ τέτραπται / θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἄν καθαρὰν, / μὴ φθόνει κόμπων τὸν εἰκότ’ ἀοιδῶ / κερνάμεν ἀντι πόνων. / καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ / λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ’ ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὀμοκλαῖς...

<sup>154</sup> Burnett (2005: 96) says of the questions that “they do not provide the usual glimpse of a particular episode. Instead they challenge the listener with questions that force him to supply three battlefield contests to his own inner eye, then cap these with a fourth.”

effort from that demanded by the account of the Aiakids in lines 36–38. In response to the latter, the listeners would simply have had to accept that what they heard tallied with their preconceptions of Aiakos and his sons. Though entailing a certain demand on their faculties of memory and association, this demanded less than the rhetorical questions of lines 38–42.

What is the significance of this? It seems likely that through a mythological digression that created various demands on the audience's mental faculties, the laudator heightened the listeners' engagement with the performance and primed their powers of association in preparation for their construal of the imagery that was to follow in lines 43–50. But what was the nature of this engagement? In *Isth.* 6.25–56, the laudator constructed an account of Herakles and Telamon, speaking both of their travels and the prayer that the former made for Aias to be born. This was construed in the form of a narrative account. The demand that this placed on the listeners was that they access their shared body of cultural knowledge about the heroes' adventures and that they mentally place themselves in the past in order to re-experience them in their imaginations. In *Isth.* 6.30–43 no such demand is made. When he speaks of the heroes that are worshipped in other cities, the laudator asks the audience to imagine the cultic state of affairs as they stood at the time of the performance. In posing questions to them about Achilles' exploits, he asks them to remember stories (as well, presumably, as pictures, sculptures, etc.). Unlike in *Isth.* 6.25–56, the laudator does not encourage the audience to detach themselves from the present and mentally take themselves into the mythical past. The significance of this will be discussed below.

## Battling at Salamis: the role of anonymity.

πολλὰ μὲν ἀρτιεπής  
γλῶσσά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει περὶ κείνων  
κελαδέσαι, καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἄρει μαρτυρήσαι  
κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθείσα ναύταις

ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Σαλαμὶς Διὸς ὄμβρῳ  
ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ.  
ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχαμα κατάβρεχε σιγᾶ,  
Ζεὺς τὰ τε καὶ τὰ νέμει,  
Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος. ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ  
μέλιτι καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον  
χάρμ' ἀγαπάζοντι. μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων

ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου  
ἐκμαθῶν, οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός  
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὀπόσαι δαπάναι  
ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν.  
αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις  
Φυλακίδα πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορήσαι,  
χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.  
λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὐμαλλον μίτραν,  
καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον.

(*Isth.* 5.46–63)

My fluent tongue  
has many arrows to ring out in praise  
of them, and recently in war Salamis, the city of Aias,  
could attest that it was preserved by her sailors

during Zeus' devastating rain,  
that hailstorm of gore for countless men.

But nevertheless drench your boast in silence;

Zeus dispenses a variety of things,

Zeus the lord of all. And in poetry's delightful

honey honours such as these also welcome

joyous song of victory. Let a man strive to perform

in the games after thoroughly learning about the family

of Kleonikos, for the long hard work of their men

is certainly not hidden, nor have all their costs

vexed the zeal of their hopes.

I praise Pytheas too among those who subdue bodies

for guiding straight the course of Phylakidas' blows,

being quick with his hands and a good match with his

mind.

Take up a crown for him, bring a fillet of fine wool

and send along this winged new hymn.<sup>155</sup>

In lines 46–50 the laudator recounts the battle of Salamis. The laudator having many arrows to shoot is a common image in the odes, occurring at *Ol.* 2.83-5, *Ol.* 9.5-12, *Ol.* 13.93-5 and elsewhere. Similarly the hailstorm and related imagery can be found at *Isth.* 7.27, *Isth.* 4.17, *Nemean.* 9.38, and elsewhere at *Hdt.* 8.109.2. I am interested in the intended response of the primary audience to the performance of *Isth.* 5, and must therefore consider what assumptions and expectations the laudator could assume they held. There is no evidence for me to make the case that the listeners were aware of these other instances of these images, and that they held them in their minds as they listened to *Isth.* 5. Therefore I will not be using them as a basis for understanding the ode. Instead, as I will explore below, I will assume an awareness of the Persian Wars on the part of the listeners, as well as a strong emotional resonance attached to imagery of the conflict, as the basis of my examination of how the laudator intended the audience to respond.

The description of the battle comprises imagery that is unlike any other in the three odes to the sons of Lampon. In lines 46–48, the laudator declares that his tongue has many arrows to ring out in praise of those brave men who scale Aegina’s heights with their lofty achievements. Here, as is common in the odes, the laudator compares his speech to a projectile.<sup>156</sup> According to Race’s convincing translation the arrows are ‘fluent’ (ἀρτιεπής) praise that ‘ring out’ (κελαδέσαι) from his tongue. In calling

---

<sup>155</sup> For an extensive discussion of *Isth.* 5.56–63, see Silk (1998).

<sup>156</sup> We have seen him do this before in *Nem.* 7.70–75, where he compares his tongue to a speeding, bronze-cheeked javelin.’ In *Nem.* 5.19–21 the laudator announces his intent to praise with the urge that a jumping pit be dug for him, and the declaration that eagles leap even beyond the seas.

his tongue ἀρτιεπής, the laudator was not simply attributing to it a quality, but describing the ready flow of speech that issued forth as the performance continued apace. The image of the arrows that the audience are prompted to conjure in their minds would thus not have been of inanimate objects, but of active projectiles, charged with energy. In other words, as the laudator sang lines 46–48, the mind’s eye of each listener would have been filled with arrows that flew with the words themselves.

This is an important point to note because in lines 48–50 the laudator plays on this impression of flying arrows in his construction of the battle scene. There he announces that ‘recently’ (καὶ νῦν), the city of Aias could attest that it was preserved by her sailors ‘during Zeus’ devastating rain, the hailstorm of gore for countless men.’<sup>157</sup> Given the context of the episode, it seems highly likely that the audience would have understood this imagery as a metaphor for the arrows of the Persian host, whom the sailors of Aegina were instrumental in defeating. Here, then, the arrows that flew from the mouth of the laudator moments before have changed. As the listeners mentally projected their course, they would have watched them fly from the present of the performance into the recent past. There, at the battle of Salamis, they rain down upon the sailors as harbingers of death, charging the scene with the sense of danger that made the fighters’ actions so noble.

In line 51, however, without describing the outcome of the fighting, the laudator terminates the scene with the urge to ‘drench your boast in silence.’<sup>158</sup> The metaphorical inundation, previously a hail of gore that rained down on the sailors,

---

<sup>157</sup> ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Σαλαμῖς Διὸς ὄμβρῳ / ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ.

<sup>158</sup> ἀλλ’ ὅμως καύχασμα κατάβρεχε σιγᾶ.

now changes in quality once again, dousing vaunting praise. This, in effect, is the completion of the journey embarked upon by the arrows in lines 46–48. From the mouth of the laudator they began as glorifying words, before transforming into the deadly projectiles that won the sailors glory, and end by washing away the additional danger of excessive praise.

The depiction of the sailors would have appealed to the audience in a way that we have not seen in the previous two odes for Lampon's sons. For it does not seem reasonable to suppose that the military action at Salamis was an activity restricted to the aristocratic class. Quite how broad the social spectrum of the Aeginetan sailors at Salamis was is impossible to say, but it would appear that this imagery was designed to appeal to a wider section of the community than simply the elite. That *Isth.* 5 is also an address aimed at the peers of Lampon and his sons, however, just like *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, may be inferred from the fact that in lines 54–56 the laudator declares that any man who strives to perform in the games should thoroughly learn about the family of Kleonikos. This indicates that, whilst having a broader appeal than *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, the performance has a special relevance for those listeners of aristocratic birth who may wish to compete in the games in the future, and for whom Lampon's family are held up as models to emulate.

The laudator looses the volley of arrows that introduces the Salamis episode immediately after he terminates the series of questions about Achilles in lines 39–42. I argued that these questions were framed in order to stimulate the audience into creating a composite image of the hero in their minds using imagery from outside the performance itself. The effect of doing so, I suggested, was a heightened sense of

engagement in their construal of the hero, which primed them for the imagery to follow. It was in this frame of mind that the audience responded to the laudator's arrows of praise flying from his mouth and into the recent sea-battle. Not only do they comprise a complex and dynamic motif that led the audience from one timeframe to another and through praise and danger alike, but the listeners' engagement with them would, I argue, have been all the more intense as a result of lines 39–42.

There is, however, another aspect to the appeal that this imagery would have held for the Aeginetan audience. The battle at Salamis, as well as being recent at the time that the ode was first performed, was also one of the crucial moments in the history of the island. For it represented the turning point when the greatest threat to the Greek world, Persian subjugation, was lifted. Aegina, thanks to her naval prowess, had been a particularly significant contributor to success on the day, and the sense of pride and glory attached to the event in the Aeginetan public consciousness would surely have been considerable.<sup>159</sup> Hearing the story of their sailors' glory would have evoked sentiments of dignity in the listeners, which would have been heightened by the intensity and power that the journey of the arrows after lines 39–42 lent to the imagery.<sup>160</sup>

In other words, lines 46–51 powerfully appealed to the sentiments, emotions and imaginations of the audience. The effect of doing so was to consolidate the sense of glory that resulted from the brave actions of the sailors; actions that were carried out

---

<sup>159</sup> We do not know the date of *Isth. 5*'s first performance, but if we are to take at face value the suggestion that the battle was recent, then it is quite possible that members of the crews that fought at Salamis were present in the audience.

<sup>160</sup> This sense of dignity would presumably also have been intermingled with the sense of personal loss felt by many of the island's families, whose male relatives had died in action.

by many in the community and which directly bore on the island's self-image of courage and glory.

This passage in the odes, then, was meant to be 'special' for the listeners; to rouse their feelings in a unique way and to touch upon the sense that they as a community had won honour through this glorious band of men. By igniting such feelings through powerful imagery the passage 'memorialised' the battle, and in this light can be compared to the communal monument at Marathon, dedicated to the Athenian war dead.<sup>161</sup> In his discussion of the latter, James Whitley says that 'the Marathon tumulus, no less than the Cenotaph in London, or the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C., is primarily a political monument, one intimately connected with collective Athenian identity and self-esteem.'<sup>162</sup> The same may be said of lines 46–51. Unlike the praise for victors, trainers or heroes, which we have seen elsewhere in the odes, here we have a scene that glorifies a large group of Aeginetan sailors. Moreover, like the Athenian fighters commemorated at Marathon, and most certainly unlike the victors, trainers and heroes elsewhere in the odes, these sailors are unnamed. As with the Marathon monument, they are undifferentiated, commemorated as a group whose identity is drawn solely from their common Aeginetan status and the fact that their actions comprise the honourable deeds of the community. It is the sense of shared stake in the honour of a battle that makes a memorial such a powerful and enduring symbol, and here the fact that the sailors remained anonymous and unattributed to specific families may have broadened the appeal of the scene. In other words, if honour is won as a group whose singular identity is attached to a community then all in that community can feel a shared sense of stake in it on (at least nominally)

---

<sup>161</sup> Later I will discuss the religious significance of memorialising the battle, and the nature of the performance as a means of re-experiencing it.

<sup>162</sup> Whitley (1994): 213–230. See also Thuc. 2.34.5.

equal terms. Anonymity is used here as a means of promoting a single, harmonious sense of glory for Aegina, and one that does not rely on praise for the victor or his family.<sup>163</sup>

The Salamis episode is separated from the series of questions on Achilles by lines 43–45. There the laudator declares that Aegina is the homeland of the hero, before saying that from of old the island has been a bastion for men to scale with lofty achievements. The audience would naturally have taken the Trojan exploits just mentioned as examples of these.<sup>164</sup> It seems likely, however, that in hearing the subsequent account of the battle of Salamis, the audience would also have construed the noble victory of the sailors in the same light. The laudator encouraged them, in other words, to think of it as being in the same line of heroic deeds that is carved out by Achilles. This can be compared to what we have seen in lines 1–29 and in *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, where we saw that the athletic victories of Pytheas and Phylakidas were construed as being the latest examples of heroic valour in a line that stretched back to the founding heroes. Here, however, it is the anonymous sailors of the community who are held up as exemplars of Aegina’s greatness.

Having drenched the boast of the sailors’ deeds, the laudator declares, in lines 52–53, that ‘Zeus dispenses a variety of things, Zeus lord of all’ (Ζεὺς τὰ τε καὶ τὰ νέμει, / Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος). In then stating that ‘in poetry’s delightful honey such honours as these also welcome joyous song of victory’ (ἐν δ’ ἐρατεινῷ / μέλιτι

---

<sup>163</sup> Not naming those who have carried out honourable deeds is a highly unusual tactic for Pindar. Its use in lines 46–51, however, resonates lines 39–42, where Achilles was praised without his name being mentioned.

<sup>164</sup> Achilles, one of the most famous Greek heroes, was connected to Aegina by blood, being the grandson, via Peleus, of the island’s original king, Aiakos. His appearance here in *Isth.* 5 and in *Pyth.* 6 attests to his appeal to Greek audiences as a paragon of heroism.

καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον χάρμ' ἀγαπάζοντι), the laudator shifts his attention towards the glory of the victorious family.<sup>165</sup> In lines 54–56 he announces that any man who strives to perform in the games should learn thoroughly about the family of Kleonikos, Lampon's father, since their hard work is not hidden and their vast expense (i.e. financial outlay in training) has lived up to their hopes. Pytheas is then praised for his performance as trainer to Phylakidas, being quick with his hands and a good match with his mind.<sup>166</sup> This praise for the victor and his family is of the sort that might be termed conventional, reflecting what we have seen elsewhere in *Isth.* 6 and *Nem.* 5. By naming the victors and their family, the laudator attaches their identity explicitly to their glorious deeds.

The declaration that poetry's song also welcomes honours 'such as these' (τοιαῖδε) refers to the athletic successes of the victor and his family that are about to be recounted. It suggests a contrast to the martial victories that have just been spoken of in lines 46–51 whilst maintaining a continuous line of thought that began in lines 43–45 with the statement that Aegina is a bastion to be scaled with lofty achievements. Like the sailors' victory at the battle of Salamis, then, the athletic achievements of the victor and his family are positioned at the end of Aegina's line of heroic deeds that lead from the ancient successes of Achilles (and Peleus and Telamon) to the present day of the performance.

What were the implications of a performance in which the victor and his family are not the only living parties whose successes are praised? Here, as we have seen, the recent victory by Aegina's sailors is also glorified. Would this have created a sense of

---

<sup>165</sup> Lines 53–54.

<sup>166</sup> Hamilton (1974: 107–8) sees Pytheas only as a metaphorical trainer, as does Silk (1998: 56–65).

competition between the community and the victorious family; a ‘jostling for position’ at the end of the line of outstanding Aeginetans? I argue that it would not, and that, furthermore, there were mutual advantages to both community and victor in the laudator’s highly unusual deployment of imagery in the final three stanzas of the ode.

Lines 54–56 (‘let a man strive to perform in the games after thoroughly learning about the family of Kleonikos’) is designed to appeal to young men who, judging by the context, are not members of the victorious family.<sup>167</sup> It seems that here the laudator is appealing to a group whom he supposes has a special interest in hearing the tales of Phylakidas and Pytheas’ success recounted, as well as an account of how it was achieved. It is, then, a didactic address to those would-be victors who hold hopes of athletic glory themselves, and with its reference to past Psalychiadai glories, resonates *Nem. 5* and *Isth. 6*. In *Isth. 6* in particular the laudator carefully constructs an impression that victory was won through Lampon’s dedicated transmission of a disciplined work ethic, and that this acts as a model for success. It would seem that in appealing here to other young men, the laudator gives voice to the family’s desire that their corpus of odes should be listened to by others in the future: in other words that they be reperformed.

This, however, is not the only respect in which the laudator touches the issue of reperformance. In his recent examination of the Aeginetan odes, Morrison speculated on “why a victor, or his *polis* or *oikos*, might have gone to the trouble of reperforming

---

<sup>167</sup> And, in the process, to flatter the family all the more.

a victory ode.”<sup>168</sup> Though he then goes on to argue convincingly that the reperformance of a victory ode could reactivate a family’s stock of honour, he implicitly recognises that the wider community might have an interest in restaging epinicia.<sup>169</sup> Here the laudator gives a particular impetus to reperformance by the community. Memorialisation, as I have argued, created a powerful sense of honour in which the entire listening community partook. In *Isth.* 5, however, unlike in the accounts of athletic successes and heroic endeavours in *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, the noble deed recounted was one in which the community had (through the actions of its sailors) collectively exerted itself to achieve *kleos*. The special quality of this event and the power with which it was memorialised would have formed a strong incentive for the listening community to attend (perhaps even stage) future performances of the ode. Through the memorialisation of the battle of Salamis in lines 46–51, then, the laudator ‘aligned’ the vested interests of the listening community and the victorious family: each had a powerful motivation for the ode to be reperformed, as reperformance would benefit both alike.

Reperformance would not, however, benefit each in the same way. I have argued that the sailors’ anonymity in the laudator’s account of Salamis made the glory that they won more ‘accessible’ to the listeners, i.e. easier for all of those present at the performance to feel part of the victory. The fact that they are unnamed, however, whereas the victor and his family are named several times throughout, means that the latter have a certain salience. Phylakidas and Pytheas might share the ode with another victorious Aeginetan party (the sailors), but the praise that they enjoy is linked explicitly to their identities as individuals. Thanks to the laudator’s use of

---

<sup>168</sup> Morrison (2011): 235.

<sup>169</sup> Morrison (2011): 236.

anonymity, then, the names of those in the victorious family are not occluded by a raft of other outstanding individuals. Furthermore, the encomium to the family of Kleonikos forms the ode's conclusion, providing the latter not only with firm identities to attach to their victories, but also the great rhetorical advantage of having the last word.

*Isth.* 5 is not only shorter than either *Isth.* 6 or *Nem.* 5, but it works in a different (though complimentary) way. Here, once again, the laudator conjures up in the minds of the audience the line of outstanding Aeginetans, that mythical lineage of honour that allowed them to assimilate the glory of the outstanding individual to their collective glory. This time, however, a party other than the athletic victors and the heroes add to it. This is the group of unnamed sailors that was sent out from the community to do battle with the Persians at Salamis. By commemorating them as he does, the laudator serves to memorialise one of the greatest events in recent Aeginetan history. In doing so he creates a vested interest for the listening community to hear the ode again, resonating the vested interest of the victorious family, whose members alone are the only living Aeginetans to be mentioned by name, for a repeat performance.

In this way, the model of praise that I have argued is evident in *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, where the honour of the outstanding individual is assimilated to the greater glory of the community, remains intact. Here, however, we have seen another example of the subtle amalgamation of distinct vested interests: the community's in the need for honour and the family's in the need for remembrance.

In this section of the thesis I have explored how the laudator encouraged the audience to conjure up a sense of glory and attach it to the outstanding individuals in their midst, and have asked what stake the listening community was encouraged to assume in it. Broadly speaking I have found that at Akragas the audience are encouraged to attach a greater sense of honour to the Emmenidai than they are to themselves. At Aegina, on the other hand, the listening community are encouraged to imagine that the honour won by the sons of Lampon and their relatives enriches the glory of the community, and indeed that individual honours should be seen in the context of a wider and greater collective glory in which the listening community are the principal stakeholders. These divergent construals of what it means to be an outstanding individual reflect the specific social conditions that prevailed at Akragas and Aegina. They also suggest that, in composing the odes, the poet was aware of these conditions and how they influenced the expectations and assumptions of the listeners. This picture of the social relationships engendered by the odes, however, is a simplifying one, and the way in which the victorious family and the listening community related to each other through the individual performances was much more complex. In the following section I will develop the position laid out above by considering the position of the gods and how their assumed presence at the performances mediated the relationships amongst the participants in each set of odes.

## **SECTION TWO: IMAGINING THE DIVINE.**

### **Introduction**

In the previous section of the thesis, where I explored how the odes mediated relationships amongst the mortal participants, my analysis was based on a specific construal of the relationship between athletic and poetic performance. This was that the patron's purpose in both cases was to achieve glory, which, in the case of athletics, came as a result of the victor successfully exerting faculties that were intrinsic to his person (strength, stamina, etc.), and in the case of the odes came as a result of the laudator successfully appealing to the listeners to exert their mental faculties in order to attach a sense of glory to the patron himself. In this section of the thesis, where I extend the scope of my analysis to consider the role of the gods in the odes, a new comparison between athletic and poetic performance will provide the basis of my analysis. Rather than examining the consequences of glory being extrinsic to the patron, I will focus on the qualities that were intrinsic to that sense of glory itself. The purpose of this section, and its relationship to my previous analyses, is best understood with reference to Mark Griffith's recent observation about the broad cosmological significance of poetic performance:

“The relationship between human communities and their gods can thus be seen as extensions of the basic social institutions of family/household (*oikos*) and local chiefdom or aristocratically governed city (*polis*), with the gods operating as a class of super-parents and super-elites.... To some degree, their human subjects/children thus all share with one another a common status; and indeed,

participation in ‘common’ cults is one of the most important mechanisms of social cohesion and group/regional/ethnic unity in ancient Greek (as often in modern) society... Laudators, especially choral lyric laudators, were prime promoters of this sense of community; but at the same time, different elements within a particular society might be expected to relate to the deity in significantly different ways, and one of the laudator’s functions was to regulate this interface, as an intermediary both (vertically) between human and divine and (horizontally) among the various humans themselves.”<sup>170</sup>

Previously I argued that the relationships the odes mediated amongst the mortal parties to the performance were manifold, encompassing the patron, his family, his peers and the listening (specifically aristocratic) community. These various sets of responsibility and expectation were simultaneously articulated and satisfied through the physical act of performing the ode, and the collective conjuring of mental imagery and sentiment by the listeners. Here I will continue to look at the dynamics of these relationships, whilst broadening the scope of my inquiry to include the gods as participants in the performances. In doing so I will follow the principle described above by Griffith, that the relationship between mortals and gods was highly complex, being both collective (i.e. incumbent on the community), group (incumbent upon specific bodies within the community, for example, the family) and individual, with each set of relationships entailing different obligations and expectations towards the parties involved. Through examining the intrinsic value of the glory achieved through the performance of the Pindaric odes, I seek to advance our understanding of these relationships and how they were consolidated through the performance.

---

<sup>170</sup> Griffith (2009): 76.

According to Ancient Greek thought, success in life was granted through the favour of the gods.<sup>171</sup> This included athletic achievement, and in the odes the laudator explicitly attributes victory to divine favour. Amongst the performances we have already examined, this is perhaps best expressed in *Isth.* 2.12–18, where Poseidon is said to have granted Xenocrates honour at the Isthmian games and Apollo to have beheld him and given him splendour (ἀγλάισμα) at Delphi:

οὐκ ἄγνωτ' αἰίδω  
Ἴσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,  
τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις,  
Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμα  
πέμπεν ἀναδειῖσθαι σελίνων,  
  
εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων,  
Ἄκραγαντίνων φάος.  
ἐν Κρίσῃ δ' εὐρυσθενῆς  
εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν

(*Isth.* 2.12–18)

... Not unknown is the  
the Isthmian chariot victory that I sing,

---

<sup>171</sup> Boeke (2007: 40): “The power of the gods is not only inherently different from and superior to that of man, it is also a power that is exercised over man and profoundly influences his life. It is the source of human abilities and achievements, and of the things that befall humans.”

which Poseidon granted to Xenocrates,  
and sent a crown of Dorian parsley  
for him to bind upon his hair,

thus honouring the man of fine chariots,  
a light to the people of Akragas.

In Krisa mighty Apollo

beheld him and gave him splendour...

In *Isth.* 5.11–20 the laudator says:

κρίνεται δ' ἄλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.  
δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μούνα ποιμαί-  
νοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον, εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ,

εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούη.  
μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι, πάντ' ἔχεις,  
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν.  
θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.  
τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά,  
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέα δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν  
Πυθέα τε, παγκρατίου. τὸ δ' ἐμόν  
οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται,

But men's strength is determined by the gods.  
There are truly two things alone that foster the finest  
sweetness of life in blossoming prosperity:

if a man succeeds and hears his praises sung.  
Do not seek to become Zeus; you have all there is,  
if a share of those blessings should come to you.  
Mortal things befit mortals.  
For you, Phylakidas, a flourishing double achievement  
is stored up at the Isthmos, and at Nemea for both you  
and Pytheas in the Pancratium. But my heart  
tastes no hymns without including the Aiakidai...

Here the same belief about the dependency of mortals upon gods is expressed and its implications elaborated. Not only is victory the result of the overwhelming physical exertion of an athlete, but his very strength is a gift of the god. Considered in conjunction with the urge that one should not seek to become Zeus there are two important and related messages conveyed by the passage. The first is that mortal faculties and divine faculties are distinct, the latter being of immeasurably greater scope than the former.<sup>172</sup> The second is that they may both be demonstrated through the exercise of the same quality. Strength is possessed by outstanding men (literally 'of men': ἀνδρῶν), though it is at the same time the expression of Zeus' divine

---

<sup>172</sup> Boeke (2007: 38) discusses this with reference to *Nem.* 6.1–7. The opening phrase in particular (Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος) has prompted divergent translations and different interpretations of the relationship it proposes between gods and men. For a discussion of these see Gerber (1999): 43–45. Parker and Bremer (both 1998) have each discussed the unequal weighting inherent to any relationship between mortals and gods. The latter, with their superior power, could grant favours out of all proportion to mortal offerings. Bremer (1998: 127) notes that “the relationship between god and man is characterized by *asymmetry* [his italics].”

agency (i.e. the willingness and power of the god to influence the course of human life).

Mark Griffith recently observed that “although the gulf between gods and mortals is often regarded as vast, the conventions for composing a ‘hymn’ (*hymnos*) for the gods are in fact similar to those for an *enkômion* or eulogy for a human being, as later rhetoricians observed.”<sup>173</sup> The fact that the odes conflate human and divine power is something that has been remarked upon by Jan Maarten Bremer. In his 2006 article, he suggests that “in many, if not all, epinicians praise of the gods comes in the first place, praise of the gods being the foundation and the echo-chamber of the praise directed at the victorious athlete.”<sup>174</sup> On the face of it this suggests that in the odes the gods were attributed responsibility for ordaining human excellence and the exceptional qualities of outstanding individuals. Underlying it, however, is the recognition that appealing to the gods, to the patron and to the rest of the audience was a simultaneous, or what we might call a ‘singular,’ action. Bremer (under the influence of Albin Lesky) goes on to argue that “divine help is the sign and proof of

---

<sup>173</sup> Griffith (2009): 76. The relationship between victory and cosmology has become a subject of considerable interest. In her recent monograph (Boeke 2007), Hanna Boeke carried out a sophisticated analysis of the ‘value’ of victory in the odes by considering it in the context of the *gnomai* utilised by the laudator.

<sup>174</sup> Bremer (2006): 1. In support of his argument that the odes appealed to the gods, he refers to the following passages, among others, in which the gods are addressed directly: *Ol.* 2.12-15 (‘O son of Kronos and Rhea, you who rule over your abode on Olympus, over the pinnacle of contests, and over Alpheos, be cheered by this song, and graciously preserve the ancestral land for them (i.e. for Theron and his sons).’ – ἀλλ’ ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας, ἔδος Ὀλύμπου νέμων / ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ’ Ἀλφειοῦ, ἰανθεῖς ἀοιδαῖς / εὐφρων ἄρουραν ἔτι πατρίαν σφίσιν κόμισον / λοιπῶ γένει); *Ol.* 5.17-19 (‘You, Zeus, our Saviour who are high up in the clouds, who dwell on Kronos’ hill and keep wide-streaming Alpheios and the sacred cave on the Ida in honour, it is to you that I come as a suppliant with my Lydian music.’ – Σωτήρ ὕψινεφές Ζεῦ, Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον / τιμῶν τ’ Ἀλφειὸν εὐρὸν ῥέοντα Ἰδαῖον τε σεμνὸν ἄντρον, / ἰκέτας σέθεν ἔρχομαι Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς); *Ol.* 7.87-89 (‘Father Zeus, you who rule over the ridges of Mountain Ataburion, honour the hymn, rightfully made, on the occasion of this Olympian victory and the man who obtained excellence in boxing.’ – ἀλλ’ ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, νῶτοισιν Ἀταβυρίου / μεδέων, τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, / ἄνδρα τε πύξ ἀρετὰν εὐρόντα); *Ol.* 9.5-8 (‘But now, from the far-shooting bows of the Muses shoot a volley of arrows such as these at Zeus of the red lightning and at the sacred hilltop of Elis.’ – ἀλλὰ νῦν ἑκαταβόλων Μοισῶν ἀπὸ τόξων / Δία τε φοινικοστερόπαν σεμνόν τ’ ἐπίνειμαι / ἀκρωτήριον Ἄλιδος / τοιοῦσδε βέλεσσιν).

human excellence, not an indication of human weakness nor a supplement of it,” and points out through the analogy of wave and particle in quantum mechanics, it is better to see them as “two ways of indicating the same reality.”<sup>175</sup> The meaning behind this compelling formula would seem to be that divine and human agency alike could be instrumental in bringing about the same result and might even be considered inextricable.

The relationship between mortal and divine actions has been examined in a different context by Josine Blok, whose exploration of what it meant to participate in the Athenian *polis* as a citizen is framed by an exploration of the meaning of *hiera kai hosia*, gifts to the gods and *hosios* acts, the formula used by the Athenians to express the obligations of mortals towards gods.<sup>176</sup> Through an examination of the semantic and cultural values of these terms, their relationship to each other and their joint meaning as a formula, she argues that the most useful way in which to view citizenship of the *polis*, and the obligations, expectations and practices that it entailed, was as a ‘covenant’ of the *polis* with the gods. This self-understanding of the *polis* is not only attested in Athens, but applies to Greek *poleis* generally.<sup>177</sup>

Several points she makes in relation to this are particularly important. The first is that the relationship between gods and mortals was not equal, but heavily slanted in

---

<sup>175</sup> Bremer (2006): 16. Lesky (1961).

<sup>176</sup> Josine Blok has kindly allowed me to see material from her forthcoming work (Blok 2013 and 2012), on which the present discussion of her studies on citizenship is based. See also Blok 2011. Her work positions itself against the traditional ‘sacred and profane’ dichotomy used to understand the role of religion in the Athenian *polis*. In casting doubt on the value of this dichotomy, however, she remains firmly within the scholarly tradition that treats religion as the salient connecting factor between the subgroups of the *polis*, building on the work of, among others, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood (1990), Stella Georgoudi (1998), François de Polignac (1984), Robin Osborne (1993) and Robert Parker (2005).

<sup>177</sup> For a discussion of the relationship between divinity and social order, with regard to Themis and the Archaic *polis*, see Stafford (1997): 158–167.

favour of the divine. Humans reciprocated divine gifts with *hiera*, but these could never balance the gifts of the gods to them. This observation, uncontroversial in itself, frames the two rules of conduct comprised in *hosiê*. One is “rules of conduct of humans towards the gods, notably their exchange with and obligations to the gods - more generally, how they are to deal with *ta hiera*.” Another is “rules of conduct among humans valued particularly by the gods and guarded by them.” Such conduct primarily included respect of and care for one’s parents, the dead, guests and suppliants, in sum long-term reciprocal relations between humans.<sup>178</sup> Thus Blok also perceives the relationships between mortals and gods as both ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’: vertically between humans and gods, and horizontally between humans, including the hierarchies that prevail amongst them.<sup>179</sup> They encompassed modes of conduct that were overtly religious, i.e. that concerned human relationships with the gods (sacrifice, offerings, etc.), and others that concerned relationships amongst humans under the guidance of the gods.

By conceiving citizen participation within the framework of the covenant, Blok advances two important observations about the relationships between mortals and gods in the *polis*. The first is that normative social trends, i.e. those modes of conduct that characterise long-term reciprocal relationships amongst mortals, need to be understood within a framework of obligation not only towards humans, but also towards the divine. The second point (which is really an extension of the first) is that an individual’s manifold obligations, both to the gods and to his or her fellow citizens, could be pursued through the same modes of conduct. Acts of piety towards the *polis*’

---

<sup>178</sup> For the observation that the human relations included in *hosiê* entail long-term reciprocity, see Saskia Peels in her forthcoming dissertation.

<sup>179</sup> Lazzarini (1989-90) casts the terms ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ based on votive inscriptions; cf. Pulleyn (1997) for prayer, Keesling (2003) for votives, Griffith (2009) especially 76 for hymns and other (Archaic) lyric poetry.

gods (prayers, offerings, etc.) strengthened the bonds of the covenant, not just for one's own well-being, but by implication also for one's family and *polis*. So, indeed, did acts of *hosios* conduct towards other humans. Fulfilling one's duties towards one's parents, for instance, gratified not only these recipients themselves, but also the gods as guardians of this moral and social order.

Given this relationship between human and divine, I will argue in this section of the thesis that divine and human gifts could converge; the same action taken by mortals in the context of a poetic performance could simultaneously be the exercise of mortal and divine agency. As we have seen in *Isth.* 2.12–20, the laudator explicitly describes victory as an expression of both divine and mortal power, whilst construing the fact of their singular expression as evidence of the divergent natures of man and god. Here I apply the same line of thought to the actions taken by the listeners to the odes. I will argue that in response to the poetic imagery, the audience conjured up glorious sentiments in their minds and attached them to the patron, and that this was at once the exercise of their own mental faculties and the gods' exercise of their divine power.

In a sense the poetic performance is the analogue of its athletic counterpart. Just as the athlete's successful physical exertion is a show of his own strength, so it is also the expression of divine favour and power. In successfully rallying their sentiments in favour of the patron, the audience likewise expressed the favour of the gods. This singularity of mortal and divine agency was achieved through the careful construal of imagery by the laudator. So far my examination of the odes has revolved

---

Bremer's "two ways of explaining the same reality."

around an exploration of glory: the patron's desire to obtain it, the laudator's suggestions to the audience that the patron possessed it, and the social implications of being glorious at Akragas and Aegina. Here I will explore the implications of the simultaneous and singular expression of mortal and divine agency through the thoughts of the audience. Following Josine Blok's model of how a community (in her case, a *polis*) construed itself through interactions with the divine I will investigate the creation of a community in the *epinikia*, in the interactions amongst the mortal parties (patron(s), family and listening community) as well as those between these parties and the gods, i.e. from a horizontal and vertical perspective. In analogy with the notion of 'covenant,' I will call the principle that the odes facilitated the simultaneous and singular expression of mortal and divine agency, the effect that it created and which I will examine here, 'communion.'

**AN EXAMPLE OF COMMUNION: *Ol.7* 1–12.**

As with my analysis of *Nem.* 7.30–52 in the previous section, I will broaden the range of evidence considered here by examining an ode that was not written for the Emmenidai or the Psalychiadai. *Ol.* 7 was written for Diagoras of Rhodes, who achieved an Olympian boxing victory in 464 BC.

Φιάλαν ὡς εἴ τις ἀφνειᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλών  
ἔνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζοισαν δρόσῳ  
δωρήσεται  
νεανία γαμβρῶ προπίνων  
οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε, πάγχρυσον, κορυφὰν κτεάνων,  
συμποσίου τε χάριν κᾶ-  
δός τε τιμάσαις ἐόν, ἐν δὲ φίλων  
παρεόντων θῆκέ νιν ζαλωτὸν ὁμόφρονος εὐνᾶς,  
καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις  
ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός,  
ἰλάσκομαι,  
Ὀλυμπία Πυθοῖ τε νικῶν-  
τεσσιν, ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί,  
ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύ-  
ει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἀδυμελεῖ  
θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν  
αὐλῶν.

(*Ol.* 7.1–12)

As when a man takes from his rich hand a bowl  
foaming inside with dew of the vine  
and presents it  
to his young son-in-law with a toast from one home  
to another– an all-golden bowl, crown of  
possessions–  
as he honours the joy of the symposium  
and his own alliance, and thereby with his friends  
present makes him envied for his harmonious marriage,  
so I too, by sending the poured nectar, gift of the Muses  
and sweet fruit of the mind, to men who win prizes,  
gain the favour  
of victors at Olympia and Pytho.

Blessed is the man who is held in good repute.  
Charis, who makes life blossom, looks with favour  
now upon one man, now another, often with sweetly  
singing lyre and pipes, instruments of every voice.

Let us take note of the social structure in the scene presented in the opening lines. The precise action of the individual passing the cup to the newly-wed young

man, and the question of who the figures might represent, have caused debate amongst scholars. Traditionally there have been three approaches to the text. The first sees the father-in-law ‘take-up’ the cup in his hand;<sup>181</sup> the second sees the cup being presented from a wealthy hand (presumably not the father-in-law’s),<sup>182</sup> and the third has the cup being taken by the father-in-law from another hand before being passed to the son-in-law.<sup>183</sup> According to Young, who followed the third interpretation, the hand that passed the cup to the father-in-law belongs to a slave.<sup>184</sup> This is contested by Brown, who has said that it most likely belongs to some third party proposing the toast, and that the father-in-law is a representation of the Muses, who are echoed as the original givers of poured nectar in the antistrophe.<sup>185</sup> I prefer to follow Race in seeing τῆς (line 1) as signifying the father-in-law, and that he himself is thus the one who has taken the cup before passing it to the son-in-law.<sup>186</sup> This ambiguity in line 1 is reflected in line 5, where Brown prefers ἐόν rendered as νέον, describing any reading derived from the former as “otiose.”<sup>187</sup> Rather than seeing this ambiguous use of pronouns as problematic, I believe that they may be a way of deliberately blurring the distinction between the identity of the imaginary symposiasts and the participants in the poem, i.e. the laudator, Diagoras and the listening community. The explicit parallel between simile and recital is made clear by ὡς εἶ in line 1 being picked up by καὶ ἐγὼ in line 7. By employing τῆς and ἐόν with regard to the father-in-law and son-in-law respectively, the laudator is leaving the listener free to assimilate these ‘open’

---

<sup>181</sup> Sandys (1919): 71.

<sup>182</sup> Verdenius (1972).

<sup>183</sup> Young (1968).

<sup>184</sup> Young (1968): 72.

<sup>185</sup> Line 7. See Brown (1984): 39-40. I disagree with this, since the ode specifically says that the toast was made οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε. A third party raising a toast would surely offer it to both houses, rather than from one to the other (unless they also happened to be a more senior member of the father-in-law’s *oikos* than the father-in-law himself, of which I see no suggestion).

<sup>186</sup> Race (1997): 121.

<sup>187</sup> Brown (1984): 42.

identities to those of the participants themselves. That *έόν* refers to the young man, and that he stands in for Diagoras, seems clear enough. The debate concerning the identity of *τις* is one that cannot be decisively resolved, though I come down on the side of Race in seeing it as a reference to the father-in-law.

Who, then, might the father-in-law be? Brown, as I mentioned above, sees him as a reference to the Muses, following the parallel in line 7. According to his reading, the act of publicly toasting a wedding is analogous to the poet's function of publicly praising the victor. He believed that the significance of this scene was to suggest the latter's immortality through association with procreation and the production of heirs.<sup>188</sup> Young gives a similar interpretation, seeing the cup as a symbol of the generational rebirth of the family.<sup>189</sup>

I propose that the connection between the question of who the father-in-law represents and the significance of the wedding scene for the listeners at the recital is closer than is generally recognised. I see the father-in-law as raising up the golden cup himself and passing it to the son-in-law (thus following the first of the three interpretations mentioned above), and that he is a representation of the laudator himself. I therefore consider the laudator to be metaphorically taking the cup of wine and presenting it to Diagoras, just as he does the poured nectar of the Muses in line 7. This creates a direct relationship between the laudator and the athlete in the first stanza that is mirrored in the second.

---

<sup>188</sup> Brown (1984): 45.

<sup>189</sup> Young (1968): 73-74.

The scene painted is of an aristocratic symposium. This probably did not reflect the circumstances of *Ol. 7*'s debut, and is unlikely to have been any more than a poetic construal. It would seem, however, to have been constructed to appeal to particular parties within the audience. The most notable is Diagoras, as it is he who is being compared to the young newlywed. By extension, then, the groom's friends would seem to be a reference to Diagoras' peers in the audience. What would the response of the latter have been to the praise? I view the 'joy of the symposium' (*συμποσίου τε χάριν*) as a reflection of the emotions of the symposiasts. If it solely concerned the young man and his father-in-law it would have been easier to attribute the emotion directly to them, speaking of their personal joy. Instead, *συμποσίου* implies that the experience is part of a shared event, including all of those present. To say that the marriage is *ζαλωτός* (enviable) refers to the emotional response expected of the other young men present, the newlywed's friends. I take this to indicate a dual nature in their response to his success, and that, whilst *χάρις* clearly lends a cheerful sense to *ζαλωτός*, there is also an underlying hint of potential hostility.<sup>190</sup> Joy is a positive feeling that any victor would wish to cultivate in his peers. Envy, by contrast, is a potentially hostile emotion that one would want to avoid being subject to in any but its most controlled forms. Both are tied to fortune in life, success breeding good wishes as well as jealousy.<sup>191</sup> Here these emotions are the reactions of the symposiasts to the newly wed young man's good marriage, and thus, it seems, the reaction

---

<sup>190</sup> Envy is a common theme in the odes, and usually expressed using derivatives of *φθόνος*. I believe the use of *ζαλωτόν* here, though its only occurrence in the odes, is an expression of what is, substantively, the same emotion. Bulman distinguishes between *φθόνος* and *ζήλος* (of which *ζαλωτόν* is a derivative) by translating the latter as 'emulation,' and saying that this is "obviously" the meaning Pindar intended (Bulman (1992): 7). I prefer to read 'envy' or 'jealousy,' and am in agreement with Thummer (1968-9: 1:81), who suggests that Pindar purposefully sought to make Diagoras into a man worthy of envy.

<sup>191</sup> Raiga (1932: 11) distinguishes two types of envy: one is the common jealousy of another man, the other is the sense of indignation that arises from the perception of injustice. My reading corresponds with the former.

anticipated in the audience as they heard praise for Diagoras' achievement. Kirkwood refers to Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (3.9.8), which suggests that envy is a reaction of people who see an enviable man as being, essentially, like themselves.<sup>192</sup> Similarly, as I have discussed with reference to *Isth.* 2, Mills (when examining Aristotelian concepts of envy) points out the importance of "social propinquity" with regard to the emotion.<sup>193</sup> Its use in this context would thus seem to rely on a nominal social parity between the newlywed and his friends, which probably reflected the nominal social parity between Diagoras and his peers.

What is the consequence of acknowledging envy in the context of the symposium? It would seem that by doing so this potentially negative emotion was rendered harmless. The symposium was a gathering where the bonds between individuals were consolidated and reinforced. Such a scene at the start of the ode thus immediately created an impression of a congenial and welcoming atmosphere in which the praise for Diagoras could be articulated. As I have argued, this scene is constructed in such a way as to allow the mortal listeners to assimilate their own identities to those of the symposiasts at the wedding toast. It would have been natural for unmarried young men to aspire to a good marriage, one in which union with an attractive and high-status wife would induce both envy and admiration. By assimilating praise for Diagoras' success to a wedding toast it could be articulated without appearing to be excessive. Thus envy, though potentially damaging, is linked in the first stanza to a practice to which all young men had access (matrimony), placed within an equally accessible institution (the symposium) and connected in the

---

<sup>192</sup> Kirkwood (1984): 173.

<sup>193</sup> Mills (1985): 2.

subsequent stanza to the athletic success of the champion.<sup>194</sup> In the context of this socially ‘level playing field’ his peers are expected to feel happy for him, and any envy on their part would be entirely expected in the circumstances, though harmless in such a friendly setting.

What do the poetics of praise, described above, reveal about the expectations and assumptions of the listening community, who have gathered for the performance of the ode? It would appear that a concerted effort is made to praise the athlete without elevating him above them, and this may reflect the Rhodian social model that was current at the time of the performance. In this period the aristocratic class that held political power on the island had never been subject to domination by a single individual. Recognition for achievements in noble fields, such as athletics, however, raised the public profile of the achiever, increasing his standing within the elite. In a society such as Rhodes, where social interaction amongst the upper class had direct ramifications for the political nature of the state, increased social standing could translate into higher political prominence. Therefore, if praise for an individual were seen to elevate him beyond the proper standing of a member of the upper class, it may have been perceived as a potential threat to the established order. That is not to say that the social structure of Rhodes hinged on the turn of phrase in a victory ode; it almost certainly did not. Such assumptions about the proper form praise should take, however, and the expectations about an individual’s standing relative to his class, provided the boundaries within which poetic praise could be meted out.

---

<sup>194</sup> Eitrem (1951-3: 533) says that Pindar incorporates various aspects of competitive success into the odes, including praise, blame, success and failure. This mixture of positive and negative would have to be accommodated by the laudator in his direction of the audience’s response to the athlete’s victory.

This is further demonstrated in line 10: ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί ('blessed is the man who is held in good repute'<sup>195</sup>). The suggestion here is that in order to be ὄλβιος one must be considered so by others, i.e. that it is an extrinsic quality. In the context of the symposium it seems reasonable to suppose that the others in this case are the φίλοι mentioned in line 5. If this is so, then for Diagoras to be ὄλβιος he must be held in high regard by his peers, whose identity as a group is equated with that of the φίλοι. If the praise for Diagoras does not convince this group that he is ὄλβιος (or at least reinforce an already existing impression that he is), then by implication he will not have achieved the glory he hoped for.

This qualifying role played by the listeners is not by itself sufficient to explain the construction of praise in the first two stanzas. For this, we must turn to the role of the divine, which, as I said in the introduction, was fundamental to the success of the performance. In lines 1–12 there are two instances of the gods playing a part in the ode, which I will examine in turn.

The first instance occurs in line 7. With καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν..., the laudator sends the poured nectar of the Muses to men who score athletic victories. The nectar seems to be analogous to the poetic praise delivered through the performance. If that is the case, then as a gift of the Muses it is the latter who (through the laudator) are responsible for the sweet verses of praise that find their way to the ears of the mortal participants. This credits the divine with the very substance of the praise itself, which acts as the means by which Diagoras' glory is guaranteed. In other words, since the praise and its correspondent glory were comprised in the thoughts

---

<sup>195</sup> Race reads 'fortunate is the man who is held in good repute.' I prefer 'blessed' as it suggests the role of the gods in granting honour and praise, which I explore below.

and sentiments of the listeners, it is through the use of their mental faculties that the power of the divine is exercised.

The second instance of the gods' involvement is in lines 11–12. Here Charis is said to make life blossom, favouring one man here, another there (ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἄδυμελεῖ / θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν). This places favour in the hands of the gods and makes it ephemeral, not destined for one man alone but scattered among many. Charis is characterised by the epithet ζωθάλμιος, which is defined by Liddell and Scott as 'giving the bloom and freshness of life.' It is this goddess who is attributed with the power to bless the lives of mortal men, reflecting the use of ὄλβιος in line 10, and my translation of it as 'blessed.' The way that Charis 'often' (θαμὰ) expresses herself is through the lyre and the aulos. According to Liddell and Scott, παμφώνοισί is 'in full-tones' or 'in many-tones,' though Race prefers 'of every voice.' I am inclined to agree with Race, and perceive the explicit multi-tonal qualities of the instruments, when taken in conjunction with Charis looking to and fro at one man and the next, to be a reference to the voices of men.<sup>196</sup> More specifically, I view them as the men that comprised the chorus at the performance.

By giving voice to the young men from the athlete's social group, and saying that this is often how Charis looks with favour on men (ἄδυμελεῖ / θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν), the importance of the peer group in qualifying praise for the athlete is reinforced. Moreover, the means by which the praise for the athlete is articulated (through the chorus) and the means by which his being ὄλβιος is

---

<sup>196</sup> Martin (2003) discusses *aulos*-playing as a communicative act, and its political interpretation. For a discussion of mimetics in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* see Bing (1993).

achieved (in the minds of his peers) conspire to make public recognition by one's peers a manifestation of the divine itself.

ζωθάλμιος, 'giving the bloom and freshness of life,' is a quality that specifically concerns young people, those who have most of their lives yet to lead. As I mentioned above, the laudator, in acknowledgment of the socio-political circumstances of Rhodes, casts the athlete and his peers as young men of marriageable age. As such, whether or not this portrayal was accurate, in the world of the ode Charis as ζωθάλμιος would have direct concern for all of them. When it is said that she looks with favour, now upon one man, now upon the next (ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον), two things are occurring.<sup>197</sup> Firstly, the excellence of the athlete, and the good repute held of him by his peers, is attributed to her. Secondly, it is implied that this excellence is not reserved for an outstanding individual alone, but is distributed amongst other young men at the whim of the goddess. In this case the other young men, as I have discussed above, would seem to refer to Diagoras' peers. We have, then, another instance in which a (nominally) socially level playing field is being used to qualify the praise for the athlete. Any of them might expect the favour of the goddess, though in this instance Diagoras is the recipient. This nominal equality is achieved through the action of the divine in the performance; actions that are comprised in the images and sentiments evoked in the minds of the listeners.

---

<sup>197</sup> Kirkwood (1982: 102) interprets this passage as conveying the message that "the precious moments of success, with their attendant *charis* of song, are rare and fleeting." The expression itself is common in Pindar's odes, and even concludes *Ol.* 7, where at lines 94–95 it is said that the 'in a single portion of time the winds shift rapidly now here, now there' (ἐν δὲ μιᾷ μοίρᾳ χρόνου / ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι διαιθύσσοισιν αὖραι). The use of context, however, should not be ignored when attempting to determine its significance, and it is *implications* of Charis looking from one man to another that give this use of ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι its special significance here. Among other examples are *Ol.* 2.33, *Pyth.* 8.77 and *Pyth.* 10.54.

In listening to these words, Diagoras would have been reminded that, although his victory was singular, fortune and good favour are bestowed upon individuals at the whim of (vacillating) higher powers. There is no risk that the athlete's peers will find his high praise excessive, since Diagoras' blessed circumstances could, in theory, come to any of them. The laudator's description of the goddess thus serves to accommodate the socio-political expectations of the Rhodian audience about the relationship between the community and an outstanding individual, and to subsume the praise for Diagoras within a testament to the primacy of the divine. What is more, the mental imagery that the audience conjured in response to this description comprised the exercise of the goddess's power. In essence, the very act of imagining her divine agency manifest in the words and sounds of the performance served to embody its force. In expressing the goddess's favour through the performance in this way, other sentiments held by the audience were appealed to, notably the sense of social balance that prevailed at the top of Rhodian society. Thus, listening to the words of the laudator instituted communion between the mortal parties to the performance and Charis herself, through which her power was exercised to the benefit of the patron, the social mores of Rhodes and the greater glory of the gods.

## COMMUNION IN THE AKRAGANTINE ODES:

A correspondent relationship between divine agency and performance can be seen in the communion of *Pyth.* 6.44–54:

τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος  
πατρῶαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα,  
  
πάτρῳ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἄπασαν.  
νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει,  
ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων,  
σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων,  
τίν τ', Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχεις δὲ ἰπιᾶν ἐσόδων,  
μάλα ἀδόντι νόῳ, Ποσειδάν, προσέχεται.  
γλυκεῖα δὲ φρῆν  
καὶ συμπόταισιν ὀμιλεῖν  
μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

But of men now, Thrasyboulos  
has come closest to the standard of filial devotion,  
  
whilst approaching his uncle in all manner of splendour.  
He uses wealth with intelligence,  
he enjoys a youth without injustice or insolence  
and culls wisdom in the haunts of the Pierians.

And to you, Earthshaker, who rule the paths to horse  
racing,  
he keeps close, Poseidon, with a mind you greatly favour.  
And his sweet spirit,  
in company with his drinking companions,  
surpasses<sup>198</sup> the perforated labour of bees.

Through the synoptic description of Thrasyboulos contained in these lines the laudator consolidates in the minds of the listeners an image of a young man who embodies the highest ideals of nobility. In line 50 the laudator addresses Poseidon, calling him by his epithet, Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχεις δς ἰπιῶν ἐσόδων (‘Earthshaker who rules the paths to horse-racing’). The use of epithets in addresses to the gods was a common feature of Greek prayer. Spoken aloud, they created a synoptic and flattering image of the god in the minds of the speaker and listeners, which served as the basis of dialogue between the two parties.<sup>199</sup> Here, the epithetic address casts the god in the role of the divine master of chariot victories. Through this the laudator intended to generate an impression of the god’s power and importance in the field of chariot-racing.

There are, then, two synoptic images created in lines 44–54: one is comprised of a list of credits for Thrasyboulos, the other is an epithetic synopsis of the god’s primacy over horses and horse-racing. To help us understand the relationship between these two images, I turn to Joseph Day’s analyses of Archaic funerary and votive

---

<sup>198</sup> See Kurke (1990: 100–101), where ἀμείβεται is translated as ‘requites.’ This is followed in Morrison (2007: 43).

<sup>199</sup> See Day (1994, 54); Versnel (1981: 51–53), and Pulleyn (1997: 51–53). See Ausfeld (1903: 505ff.) for *invocatio-pars epica-precatio* formulation of prayers and hymns, and Depew (1997) for the broadening of this view.

inscriptions, in which he argues that the creation of a divine archetype through epithet could, through oral recital and visual cue, stimulate a relationship between the reader/listener, the god and the dedicant.<sup>200</sup> Day discusses how such recitals could create an aristocratic archetype of the deceased that served as a mode of commemoration, whose efficacy was renewed through repetition. Of Archaic verse epitaphs, he argues that “their fundamental message was praise of the deceased, expressed in forms characteristic of poetic encomium in its broad, rhetorical sense, i.e., praise poetry.”<sup>201</sup> Comparing the poetic forms of Pindaric epinician verse with those found in epigraphic epitaphs, he concludes that “verse inscriptions and grave markers not only communicate the same message of praise, but do so in a formally parallel manner.”<sup>202</sup> Using the example of Mantiklos’ Statuette, he argues that the use of prayer-forms; epithetic construction; the expectation of oral recital by the reader, and the appearance of the sculpture created a special set of circumstances. By viewing the statue and reading the inscription aloud, the dedicant’s original prayer, construing a covenant with the god and the expectation of divine favour, is ritually repeated and reinforced by the reader.<sup>203</sup> The important point about these studies for my argument is that they demonstrate that the relationship between dedicant, god, artist and viewer was mediated through the mental machinations of those who heard the ode and responded to its poetic imagery, i.e. the audience.<sup>204</sup>

This has broad application for the treatment of Pindaric performance, where the

---

<sup>200</sup> Day (1989: 16–28); Day (1994: 37–74), and Day (2000).

<sup>201</sup> Day (1989: 16).

<sup>202</sup> Day (1989: 16).

<sup>203</sup> Day (1994). For discussions of covenant in its broader social aspects, see Blok 2013. For a sense of the horizontal and vertical forces at work in such a relationship, see Lazzarini 1989–90. See also Svenbro (1993): 28ff.

<sup>204</sup> This would, of course, include the laudator, any other performers and Thrasyloulos himself. In the circumstances of the performance, however, it was the members of the aristocratic community whose reception of the ode determined its effectiveness both as a means of perpetuating glory and, as I argue here, a prayer.

success of an ode depended on the audience accepting the terms under which it was performed and the basis of its claims for the patron (i.e. that the latter was a high achiever whose glory would endure forever). In the case of *Pyth.* 6.44–54, the minds of the audience provided the medium through which the covenant between the family and Poseidon was negotiated, even if it was Thrasyboulos' conduct beyond the performance that guaranteed his stake in it.

In *Pyth.* 6.44–54, the laudator creates a synoptic image of Thrasyboulos in the minds of the audience, giving them a well-rounded impression of a young man who embodies the noble principles of his class. By telling Poseidon, in lines 50–51, that Thrasyboulos piously keeps him close (*προσέχεται*) and has a mind that he favours (*μάλα ἄδόντι νόῳ*), the laudator hopes to mediate a specific response from the god: delight at the character of Thrasyboulos and divine reciprocal favour. In essence, the laudator presents the synoptic image of Thrasyboulos as surety in a covenant between them, hoping to engender the very relationship that he describes. What Thrasyboulos hopes for in return is revealed by the epithetic address to Poseidon. By calling on him as master of horse-racing, the laudator succinctly expresses the hope that Thrasyboulos will secure future chariot victories. The value of the poetic image of Thrasyboulos as an offering depended on the sense of vitality imparted to it by the listeners. This, in turn, relied on their perception of a high degree of correspondence between image and reality. Thus, the portrayal of Thrasyboulos as an honourable and upstanding young nobleman would need to have sufficient cogency at the time of the recital for the listeners to imbue it with the necessary emotive force, otherwise its value as a mental offering would have been diminished. In other words, if it was not acceptable to the audience, it would be much less acceptable to the god. At the

original performance in 490, Thrasyboulos' youth would have meant that the hoped-for chariot victory was not an immediate prospect. Rather, it would have been a hope held for the future, secured on the basis of his maintaining those civic virtues that brought him glory as a young man, and which Poseidon, master of horse-racing, found so pleasing.

In reperformance the description of Thrasyboulos' civic virtues in *Pyth.* 6.44–54, though originally written for a youth, would have been easily reconcilable with the fact that Thrasyboulos was now an adult and senior member of the Emmenidai. Indeed, Xenocrates himself is praised in similar terms in *Isth.* 2.33–42,<sup>205</sup> where it is said that he surpassed other men in his sweet disposition (line 36); was respectful in the company of his townsmen (line 37); practiced horse-breeding (line 38); welcomed the gods at feasts (line 39); never lacked hospitality at his table (lines 39–40), and that his hospitality traveled to Phasis in the summer and the Nile in the winter (lines 41–42). This non-athletic encomium, which deals with Xenocrates' manner, lifestyle and character, is similar to the civic encomium to Thrasyboulos in *Pyth.* 6.44–54. Both create synoptic images of noble, non-athletic virtue, and cast them as the defining features of each man's character. This suggests that the traits for which the young Thrasyboulos was praised in 490 formed the basis not just of a youthful, but an adult code of behaviour, and are thus part of a long-term strategy by which he could maintain his covenant with Poseidon throughout his life.<sup>206</sup>

The hope that Thrasyboulos would distinguish himself as the owner of a

---

<sup>205</sup> Also noted by Bury (1892): 32.

<sup>206</sup> Poseidon, as a god, was naturally considered to be unageing and unchanging. Thus, the image conveyed by his epithet in lines 50–55 would have been as cogent to the audience of 470 as it was the audience of 490.

victorious chariot team would presumably have been as strong in reperformance as it was in *Pyth.* 6's debut. Despite the fact that he does not seem to have achieved such victories by the debut of *Isth.* 2, there is no reason to suppose that the hope had diminished. Indeed, not to maintain at least the pretence that future athletic success was in prospect may have been tantamount to admitting athletic incapability (which would have dramatically diminished the cogency of the laudator's image of Thrasyboulos as a divinely favoured aristocrat). Creating a sense that Thrasyboulos took after his father through the portrayal of outstanding long-term prospects and his favourable relationship with Poseidon was essential to the success of *Isth.* 2's agenda. In hearing the profiles of father and son in *Pyth.* 6.44–54 and *Isth.* 2.33–42 'side-by-side' in the joint performance, the audience would have been encouraged to imagine that Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos shared a noble character and disposition that was common to the family (note also that Theron is credited with splendour in *Pyth.* 6.46) and which delighted the god. If the listeners accepted that Thrasyboulos' mind and bearing were essentially the same as his father's, it would have been all the easier for them to attach to him Xenocrates' glory. In reperforming *Pyth.* 6.44–54 alongside *Isth.* 2.33–42, then, the laudator not only consolidated Thrasyboulos' life-long association with the god, but helped satisfy his present needs by stimulating the sentiments of the audience so as to make them amenable to the transfer of his father's honour to him.

In *Pyth.* 6.19–27 a different kind of relationship between the young man and the gods is proposed, which I will explore below:

σύ τοι σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὀρθάν

ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν,  
τά ποτ' ἐν οὐρεσι φαντὶ μεγαλοσθενεῖ  
Φιλύρας υἷὸν ὀρφανίζομένῳ  
Πηλεΐδα παραινεῖν, μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν,  
βαρυόπαν στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν,  
θεῶν σέβεσθαι,  
ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς  
ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

Truly, by keeping him at your right hand,  
you uphold the precept,  
whose words of advice they say Philyra's son  
once gave to the mighty son of Peleus in the mountains,  
when he was away from his parents: above all gods  
to revere Kronos' son, loud-voiced lord  
of lightning and thunder,  
and never to deprive of like honour  
one's parents during their allotted lifetime.

This is the first of the ode's two mythological digressions. Here it is Thrasyboulos' relationship with Zeus that is the focus, and unlike the appeal to Poseidon that follows, it is not couched in terms of reciprocal expectations. Instead it is framed as a lesson in filial obligation. The image casts the audience back in time to the mythical past. It would seem that the laudator intended to create an association in the minds of the listeners between Achilles and Thrasyboulos. The hero is represented

as a youth (which, I have argued previously was probably the status of Thrasyboulos at the time of *Pyth.* 6's debut), and one who, like Thrasyboulos, was receptive to the examples of his elders, in this case Cheiron. Achilles' life story, one of the most important in Greek myth, would have been familiar to every member of the audience, and the impression of the hero that they summoned to the surface of their minds would have been coloured by the knowledge that he was destined to achieve greatness on the battlefield of Troy. Doubtless the laudator, in encouraging the perception of similarity between Achilles and Thrasyboulos, expected this sense of great expectations to be imparted to the latter. Sentiments such as this would have consolidated the message of the passage: that Thrasyboulos, like Achilles, was destined for greatness if he too would honour Zeus above all others and give like honour to his parents.<sup>207</sup>

Though the urge to honour Zeus and honouring parents is unremarkable, the language used to express it has striking implications.<sup>208</sup> I propose that the audience would have understood the two acts of honouring, not simply as comparatives, but equivalents. This is supported by the depiction of Achilles. For he would not only have been imagined by the listeners as one who covered himself with glory later in his life, but one who had a special relationship with the gods, and Zeus in particular.<sup>209</sup> The *Iliad* describes how, through the mediation of his mother Thetis, Achilles was able to secure the intervention of Zeus on the battlefield at Troy.<sup>210</sup> Thetis reminds

---

<sup>207</sup> It may be that this mythological account also conveys a subtle hint that Thrasyboulos might even surpass his father in greatness, just as Achilles exceeded Peleus.

<sup>208</sup> According to the scholia this passage refers to the *Cheirónos Hypothekai*, attributed to Hesiod. For discussion, see Kurke (1990). See also Fowler (2000: 205–19).

<sup>209</sup> Note, however, the laudator's focus in *Nem.* 3.43–52 on the young hero's remarkable hunting skills, which impress even Athena and Artemis.

<sup>210</sup> *Il.* 1.350–530. The fact that this passage reinforces Zeus' position of divine seniority also matches the theme of *Pyth.* 6.23–25.

Zeus that she once defended his position as ruler of the gods when it was under threat, and this persuades the god to grant her request to honour her son. This passage may or may not have come to the minds of the listeners at the performance of *Pyth.* 6, but it serves to illustrate the prevalent image of Achilles as a mortal for whom a close relationship with a parent and the favour of Zeus were inextricably bound.

Parents' lifetimes are described as *πεπρωμένον*. Race convincingly translates this as 'allotted.' By this reading the word suggests a divinely predetermined course, i.e. an existence whose span is subject to divine will.<sup>211</sup> The word *πεπρωμένον* thus implicitly situates parents in the context of a divine order in which the gods reign over mortals and Zeus reigns over gods. This, along with the mortal order, in which parents are the primary recipients of honour above all other men and women, is a reflection of Zeus' will, which has itself ordained the order of Olympus. The precept of honouring parents was fundamental to Greek culture, as the seniority of Zeus was to the Greek perception of the cosmos. It was one that the laudator could rely on the listeners accepting readily. The implication of the passage, then, would seem to be that both Zeus and parents are owed honour due to their respective positions in the social order, and that to honour parents was to commemorate and reinforce that order, and in this way to honour Zeus as its architect and protector.

Let us examine the implications this had for the audience's perception of Thrasyboulos. The laudator follows the Achilles scene with a mythological account of

---

<sup>211</sup> A related sentiment is expressed in *Pyth.* 8.95–97: *ἐπάμεροι, τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ / ἄνθρωπος. ἀλλ' ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ, / λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.* ('Creatures of a day! What is someone? What is no one? A dream of a shadow is man. But whenever Zeus-given brightness comes, a shining light rests upon men, and gentle life.')

Antilochus saving his father, Nestor, in battle.<sup>212</sup> The latter is described as having been caught in an impossible position, with Memnon, leader of the Ethiopians, bearing down upon him. The old man's relief, however, is bought by his son, Antilochus, at the cost of the latter's life. The young hero willingly sacrificed himself so that his father might live, and the laudator declares that as a result of this selfless filial devotion he was held by the young men of his generation to be the highest in filial honour.

This account, as I have discussed previously, is terminated in line 43 by the declaration that 'those things are past' (τὰ μὲν παρίκει). With this the listeners are plucked from the distant past in which the scene takes place and returned to the present day, as the laudator declares that 'but of men now, Thrasyboulos has come closest to the standard of filial devotion,' proceeding then to list his excellent attributes, which preface the prayer to Poseidon, and which I have examined above.<sup>213</sup> Through this comparison with Antilochus, the laudator sought to generate the impression in the minds of the listeners that Thrasyboulos had reached the peak of filial virtue; that his honour towards Xenocrates was comparable to that of Antilochus, who, even amongst heroes, was renowned for his nobility. If this image of Thrasyboulos as a paragon of filial piety was convincing to the audience, it was with Cheiron's lesson to Achilles still fresh in their minds that they would have understood its implications. In the lines following they would hear how such virtue (alongside his wealth, intelligence and sense of justice) formed the basis of a special relationship with Poseidon. By showing such respect for his father he reinforced the natural order

---

<sup>212</sup> Lines 28–42.

<sup>213</sup> Τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος / πατρώαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα ('But of men now, Thrasyboulos has come closest to the standard of filial devotion.').

in which parents are the primary recipients of honour amongst other mortals, and thus situated himself in the most respectful and advantageous relationship with Zeus, the guarantor of that order.

Let us now consider the implications of lines 19–27 in the context of *Pyth.* 6's reperformance at the debut of *Isth.* 2. As I have argued above, the act of staging the ode was an act of honour on the part of Thrasyboulos towards his dead father. In carrying it out he hoped both to rekindle Xenocrates' glory in the minds of the listeners and 'appropriate' it by encouraging the latter to attribute it to him as his birthright. In my exploration above I have argued that the listeners, hearing the joint performances of *Isth.* 2 and *Pyth.* 6, remembered and then 'disembodied' the glory of Xenocrates, whilst imagining Thrasyboulos as the worthy and rightful bearer of such glory, in whom it was 're-embodied.' As far as Thrasyboulos' public duty to honour his father went, as well as the pursuit of his own interests in securing the old man's former position in society, he acted 'vicariously,' that is to say through the listeners, the thoughts and sentiments of whom were directed by the laudator. It seems reasonable to assume that the audience would have been aware of their role in this capacity. After all, Thrasyboulos is cast explicitly as the perfect son, Xenocrates as the perfect aristocrat, and the audience would have been abundantly aware that the name and honour of the distinguished deceased was an inheritance that demanded the staking of a public claim. In essence, a case had to be made to them for the future perception of Xenocrates' honour and the standing of Thrasyboulos in their thoughts.

But before we consider how *Pyth.* 6.19–27 might have influenced the audience's reception of *Isth.* 2 let us consider how salient it would have been in the

minds of the listeners as *Isth.* 2 was being performed. An important point in this regard is the fact that Cheiron's precept was not simply a message to Achilles that had a special application to Thrasyboulos. It was a gnome of universal applicability. All those listening would have concurred with the substance of the lesson that Zeus should be honoured above other gods and parents above other mortals. This would have formed a tenet of their own upbringings, reaffirmed time and again in storytelling and myth. The fact that it is framed as a lesson by Cheiron should not be underestimated. The centaur was the archetype of the wise teacher, and his appearance here would have strengthened the didactic force of a lesson to Thrasyboulos. We have seen in lines 44–45, however, that Thrasyboulos has already established himself as a dab hand at the niceties of filial duty. I have argued above that another value of the lesson is as a qualifier for the cosmic significance of honouring parents. Framed as a gnome whose message is lent force by the weight of the audience's own cultural experience and assumptions, and bolstered by the authority of Cheiron, the impact of *Pyth.* 6.19–27 would have been considerable. The fact that its filial focus resonated so strongly with the circumstances of *Isth.* 2 meant that it would surely have qualified the audience's reception of the latter's imagery. This resonance is all the more striking when we consider that *Isth.* 2, as an encomium for Thrasyboulos' dead father, echoes an important aspect of the gnome: never to deprive parents of honour during their *allotted* lifetime. At the debut of *Isth.* 2 the measure of Xenocrates' allotment had been exposed, and these words from *Pyth.* 6 would doubtless have echoed the message of the new ode.

These points suggest that the impact of the passage upon the audience was intended to be considerable, appealing to their deepest sentiments about family and

their shared cultural knowledge of myth. This, along with its message of filial loyalty, which is so strongly the theme of both odes, would have meant that it remained salient in the minds of the listeners, colouring the imagery of Xenocrates that they conjured in response to the laudator's praise. I have argued previously that, in attempting to mediate the audience's thoughts in favour of Xenocrates' glorious memory and Thrasyboulos' status as heir to it, the laudator had to work in sympathy with the audience's cultural assumptions and expectations. In other words, the case made for Xenocrates and Thrasyboulos had to be made in sympathy with the listening community's sense of social order. This principle can be seen at work here, where the laudator uses the lesson of Cheiron to colour the audience's sense of the significance of Thrasyboulos' public tribute to his father. The passage of honour from father to son is cast not only as a corollary of the natural order of things, but as an expression of a wider cosmic order of which Zeus himself is the guarantor. By using Cheiron's lesson to qualify the act of Thrasyboulos paying public tribute to his father, the laudator casts the performance as a tribute made by Thrasyboulos through the sentiments of the listeners to that Zeus-given order. By deploying a gnome that appeals to the listeners' deeply held sentiments about honour for parents and for Zeus, the laudator mobilises the listeners' sympathies for the established sense of order. By using that gnome to associate honour for parents with honour for Zeus and his cosmic order, the laudator proposes, in effect, that the re/performance of *Isth.* 2 and *Pyth.* 6 consolidates Zeus' cosmic order. The corollary, then, of the audience rekindling their sense of Xenocrates' glory and attaching it to Thrasyboulos was to pay homage to the natural order of Akragas and of the cosmos. In essence, the act of mobilising the sentiments of the listeners was at once an act of honour on the part of Thrasyboulos towards his

father and of homage towards Zeus and his order, whilst these sentiments themselves were, as I have explored, the very basis of Thrasyboulos' glory.

Though we do not know the exact date of *Isth.* 2's debut, the fact that Xenocrates and, it would seem, Theron are referred to in the past tense suggests that it was staged around the time that the tyranny of the Emmenidai ended.<sup>214</sup> This may well have meant that the standing of the family was at the very least much less secure, and possibly diminished (though the fact of the performance itself suggests a high status nonetheless). But what of the audience's relationship with Xenocrates, the man whose honour they are encouraged to remember?

In the description of the treasury of hymns in *Pyth.* 6, the structure is said to stand for the Emmenidai, for Akragas and for Xenocrates. The listeners would no doubt have imagined this reference to their town to be a reference to themselves. In this way they are given a stake in Xenocrates' glory, albeit, as I have argued, one that pales in comparison with that held by his family and son. In *Isth.* 2, however, we see Akragas mentioned twice. In line 17 Xenocrates is described as a 'light to the people of Akragas' (Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος), whilst in line 37 he is said to have been 'respectful in the company of his townspeople' (αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν). The image of Xenocrates as a light to the people, towards whom he was scrupulously respectful, implies that the laudator was attempting to shape the listening community's memory of the man as an individual of benevolent authority. If it is true that at this time the status of the Emmenidai was diminishing in the face of dramatic

---

<sup>214</sup> Lines 28–32: ἴν' ἀθανάτοις Αἰνησιδάμου / παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν. / καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἄγνωτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι / οὔτε κώμων, ᾧ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν, / οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδῶν ('There the sons of Ainesidamos [Xenocrates and Theron] were joined to immortal honours. And so your family's houses are not unfamiliar with delightful victory revels, O Thrasyboulos, nor with songs of honey-sweet acclaim.')

social change, and the tone of vaunting superiority I argued for in the first performance of *Pyth.* 6 was no longer as pronounced, then the audience's response to the new performance may well have been different. In *Isth.* 2 Xenocrates is portrayed as having the status of a prominent individual who, through benevolence and respect for his countrymen, achieved wide acclaim. The tone here thus seems to be one of distinction and authority but not outright superiority. The sensibilities of the listeners, suggested in line 37, are made prominent and handled delicately. He is shown as having a close relationship with them, whilst being conveyed as powerful and much distinguished. The audience's act of rekindling the glory of Xenocrates and of construing his honour anew would have been accompanied by a sense that they were honouring Zeus's cosmic order as a group, and not simply on behalf of Thrasyboulos. The imagery used, then, to construe the honour of the community (of which there is notably less than in the Aeginetan odes) would have taken on a new significance. The fact that in *Pyth.* 6 the treasury of hymns is said to stand for Akragas, city by the river, as well as for the Emmenidai and Xenocrates, would, in reperformance, have suggested to the listeners that they had a stake in Xenocrates' glory; much more than would have been perceived by those who listened at the ode's debut twenty years before.

In light of the sense that the family's stake in the community was now less secure, a 'public' monument such as this would have excited the sensibilities of the listeners in a different way. With a more pronounced sense of their own stake in the ode, they may have attached a greater sense of importance to their own self-image as a community (or, rather, the aristocratic element of it), possibly in a way akin to that which I have explored in the Aeginetan odes. If this is indeed an accurate construal of

the audience's reception of the ode, then Thrasyboulos would have faced a notable challenge. In light of a diminished sense of the Emmenidai's status, the laudator's success in moving the sentiments of the listening community in favour of pride in the old man by casting him as a 'father figure' for Akragas seems a sensible means of bolstering the family's social security. If, in association with *Pyth.* 6.19–27, this sentiment were successfully construed as a means of honouring Zeus's ordained order, then the position of Xenocrates (and by association his son, whose concern was to be the sole bearer of Xenocrates' honour) would be better secured.

This idea is a difficult one, and I wish only to point out the possibility that it appealed to the interests and expectations of Thrasyboulos, the family and the listening community itself, all of which had shifted in the wake of the political change that fell upon Akragas around this time. If it is taken as accurate, then it serves as an example of how, through the action of an audience conceiving glory in their minds, the vested interests of the various mortal parties could be served, but that this was done through an appeal to the gods, whose reciprocal favour was managed through the very exercise of those thoughts. Moreover, it illustrates how the distinct relationships between the family, patron and community with the gods were consolidated simultaneously and through this single act.

## COMMUNION IN THE AEGINETAN ODES

### NEMEAN 5

I now move on to consider *Nem. 5*. In my previous analysis of the ode I explored how the performance mediated relationships between the victor, Pytheas, the members of his family and the listening community. I wish to revisit several important aspects of that argument, examining how they can help us to understand the cosmological significance of the ode. The first concerns lines 3–8.<sup>215</sup> This passage, I argued, proposes the disposition of glory amongst the mortal parties to the performance, giving the Aeginetan community and their common ancestors (the Aiakidai born of Kronos and Zeus) a distinct share in the victory. *Pyth. 6.5–9* also states that the athletic success of the hero is a success for the community (ποταμῖα τ’ Ἀκράγαντι: ‘Akragas on its river’), for whom the treasure house of hymns also stands. The terms by which the Aeginetan performance credits the community with a stake in the victory, however, are more powerful than those of *Pyth. 6*, even when considered in the light of the latter’s reperformance alongside *Isth. 2*. This is due in no small part to the prayer in *Nem. 5.9–16*, in which Peleus and his brothers are shown praying to Zeus Hellanios that Aegina will be a place renowned for being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός. I argued that the laudator’s construal of the prayer makes it likely that the audience would have imagined it as still being in operation. This is an important point to which I will return below.

---

<sup>215</sup> ὅτι / Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς / νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον, / οὐπω γένυσι φαίνων τερείνας ματέρ’ οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν, / ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῶν Νηρηΐδων / Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρόπολιν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν (‘that Lampon’s mighty son Pytheas has won the crown for the Pancratium in Nemea’s games, not yet showing on his cheeks late summer, the mother of the grapes soft bloom, and he has glorified the Aiakidai, heroic warriors born of Kronos and Zeus, and his mother city, a land welcome to foreigners.’)

The second aspect of my previous analysis that will weigh on my exploration in this section is the point I made about the laudator's construal of being εὖανδρος and ναυσικλυτός. These words, I argued, may faithfully be rendered 'being good men' and 'being renowned for sailing,' and given meaning and social value through the subsequent mythological digression in lines 19–39. There the laudator metaphorically leaps into the midst of a chorus led by Apollo, who are singing the tale of Peleus' conflict with Hippolyta, and the hero's subsequent reward of Thetis' hand in marriage, orchestrated by Zeus and with the blessing of Poseidon.

The final point that I will take up below relates to lines 40–52, where Pytheas and his athletic relatives are praised for their victories. It is my argument that the audience, having been encouraged to imagine being εὖανδρος and ναυσικλυτός as characteristics of the community granted by Zeus, and whose nature and implications having been defined in the myth, are encouraged to impart these qualities to the victor and his victorious relatives on account of their athletic successes. In this way the laudator makes the case that they are exemplars of an excellence that characterises Aegina.

The broad cosmological context of *Nem.* 5 is established in the prayer in lines 9–16. There Peleus mediates a special relationship between Zeus Hellenios and the community, casting the former in the position of benefactor and the latter as beneficiary of the god's favour. I have argued that by asking that their hopes for Aegina's greatness be fulfilled 'one day' (ποτε) this relationship that the brothers created between Zeus and the island was ongoing. Moreover, I propose that the

audience would have considered the prayer to be active at the time of the performance. If this was indeed the case, it is important to consider exactly *how* it was active.<sup>216</sup>

The relationship between Zeus as benefactor and the island community as beneficiary was one between two parties who were themselves everlasting. Neither the island nor the god would die, and could be expected to continue perpetually, the one because of his divine nature, the other because of human fecundity. As long as there was a population capable of perpetuating itself the community would continue.<sup>217</sup> In addition to this, the term under which the prayer might be fulfilled, its ‘point of completion,’ is not construed as a finite event or action. The two qualities that Peleus and his brothers pray for are those of being εὖανδρος and ναυσικλυτός. As long as men do good deeds and perpetuate the reputation of Aegina as a sailing nation, being εὖανδρος and ναυσικλυτός can be attributed to the community as a whole. But it would not be sufficient for them to be achieved at a certain point in time and then taken for granted in every subsequent generation. In order for Aegina to remain a community whose men are εὖανδρος and ναυσικλυτός, such deeds would have to be performed continually by every new generation. They must, in other words, be renewed.<sup>218</sup> This is a concept that we have seen in evidence in *Isth.* 2 and the reformed *Pyth.* 6. The Emmenidai family, like the Aeginetan community,

---

<sup>216</sup> Pfeijffer (1999: 63–64) interprets the image of the brothers praying together as conveying a sense of solidarity, in contrast to the murderous scene that follows: “ἀμῶ, emphatically placed at the end of the clause, stresses the solidarity of Peleus and Telamon with their half-brother Phocus. There is a strong contrast between the picture presented here and the story of Peleus and Telamon murdering their half-brother Phocus alluded to in the following lines. Just as the breach of solidarity is explicitly reprobated in the following lines, the concord of the three brothers is commended, both implicitly and by contrast and because the prayer undertaken in concord has been fulfilled.”

<sup>217</sup> As it happened, the terminal event of the island community occurred in 431 BC, when the population was expelled by the Athenians.

<sup>218</sup> The ancient Greek concept of glory as a quality that must continually be renewed is discussed in detail by Kurke (1991a): 43–76.

would outlive its individual members, but its honour could only be definitive as long as there was scope for its renewal. This is how Aegina's relationship with Zeus, as beneficiary of divine favour, should be seen: as long as there were men to win glory, the honour that had been won in the past might be renewed.<sup>219</sup>

Since being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός are expressions of Zeus' divine favour, the special relationship that the island enjoys with the god must be renewed as well. The laudator's construal of the prayer portrays both an event that took place in the distant past and a relationship that continues in the present day. In addition to this, however, the prayer had another significance. By imagining it the listeners were not just 'remembering' it, but 'reperforming' it, and in doing so renewing their relationship with Zeus, on which glory, honour and fame, both individual and collective, depended. Below I will explore how this took place and what it meant for the relationship between the outstanding individual and the community.

In lines 19–25 a break-off occurs. The laudator declares (apparently in the guise of the poet) that 'if it is decided to praise happiness, strength of hands or steel-clad war, let someone dig for me a jumping pit far from this point, for I have a light spring in my knees and eagles leap even beyond the sea' (εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ σιδάριταν ἐπαινῆσαι πόλεμον δεδόκηται, μακρά μοι / αὐτόθεν ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκάπτουσι, ἔχω γονάτων ὄρμάν ἐλαφράν, / καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί). This metaphorical leap ends at Mount Pelion, where the Muses are being led by Apollo the chorus master, whose prelude to Zeus prefaces the tale of Peleus and Hippolyta. Previously I argued that these lines, which comprise high praise for Peleus, qualified

---

<sup>219</sup> See Morrison (2011: 236) for his proposal that epinician reperformance reactivated a family's stock of honour.

being ναυσικλυτός by emphasising that glory was won across the seas, whilst Peleus' victorious struggle with Hippolyta in lines 25–39 construed the terms of being εὐάνδρος. This interpretation was the result of considering how the audience would have understood the images in relation to the prayer in lines 9–16. As an encomium to Peleus it positions him as the earliest exemplar of Aegina's collective glory. If we consider how the audience would have imagined Zeus, the guarantor of the prayer, responding to the imagery of lines 19–39, however, another interpretation is possible. Looked at from this perspective the leap across the seas and the account of Peleus and Hippolyta become an encomium to the king of the gods, placing him at the top of the cosmic hierarchy and making him the lord of the natural order.

Lines 21–25 would have had a special resonance for the listeners, since they described the very thing that they themselves were attending: a poetic performance. As they imagined Apollo and the Muses engaged in song and dance, the voices of the choir and the musical accompaniment would have enlivened the image they conjured in their minds. We have seen this previously in *Ol.* 7. 11–12, where 'Charis who makes life blossom looks with favour now on one man, now another, often singing with sweetly singing lyre and pipes, instruments of every voice.'<sup>220</sup> By creating this resonance between the performance and the scene it conveyed, the images that the listeners created in response would have been lent a heightened sense of vitality. This would not only have been delightful for the audience itself, but also for Zeus. The god, whose presence is assumed, is given a special interest in the performance after the laudator's account of the prayer made by Peleus and his brothers. If, as I have argued, the listeners really did feel that they were renewing the prayer in their minds

---

<sup>220</sup> ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος ἄδυμελεῖ / θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισι  
τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν.

as they listened to it, their expectations that the god was paying close attention to them and to the performance would have been primed. In *Pyth.* 6.50–54 the laudator mediated a special relationship between a god and his beneficiary (in that case Poseidon and Thrasyboulos) by construing imagery that the audience would imagine as being delightful to the god. Here in *Nem.* 5 the Apolline choir are similarly construed. Following the prayer to Zeus Hellanios it is cast in terms designed to delight the audience, who in turn would construe it as being pleasing to the god.

Once the divine chorus has been introduced to the listeners it is said to give a prelude to Zeus before commencing with the story of Peleus' bravery. Though the details of this prelude are not discussed, the fact of its inclusion would have cast the passage in the manner of a hymn.<sup>221</sup> It would have emphasised to the listeners that the image had a special claim to the god's attention, an effect magnified by the delivery of the story through the mouth of his son Apollo, whose role as chorus leader was being brought to life in the minds of the audience.

Delivering the story of Peleus and Hippolyta in the form of an Apolline hymn also had another consequence: it articulated the senior position of Zeus in relation to Apollo and the Muses. This is a relationship that would have been taken for granted by the listeners, but by casting the archer god as delivering an encomium to his father, one in which the human participants of *Nem.* 5 themselves joined, the position of Zeus as the master of the cosmic order was powerfully reaffirmed. This can also be seen in the portrayal of the god's relationship with Poseidon in lines 34–39. There, after Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta's wiles Zeus promises the hero that he will have a sea-

---

<sup>221</sup> For discussions on the nature of Greek hymn see Clay (2006); Vamvouri Ruffy (2004: 19–23); Bremer (1981). For discussions on prayer see Pulleyn (1997); Burkert (2001); Aubriot-Sevin (1992); Mikalson (1989).

nymph as his bride, ‘persuading’ Poseidon of the same. That Zeus is able to mediate such an exchange, in which he promises a prime asset of a senior Olympian to a mortal, demonstrates his premier position, and reinforces his status as ‘king of the immortals’ (ἄθανάτων βασιλεύς) in line 35.

The passage also commemorates Zeus’ power over the moral order of man. For it is Peleus’ fear of Zeus ‘who protects hospitality’ (ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον / δείσαις) that prompts him to cast off Hippolyta, and Zeus’ observation of this (εὐφράσθη) that leads him to reward the mortal with marriage to a goddess. The audience would have understood this to mean that Zeus not only observes the hero’s disregard for the schemes of Hippolyta, but also his fear of the god. It would have suggested to the listeners not simply that Zeus had a special interest in the moral order of mankind, but that he was willing to reward those who abided by it. The fact that Peleus is shown to be rewarded (at least in part) for respecting a moral code out of fear of the god tacitly attributes this code to the purview of the god himself.

It seems, then, that this passage would have prompted the audience to conceive imagery that would delight and flatter Zeus, articulating his place atop the cosmic order, above humans and other gods alike. In my previous analysis of the ode I proposed that the listeners’ response to lines 19–39 would have been conditioned by the prayer, which occurs immediately before, with the laudator’s leap into the chorus and the subsequent mythological digression helping to qualify the meaning of being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός. It is also in relation to the prayer that the audience would have imagined the god’s response to the passage. The prayer itself mediates relations between the god and the community, asking for qualities to be associated with Aegina

at some point in the future (conveyed by  $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ ). This, I have argued, is not a request for a single act of benefaction but for continual divine honour, lasting through the ages and into the future. The audience would have conceived of the prayer as something that took place in the past but which, through their imagining it, was also renewed.

It is this need to renew the appeal to Zeus that informed the audience's reception of the rest of the ode. According to the Ancient Greek conception of divine relations, in order for an appeal to the gods to be successful a mortal party would have to make a bid to entice the god, to persuade him or her that intervention in the mortal realm was worthwhile. This might be done through sacrifice or some other offering (*da-quia-do*), through the promise of such at a future time (*da-quia-debo*) or simply by reminding the deity of a longstanding relationship that had seen them extend their favour on past occasions (*da-quia-dedisti*).<sup>222</sup> Delighting a god was a means of heightening his or her receptiveness to prayers, and is something we have seen in the case of the laudator's prayer to Poseidon on behalf of Thrasyboulos in *Pyth.* 6. Bremer, Depew and Day, among others, have discussed the use of epithets to appeal to a deity and prime them to be most receptive to a request.<sup>223</sup> In *Pyth.* 6. the laudator addresses the god with the epithet Ἐλέλιχθον ('Earth shaker'), which, I argued, was intended to invoke the god and to flatter him by vaunting his authority over chariot victories. The fact that the audience were given an account of Peleus and his brothers making the prayer would have lent it force. The prayer, after all, was first made by

---

<sup>222</sup> This terminology was developed by Pulleyn (1997). We will examine *da-quia-dedisti* later, in the case of *Isth.* 6.1–9.

<sup>223</sup> Bremer (1981: 193–197); Day (1994: 37–74); Depew (1997: 229–258). For a discussion on the use of epithets to create an image that refers to preconceived archetypes see Bakker (1993: 100–3) and Gaisser (1974). See von Reden (1995) and Nagy (1989) for an analogous comparison of a hymn's poetic value to the deity and the human patron.

heroes of Aegina, men who enjoyed a much closer relationship with the gods than present-day men, and Zeus' special affection for them would have been well-known even without the laudator telling the story of Peleus and Hippolyta. By directing the audience to imagine Peleus and his brothers appealing to Zeus all over again in the imaginations of the audience, and with all the vividness of experience that the latter could bring to such an image, the laudator presents Zeus with voices that he had a track record of listening to.

In the subsequent scene, where the laudator leaps to Mount Pelion in time to hear Apollo and the Muses, the resonance of the chorus with the performance of the ode would have conjured a charming image in the minds of the listeners. It was, as we have seen, a glittering rhetorical flourish designed to charm Zeus and further engage his attention by casting the mythological digression about Hippolyta as a hymn commemorating his place at the top of the cosmic order. Similarly the laudator's construal of the god as king of the immortals with divine oversight of mortal behaviour would have been both pleasing and propitiatory. The audience, then, self-consciously renewed Peleus' prayer as they imagined it, and then (in response to the laudator) conjured up imagery meant to charm, flatter and propitiate the god. The act of imagining the prayer became the fact of its renewal.

I have previously argued that in *Nem.* 5.19–39 the laudator not only uses Peleus to qualify the meaning of being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός, but holds up the hero as an exemplar of Aegina's excellence. This impression would have been strengthened by the fact that the listening community would have instinctively felt a sense of shared stake in the achievements and honours of one of their greatest heroes.

In my subsequent discussion of lines 40–54, and in particular the break-off in lines 40–41, where the laudator declares that ‘in-born destiny decides the outcome of all deeds’ (Πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων πέρι / πάντων), I argued that the encomium to Pytheas and his victorious relatives casts them in the same terms. Having been primed by the preceding prayer and mythological digression, the audience would have conceived of the excellence demonstrated by the victors in terms of being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός. In doing so they would have imagined Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistios in similar terms to Peleus, i.e. being of great honour but also exemplary of the community’s glory.

If the prayer voices the listening community’s expectations about their relationship with Zeus, what is the significance of the laudator casting the victors as exemplars of Aegina’s glory?

I have proposed that in imagining the prayer, the audience would have conceived of it both as a collective ‘remembrance’ of an historical act and as a kind of reperformance; one that renewed the island’s relationship with Zeus. This relationship was vital for the community, who depended on the god for their honour, fame and glory. That Zeus had honoured the island with glory since her earliest days is evident in the laudator’s treatment of Peleus as its original exemplar. Furthermore, the laudator’s treatment of Pytheas and his victorious relatives as contemporary models of communal glory suggests that the Aeginetan listeners believed the god continued to honour the island. The expectations expressed in the prayer, however, are for the future: that Aegina should one day (ποτε) be εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός. It is this construal of future expectations that determined the significance of casting Peleus and

his family as exemplars along the lines of Peleus. Doing so was not simply an expression on the part of the laudator that these individuals had achieved honour on the highest terms, nor that the community had a collective claim to their glory. Neither, indeed, was it a simple expression of Zeus' power over the affairs of mortals. It was a means by which the future expectations of the community, voiced through Peleus and his brothers in the minds of the listeners, could be ensured beyond the present day. Once the god's attention had been called through the prayer, the delightful imagery of the laudator's leap and the Apolline choir that followed would have been understood by the listeners as a means of charming and delighting him. The construal of Peleus as an archetype of Aeginetan excellence emphasised that Zeus had honoured the prayer in the earliest days of the island community, whilst the subsequent construal of Pytheas, Themistios and Euthymenes as exemplars showed that this honour continued into the present day. The laudator, I propose, mobilised the sentiments of the listeners in order to appeal to the god so that the relationship that the island community had always enjoyed with him would continue. In effect, the use of exemplars, ancient and present-day, was a way of proposing that, since his divine patronage had been established generations ago and continued into the present day, it might be allowed to continue into the future. The case that the laudator made for this was based on a line of divine honour that stretched from the beginnings of the community's history to the present day. In this respect the prayer in *Nem. 5* as a 'reperformance' by the listeners (along with the imagery that followed) can be seen as an appeal to the god that resembles a *da-quia-dedisti* model and a renewal of the covenant between them.

### Comparison with *Pyth.* 6 prayer.

I will now compare the prayer in *Nem.* 5 with that which we have seen in *Pyth.* 6.44–54. I have already discussed in previous chapters of this thesis how the differing social circumstances of Akragas and Aegina are accommodated by the performances themselves. This is particularly evident in the two prayers. In *Pyth.* 6 Thrasyboulos is the principal beneficiary of Poseidon’s favour, whereas in *Nem.* 5 it is the community.

It would be inaccurate, however, to suggest that because the prayers served to consolidate different sets of culturally determined expectations they are fundamentally different. Indeed, in many respects they are strikingly similar. Each establishes (or, perhaps more properly, consolidates) a covenant between the mortal party and a god. Moreover, each asks for glory to be granted in the future. In the case of *Nem.* 5 we have seen that this specifically refers to being εὐάνδρος and ναυσικλυτός, whereas in *Pyth.* 6 the laudator’s address to Poseidon as ‘Earthshaker, who rules the path to horseracing’ (Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχεις ὃς ἵππιᾶν ἐσόδων) suggests that it is success in chariot racing that is hoped for.

A more subtle quality that they share is that in each the laudator describes the honourable attributes of individuals in order to delight the god and tempt him into conferring divine honour. This is why I have referred to the prayer in *Pyth.* 6 as covering lines 44–54. Though the actual address to Poseidon begins in line 50, the previous six verses are spent praising the excellent attributes of Thrasyboulos, and it is these that are brought to bear in the case that the laudator makes to the god for future honour. The strength of this case, I argued, did not just depend on giving voice

to noble qualities that the youth was said to possess, but on the listeners conjuring an image of nobility in their minds that the god would find delightful.<sup>224</sup>

This corresponds with what we have seen in the case of *Nem.* 5, where images of Peleus, Pytheas and the latter's victorious relatives are summoned by the laudator to the minds of the listeners and used as the basis of an appeal to Zeus to continue his favour towards Aegina. By assimilating the glory of outstanding individuals to that of the listening community it could be construed in the most heightened terms without threatening the community's sense of honour. Maintaining a special relationship with the gods, then, seems in each case to be the basis of great expectations in the future. Despite the different social conditions at Akragas and Aegina, the laudator's mediation with the gods would seem to have been highly dependent on a successful appeal to the sentiments of the audience. Though in both odes the glory of the victor is construed according to a model in which the gods are responsible for human success, and though the implications of being outstanding are quite different in each community, the reliance of the laudator, and thus the patron, on the listening audience in each case is crucial.

---

<sup>224</sup> Pages 186–201.

## ISTHMIAN 6

Like *Nem. 5*, *Isth. 6* contains a prayer to Zeus. Through the sympotic imagery of lines 1–9 the laudator asks that the ‘Olympian saviour (σωτήρ Ὀλύμπιος) grant a third victory for the family, and seals the request by metaphorically pouring a hymnal libation on Aegina.<sup>225</sup> I argued that this would have suggested to the audience the central place of the community in mediating the relationship between the god and the victorious family. The limits of mortal glory are made explicit in lines 10–18. There, directly after the opening prayer, the laudator claims that if a man delights in expenditure (δαπάνη) and hard work (πόνος), accomplishes deeds of divinely fashioned excellence and fortune grants him fame, then he is one honoured by the gods. The laudator then proposes that it is under these terms of mortal happiness that Lampon hopes to live out his life. Following this, in lines 19–25, the community, conveyed by the address ‘O Aiakidai with your golden chariots’ (ὦ χρυσάρματα Αἰακίδαι), is praised as having countless roads that stretch to the corners of the Greek world, where no town is so backwards as not to have heard of the island’s great heroes. The subsequent account of Herakles and Telamon in lines 25–56 culminates with Herakles’ prayer to Zeus that his comrade be given a son (Aias). When the digression ends after Herakles has completed his prayer, the laudator concludes the ode with a volley of praise for the present day victories of Phylakidas, Pytheas and Euthymenes (lines 56–75).

---

<sup>225</sup> εἷη δὲ τρίτον / σωτήρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυπῖω Αἴγιναν κάτα / σπένδειν μελιθόγγοις ἀοιδάϊς (‘May there be a third bowl for us to prepare for the Olympian savior and pour upon Aegina a libation of honey-voiced songs’).

I have argued that the portrayal of Herakles' prayer created a resonance with the opening prayer, the effect of which, in conjunction with the subsequent volley of praise, was to place the present-day victors at the end of a line of outstanding Aeginetan individuals. Herakles' request for a glorious son to appear; the audience's knowledge that the prayer would be granted;<sup>226</sup> the heightened expectation of a god-given son that this would have created in the minds of listeners; the abrupt termination of the scene, and the sudden reappearance of the victors placed the latter in the position of the prayed-for offspring. Thus between lines 55 and 58, as Herakles' prayer for a son reaches its climax and Zeus acknowledges that it will be honoured, the laudator holds up the present day athletes.

I proposed that this subtle association the laudator construed between Herakles' prayer and the prayer at the beginning of the ode would have encouraged the listeners to think of Phylakidas, Pytheas and their victorious relatives as examples of those men for whom Aegina was famous throughout the world. Like Peleus and Pytheas in *Nem.* 5 they are treated as exemplars. As in the previous ode this would have allowed the audience to 'appropriate' the glory of the victors, assuming it as part of their own collective greatness. Furthermore, this gave the laudator licence to construe the victor's own glory in the highest terms possible, i.e. on a Panhellenic order of magnitude and akin to the achievements of the great heroic ancestors. By uniting the listening community's expectations about its own greatness and of winning glory through the conduct of individuals with the victors' interest in being seen as glorious in the eyes of their fellow citizens, the laudator satisfied both at once.

---

<sup>226</sup> A certainty founded on the listeners' knowledge of Aias' life and exploits and also expressed in the ode itself by the eagle sent by Zeus in lines 49–54.

One of the main differences between *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6 is the laudator's treatment of Lampon. Here, I have argued, he is portrayed in a more significant light, the driving force behind his sons' success.<sup>227</sup> Through his virtuous code of conduct towards Pytheas and Phylakidas, and the honour he brings to the city as a result, he too is treated by the laudator as an exemplar of Aeginetan excellence.

In the manner of their appeal to Zeus, both the prayers of *Isth.* 6 are similar. Each of them deploys a *da-quia-dedisti* formula. In Herakles' case this formulation is made explicitly in lines 42–46, with the hero proposing that 'if ever, O father Zeus, you heard my prayers with a willing heart, now, now with holy prayers I entreat you to bring to term from Eriboia for this man a bold son to be my destined guest friend' ("Εἴ ποτ' ἐμᾶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, / θυμῷ θέλων ἄρᾶν ἄκουσας, / νῦν σε, νῦν εὐχαῖς ὑπὸ θεσπεσίαις / λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας / ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ξεῖνον ἄμὸν μοιρίδιον τελέσαι"). The hero expresses the hope that, since the god has been generous in the past, his favour might more readily be secured in the future. This resonates the kind of appeal we have seen in the opening prayer, where the laudator recalls the Nemean victories that Zeus and Poseidon have given to the sons of Lampon. By mentioning these victories as a preface to the request for a third it would seem that they too are being used in support of continuing an already well-established special relationship.

---

<sup>227</sup> Lines 66–73: Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν / ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶ τοῦτ' ἔπος, / υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ / ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἐφ' προσάγων / καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται, / μέτρα μὲν γνώμα διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, / γλῶσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν, φαίης κέ νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν / Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν. ('In devoting industry to his deeds, Lampon holds in particular honour that saying of Hesiod, which he quotes and recommends to his sons, as he brings to his own city an adornment all share and is beloved for his acts of kindness to foreigners, pursuing due measure in judgment and holding fast to it; his tongue does not stray from his thoughts; you would say that among athletes the man is a bronze-taming whetstone from Naxos compared to other stones.')

In deploying a *da-quia-dedisti* formula the laudator uses a technique that, as we have seen above, was also a crucial feature of *Nem.* 5. Moreover, in both of *Isth.* 6's prayers the hopes placed on Zeus's favour concern expectations of *future* success. In the following analysis I will examine the relationship between the two prayers and explore how the expectations of the community and the victorious family are reconciled and advanced through the laudator's appeal to the god's favour. In doing so I will explore how the same ideas of renewing an existing relationship with the divine and of 'reperforming' prayers in hearing for the first time can help us to understand this complex ode.

### **Charm offensive:**

The opening prayer was more than a simple statement about the hopes the victor and the community held about Zeus' favour. It was also a means of engaging the attention of the god and heightening his receptiveness to the laudator's request. The latter does so by a means that we have seen before: through the construal of imagery in the minds of the audience that was designed to delight, charm and flatter the listening deity.

In my analyses of *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2 I discussed how the two audiences at the performances of the former (i.e. those who attended the debut and those who attended the reperformance alongside *Isth.* 2) would have responded to the laudator's construal of Xenocrates' chariot victory in very different ways. At the debut performance the laudator's account of the Pythian chariot victory would have roused the excitement of

the listeners, and used their awareness of recent events, shared cultural knowledge and emotional state to create a sense of immediacy and joint enterprise.<sup>228</sup> The same tactic can be seen at work here in *Isth.* 6. By creating a sympotic scene the laudator engaged the associations of congeniality and common purpose that attached to such gatherings. This was strengthened by the suggestion that ‘we’ are mixing (κίρναμεν) a bowl in celebration, the effect of which was to engage the goodwill of the listeners and create the impression of a collective endeavour. The subsequent account of the victories recalled to the listeners events that had happened recently (very recently in Phylakidas’ case). By piquing the audience’s excitement at a recent success, and construing the congratulation as a collective act, the laudator imparted a heightened sense of emotion to the prayer to Zeus. This emotion was summoned up in the minds of the listeners as they recalled the victories that the god had granted the family, and as such they became all the more powerful as a basis for proposing that the special relationship should continue into the future.

In my discussion of *Nem.* 5.19–39 I argued that the laudator’s description of the chorus of the Muses and Apollo, and the song they sing of Zeus’ reward to Peleus, was intended to flatter the god and make him more receptive to the prayer made in *Nem.* 5.9–18. The same intention is evident in *Isth.* 6.1–9. Here the account of Zeus’ favour in granting ‘the choicest of crowns’ (ἄωτον στεφάνων); the description of Poseidon as ‘the Isthmos’ lord and the fifty Nereids’ (Ἴσθμοῦ δεσπότης / Νηρηεΐδεσσί τε πεντήκοντα) and of Zeus himself as ‘Olympian saviour (σωτήρ Ὀλύμπιος) would have been intended to flatter the divine listeners. Furthermore, lines 7–9, where the laudator prays that there may be a third bowl to ‘pour upon Aegina a libation of

---

<sup>228</sup> Page 20.

honey-voiced songs' (εἶη δὲ τρίτον / σωτῆρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυμπίῳ Ἀΐγιναν κάτα / σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδάϊς), would have created an effect on the audience notably similar to that which we saw in *Nem.* 5.19–25. Here in *Isth.* 6 the song itself has already been compared to a libation in lines 1–3, where it is called a bowl of the Muses' songs (κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων). It is these lines that open the sympotic scene, creating an image in the minds of the listeners that was all the more delightful for the fact that it echoed the singing and dancing that they could see and hear before them. By using choral imagery to end the scene and voice the hopes of the prayer, the laudator effects a promise to the god: another delightful song, as charming as this, will follow if our prayers are granted.

Once again, then, we can see that the tactics for appealing for divine favour comprise the use of memory, sentiment and emotion in order to create a lively image in the minds of the listeners, such as will secure the favour of the god into the future.

### **Herakles' prayer:**

The prayer of Herakles is situated in the midst of thirty-one verses of mythological discourse. Between lines 25 and 56 the laudator details the close relationship between the hero and Telamon. In lines 26–35, which precede the prayer, the laudator recounts the exploits of the two warriors, describing Telamon as 'an eager ally into bronze-loving war, when he went with his men from Tiryns in ships to Troy, that labour for the heroes, on account of Laomedon's crimes. He took Pergamos, and with that man [Herakles] slew the tribes of the Meropes and that

cowherd great as a mountain when he encountered him at Phlegrai, and did not hold back his hands from his deep-toned bowstring, Herakles, that is.<sup>229</sup>

This account prompts the audience to remove themselves from the present time of the performance and resituate themselves in the mythical past.<sup>230</sup> The laudator does not go into detail about the heroes' individual exploits, but paints a synoptic picture of their famous deeds. In doing so he encourages the listeners to access their cultural memory of these events, of which they were surely highly familiar, drawing detailed images of Telamon and Herakles to the surface of their minds, gathered from a lifetime of exposure to artistic images, folktales and other performances, and at the same time summoning a host of positive sentiments attached to them (pride, wonder, etc.).

As in *Nem.* 5, the audience would have construed these deeds as historical events, i.e. as actually having taken place in the distant past. In a sense, then, it is an act of historical 'remembering.' Telamon enjoys a special relationship with Zeus that brings him glory in the form of his outstanding son, Aias. This is mediated by Herakles, whose personal appeal to the god secures the promise of divine favour. It is only the hero, however, who has a stake in this favour. The account of the meeting between Herakles and Telamon is prefaced by the declaration that the glory of noble men from times past forms Aegina's collective fame and glory. By prompting the listeners to summon to their minds the great deeds of Telamon and Herakles, the

---

<sup>229</sup> οὐδ' ἄτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα / καὶ πατρός, τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον / ἄγε σὺν  
Τιρυνθίοισιν πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς Τροίαν, ἥρωσι μόχθον, / Λαομεδοντιᾶν ὑπὲρ  
ἀμπλακιάδων / ἐν ναυσὶν Ἀλκμήνας τέκος. / εἶλε δὲ Περγαμίαν, πέφνεν δὲ σὺν κείνῳ  
Μερόπων / ἔθνεα καὶ τὸν βουβόταν οὐρεῖ ἴσον / Φλέγραισιν εὐρῶν Ἀλκυονῆ, σφετέρως δ'  
οὐ φείσατο / χερσὶν βαρυφθόγγιο νευρᾶς / Ἡρακλέης

<sup>230</sup> A demand also made of them in *Nem.* 5.19–39 (Peleus' conflict with Hippolyta) and *Pyth.* 6.19–42 (Cheiron tutoring Achilles and Antilochus' battle with Memnon).

laudator encourages them to renew their sense of their community's greatness. In 'remembering' the prayer, with its reference to previous divine favours that Herakles had benefited from, the audience consolidated their sense that it was through divine grace that mortal glory is conferred (the very message of lines 10–13). I propose that as well as mentally renewing the glory that the community continued to enjoy as a result of Zeus' favour towards Herakles and Telamon, the listeners would also have renewed the prayer itself. In a sense, then, here at the debut of *Isth.* 6 the prayer in lines 42–54 would have been understood both as the collective remembrance of an historical act and its reperformance.

As the latter, Herakles the long-dead hero becomes the mouthpiece of the laudator and, by extension, the listening community. Just as the prayer of Peleus and his brothers in *Nem.* 5 was made both to the Zeus of generations past and to the Zeus who was present at the ode's performance, so Herakles' prayer in *Isth.* 6 was made to the god listening to the hero's fireside appeal and to the god who was listening to the song in honour of Phylakidas' victory. In appealing to and renewing a relationship with Zeus from which the entire community enjoyed his favour, the laudator's use of Herakles as a mouthpiece would have created a similar advantage to that which we saw in *Nem.* 5, where Peleus' *kudos* as one honoured by the gods made a stronger claim for the god's attention and favour. Due to Herakles' special relationship with his divine father (a fact referred to by the hero himself), the audience would expect that Zeus would be more inclined to remember his favour towards Aegina. In 'remembering' the prayer, and with the knowledge of Zeus' close relationship with his son, the audience would thus have imparted a strong sense of expectation that their own relationship with the god would be maintained and renewed.

It is in light of this that we can perceive another significance to the synoptic account of the adventures of Herakles and Telamon in lines 26–34. This not only recalled to the audience the glories that the heroes had achieved, but in the context of Herakles’ *da-quia-dedisti* formula and the ‘reperformance’ of the prayer it would serve to remind Zeus of his previous favour, in effect bolstering the case made to Zeus for continued honour. This can be compared with what we saw in *Nem.* 5.19–39, where the account of Peleus’ honourable conduct was designed to delight the god and so encourage him to continue his support for Aegina.

Previously I have discussed how the combination of the break-off in lines 55–56 (where Herakles suddenly sits down), the deictic qualities of the prayer (‘now, now with holy prayers I entreat you’),<sup>231</sup> and the subsequent encomium to Lampon’s sons prompted the listeners to think of Pytheas and Phylakidas as the latest in a line of outstanding individuals who exemplified Aegina’s glory. The two prayers of *Isth.* 6, however, complement each other in another way. One asks that future glory be given to Pytheas and Phylakidas and, by association, to Aegina on the strength of the gods’ previous honours. There it is the achievements of the victors that are being used to make the case for divine favour. Herakles’ prayer, in its capacity as a renewal of the special relationship between the god and the community, brings the deeds of Telamon and Herakles, two of the greatest heroes, to bear in strengthening that case. Moreover, the laudator encourages the audiences to construe these deeds as the collective glory

---

<sup>231</sup> Depew (1997): “Prayers typically include vocatives in their beginning as well, a form of address whose primary function in speech is to attract someone’s attention.” See also Versnel (1981: 29–30 and n. 113). In essence, I propose that Herakles’ address to Zeus would have engaged the attention of the god in the present day of the audience through their imagining it in the context of the performance. The parallel between the laudator’s prayer that Lampon’s son will have an Olympian victory and Herakles’ prayer that Telamon will have a glorious son has been noted by Indergaard (2011: 313), though here I argue that Herakles’ prayer is actually conflated with that made at the beginning of the ode.

of the community. In encouraging the audience to make the association between Herakles' prayer and the prayer that opened the ode, the laudator is not simply making a point about Phylakidas' and Pytheas' exemplary status. At the point where they were casting their minds back to the opening prayer, the audience had already heard how Aegina's collective honour assimilated that of outstanding individuals (lines 19–25), and that the latter's claim to glory was limited by their mortal nature and finite lifespans (lines 10–18). In remembering that the ode opened with a prayer to Zeus that another victory might be granted to 'pour over Aegina,' the sense that the community was at least as great a beneficiary as the victors themselves would have been pronounced. In essence, by 'reperforming' Herakles' prayer, which sought to renew the community's long relationship with the god, the listeners were using the collectively-held deeds of the heroes to make a stronger case for him to honour the appeal that had been made using the deeds of the victors at the beginning of *Isth.* 6.

The ode begins with glorifying praise for the athletes, drawing on the audience's memories of the recent events at the Isthmian games, or at least their topical knowledge of them as well as the sense of excitement that naturally accompanies such occasions. This would have been a spectacular opening to the performance, one that was surely calculated to delight the audience and please the victorious family whose expenditure funded the recital. The same delightful effect, I have argued, would have been hoped for in the god, as it was the fact of recent and not so recent victories that was used as the basis for asking him to grant future glory. As the ode progressed, however, and by the time it reached line 54, where Herakles sits down after his prayer, the laudator has unmistakably spelt out the relationship between the outstanding young men and the mass of Aeginetans attending the

spectacle. The latter lay claim to the collective deeds of all the warriors who have ever brought glory to the island, whose fame, honour and 'body' never dies (unlike its human constituents, however outstanding they may be). Though the fact of two previous family victories is nothing to be scoffed at, when Herakles has finished making his appeal to Zeus and the audience are casting their minds back to the opening prayer to the god, they are able to bring the freshly re-imagined exploits of Herakles and Telamon to bear in their appeal for continued divine favour, not to mention the re-enacted appeal of Zeus' son, which so moved the god many generations ago. However special the victories, however wonderful the praise at the beginning of the performance and however much it may have flattered the athletes, the community is thus able to mobilise the combined weight of generations of glorious men whose fame stretches across the Greek world, and which includes the exploits of two of the greatest heroes. The community's claim to the glory of individuals, its superior capacity for greatness, is made clear not only in the praise that the laudator lays out in lines 19–25 or in the unavoidable comparison with the limits of mortal greatness in 10–18, immediately before. It is also manifest in the greater weight that the community is seen to bring in the appeal to Zeus, from whom human glory springs.

In *Reading Greek Prayers*, Mary Depew discusses a votive offering from Tomis on the Black Sea, depicting on its upper half the hero Manimazos standing by an altar where a sacrifice is being made to him, and on its lower half a ship in which a sailor and a boy are praying to him:

“Van Straten, in his discussion of these reliefs, notes another anomaly: “What is striking is the fact that the votive offerings given by sailors which have survived from Antiquity never provide a realistic reproduction of the dangers from which they have been saved.” That is because the function of these reliefs requires that, even though the verbal utterance of the prayer and the gesture of supplication made with it would have been both temporally and geographically separate from the offerings that the sailors eventually gave, their requests, as well as the gods' acknowledgment and acceptance of their offering, are depicted as though they had occurred simultaneously. The sculptors have elided what must have been two separate occasions, and in so doing have represented what votive reliefs typically represent: a successful interaction taking place.”<sup>232</sup>

Though in the case of the offering discussed above, the prayer is made to a hero rather than to Zeus, notable similarities prompt a comparison. The laudator, like the sculptor of the votive relief has combined two timeframes to create a powerful basis for interaction with a higher power.<sup>233</sup> Here in *Isth.* 6 the collapsing of the mythical timeframe in which Herakles' once made his prayer with the circumstances of the present day is made possible by using resonant imagery (that of libation and prayer) referring the listeners back to the original sympotic image at the opening of the ode. What is more, in both the sculpture and the poem the prayers have been fulfilled: the sailors returned home safely in one case, and both Lampon and Telamon have been given outstanding sons in the other. In the poetic performance, however,

---

<sup>232</sup> Depew (1997): 252. Van Straten (1981): 97.

<sup>233</sup> For discussions of Pindar's use of time and its implication for the relationship between men and gods, see Grethlein (2011). See also Griffith (1993): 607–623 and Pavlou (2011).

there is more to this than meets the eye. The desired outcome expressed by Herakles as he prays for Telamon's son is not only that the child will be brought to term, but that he will be outstanding. The indication that this wish will be fulfilled is given by the eagle whose appearance caused sweet joy to thrill within him.<sup>234</sup> This thrill that Herakles experiences at the sign of Zeus' accession to his request would have been a powerful motif for the listening audience,<sup>235</sup> and in the lines following (52–54), where the hero's praise for Aias generates the expectation of the appearance of a great son, the sense of wonder and anticipation that I have described above would have been carried back into the present day, to which the laudator returns in lines 55–59. In other words, the flight of the eagle and the prophesy of Herakles not only indicate that the prayer will be fulfilled for Telamon, but the temporal leap that follows makes it clear that it has also been fulfilled for Lampon, and indeed for Aegina. The powerful sentiments of joy that thrilled Herakles are, in other words, cues for the emotions of the audience. Like the votive relief from Tomis, then, *Isth.* 6 combines two timeframes, depicts a prayer made in the past and also shows divine intervention in fulfillment of this prayer— twice. In effect, the signifier that the prayer has been fulfilled and that the god has extended *charis* to Telamon, a great hero of the Aeginetan community, is the surging of Herakles' emotions prompted by the eagle. The same surge of emotions (pride and wonder) that would surely have come readily to the listeners as they imagined Telamon's son is carried across time and attached by the laudator to the offspring of Lampon and their uncle, for whom an encomium follows in lines 56–66. Just as emotions signified the expression of divine *charis* for Herakles, so the same emotions in the imaginations of the listeners would have

---

<sup>234</sup> Line 50: ἀδεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις.

<sup>235</sup> It is one that is employed to striking effect, though in a very different context, in *Pyth.* 1.1–10, where the poet praises the lyre as lulling even the eagle of Zeus to sleep.

signified Zeus' presence at the performance of *Isth.* 6. In his analysis of Mantiklos' statuette, Day concludes that "the inscribed narrative of Mantiklos' act is spoken aloud by our visitor, who is thus drawn more deeply into the interaction, becoming part of the dedication by lending a voice to the deferred utterance on it."<sup>236</sup> Here in *Isth.* 6 the listeners not only mentally drew the hero's prayer into the present day, 'reperforming' it (or 're-enacting' it, to use Day's term), but in a manner of speaking they also 're-experienced' the thrill of epiphany that signified the god's intervention.

### **Lampon**

In *Nem.* 5 we saw that Lampon's place in the ode was limited, and the sense of glory that was attached to him markedly less than that of Pytheas and his victorious relatives. In my previous analysis of *Isth.* 6, however, I noted that here in the second ode this had changed significantly. Now he is treated as an exemplar of excellence, and accorded even greater prominence than his sons. There are two places where he features most conspicuously. The first is in lines 10–16, where the laudator uses him to describe the limits of mortal glory:

εἰ γὰρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνη τε χαρεῖς  
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς  
σύν τέ οἱ δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐ-  
σχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου  
βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἑών.

---

<sup>236</sup> Day (1994): 72.

τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται  
ἀντιάσαις Ἄιδαν γῆράς τε δέξασθαι πολίων  
ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς,

For if a man, delighting in expenditure and hard work,  
accomplishes divinely fashioned deeds of excellence,  
and in addition fortune plants lovely fame for him,  
at the limits of happiness he has already  
cast his anchor as one honoured by the gods.

The son of Kleonikos prays  
that with feelings such as these he may meet Hades  
and welcome grey old age

The second is at the end of the ode, in lines 56–75:

ἔμοι δὲ μακρὸν πάσας <ἀν>αγήσασθ' ἀρετάς,  
Φυλακίδα γὰρ ἦλθον, ᾧ Μοῖσα, ταμίας  
Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμέ-  
νει τε, τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον  
εἰρήσεταιί που κὰν βραχίστοις.

ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου  
τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας,  
ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρως. ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς

φάος οἶαν μοῖραν ὕμνων,  
τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων  
ἄρδοντι καλλίστα δρόσῳ,  
τόν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε πόλιν  
θεοφιλῆ ναίοισι. Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν  
ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιό-  
δου μάλα τιμᾶ τοῦτ' ἔπος,  
υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ  
  
ξυνὸν ἄσται κόσμον ἐῷ προσάγων  
καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται,  
μέτρα μὲν γνῶμα διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων,  
γλῶσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν, φαί-  
ης κέ νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν  
Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν.  
πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕ-  
δωρ, τὸ βαθύζωνοι κόραι  
χρυσοπέπλου Μναμοσύνας ἀνέτει-  
λαν παρ' εὐτειχέσιν Κάδμου πύλαις.

... But it would take me too long to recount all  
their deeds,  
since I have come, O Muse, as steward  
of the revel songs for Phylakidas, Pytheas  
and Euthymenes. In the Argive manner

it will be stated, I think, in the briefest terms:

these boys and their uncle took away three  
victories in the Pancratium from the Isthmos and others  
from leafy Nemea. And what a portion

of hymns they brought to light!

They refresh the clan of the Psalychiadai  
with the finest dew of the Graces;

having exalted the house of Themistios, they dwell  
in this city beloved by the gods. In devoting industry  
to his deeds, Lampon holds in particular

honour that saying of Hesiod

which he quotes and recommends to his sons,

as he brings to his own city an adornment all share  
and is beloved for his acts of kindness to foreigners,  
pursuing due measure in judgment and holding fast to it;  
his tongue does not stray from his thoughts; you would

say that among athletes he is a bronze-taming

whetstone from Naxos compared to other stones.

I shall offer him a drink of Dirke's sacred water,

which the deep-bosomed daughters

of golden-robed Mnemosyne made to surge

by the well-walled gates of Kadmos.

The latter section may be divided into two halves. The first half (lines 56–66) is devoted to the kind of praise for Pytheas, Euthymenes and Themistios that we saw in *Nem.* 5.41–54:

τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες,  
Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτων  
ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.  
  
ἦτοι μεταίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει  
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.  
ἅ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν  
μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὃν φίλησ' Ἀπόλλων,  
ἄλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει  
Νίσου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ. χαίρω δ' ὅτι  
ἔσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις.  
ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου  
σὺν τύχῃ μόχθων ἀμοιβάν  
  
ἐπαύρεο. χρῆ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖσιν  
ἔμμεν.  
εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἴκεις  
ὥστ' αἰεδεῖν, μηκέτι ρίγει, δίδοι  
φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἰστία τεῖνον  
πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου,  
πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου

φθέγξαι ἔλειν Ἐπιδαύρω διπλόαν  
νικῶντ' ἀρετάν, προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ  
ἀνθέων ποιᾶεντα φέρε στεφανώ-  
ματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν.

... Euthymenes, twice from Aegina  
did you fall into Victory's arms  
and enjoy elaborate hymns.

Indeed, Pytheas, now too your maternal uncle, following  
in your footsteps, glorifies that hero's kindred race.

Nemea stands firm for him,

as well as the local month that Apollo loved.

He defeated those of his age who came to compete at

home

and at Nisos' hill, with its lovely glens. I rejoice

that the entire city strives for noble prizes.

Remember that it was truly through Menander's good

fortune that you won sweet reward

for your toils. A fashioner of athletes ought to be from

Athens.

But if it is Themistios you have come

to sing, hold back no longer: give forth

your voice, hoist the sails to the  
topmost yard,  
proclaim that as a boxer and in the pancratium  
he won at Epidauros a double  
victory, and to the portals of Aiakos' temple  
bring the leafy crown of flowers  
in the company of the fair-haired Graces.

It seems the praise for the victors in *Isth.* 6, coming at the end of a complex appeal to Zeus which is based on a *da-quia-dedisti* formulation, had the same qualities as it did in the previous ode: i.e. it acted as a demonstration of the god's generosity, and as such strengthened the case that this generosity should be continued. The second half (66–75) is devoted to praise for Lampon. As we have seen previously, he is cast as a man whose lessons to his sons have shaped them into the athletes that now stand victorious before the community. In my previous analysis I argued that this confirmed what we have seen elsewhere in the ode, i.e. that the community had a stake in the glory of individuals that, in its scope and durability, was superior to that of the individuals themselves. I also proposed that in placing Lampon in this role the laudator encouraged the audience to attach a special status to him as the one who honoured the city with extraordinarily successful offspring.

It is this special status that is of interest here. For though the laudator increases the prominence of Lampon compared to what we saw in *Nem.* 5, it is not simply a closer association with his sons that leads to the impression of greater honour. The

praise in lines 66–68 starts by saying that ‘in devoting industry to his deeds, Lampon holds in particular honour that saying of Hesiod which he quotes and recommends to his sons...’ (Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν / ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾶ τοῦτ’ ἔπος, / υἰοῖσιν τε φράζων παραινεῖ). This, as I have mentioned, is seen as a reference to Hes. *Op.* 412, where it is said that ‘industry advances work’ (μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει). Coming immediately after the encomium to the athletic virtues of the young men in the previous lines, and leading eventually to the declaration in lines 72–75 that Lampon is like a Naxian bronze-taming whetstone to athletes, the laudator is attributing to him special paternal qualities that led to his sons’ success.<sup>237</sup>

Significant amidst this praise are the words in line 69: ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἐῶ προσάγων (‘and he brings to the city a *kosmos* all share’). Previously, when examining the implications of this expression in terms of Lampon’s relationship with the community, I argued that κόσμος could be interpreted as ‘good behaviour’ or ‘good conduct.’ Looked at from the perspective of Lampon’s position in relation to both the community *and* the divine, however, Race’s translation of ‘adornment’ is more apt.<sup>238</sup> Though it might seem, given the references to athletic success that precede and follow these lines, that the ‘adornment’ he brings to the city is the glory generated from his sons’ athletic victories, there is another set of qualities that are encompassed by κόσμος.<sup>239</sup> These are described immediately after, in lines 70–72: he is ‘beloved for his acts of kindness to foreigners, pursuing due measure in judgement and holding fast to it, his tongue does not stray from his thoughts’ (καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται, / μέτρα μὲν γνώμα διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων, /

<sup>237</sup> Wilamowitz (1922): 102.

<sup>238</sup> See also Thummer (1968–9: ii.110), and note Burnett’s tentative suggestion (2005: 87, n. 23) that this may refer to a contribution by Lampon towards the new Aphaia pediments.

<sup>239</sup> See Indergaard (2011: 299), who reads ‘adornment’ as referring to the performance itself.

γλωσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν).<sup>240</sup> These are qualities we have seen before, in *Pyth* 6.44–54. There they are displayed by Thrasyboulos in the laudator's appeal to Poseidon for future success on the young man's behalf. They are qualities we know the ancient listeners associated with divine pleasure, and moral integrity is something that Zeus responded well to in *Nem.* 5.25–39, where he awarded Peleus for his rejection of Hippolyta. Here in *Isth.* 6.70–72 the laudator gives voice to qualities that would not only have consolidated Lampon's high standing amongst the community, but would be trusted to please the god. And it is they, not simply the victories of his sons, that are construed as adornments that all share. The audience's response to this would have been to associate these qualities with the men of Aegina, to cultivate the impression that they were characterised by the same virtuous attributes displayed by Lampon.

The father of Pytheas and Phylakidas is thus held up at the end of the ode as a man who gives glory to Aegina by producing athletically gifted offspring, whose success adds another layer of glory to the island's ancient and honourable pedigree. Moreover, in the context of a performance that uses recent and ancient glories as the basis for persuading Zeus to maintain his favour, his creation of athletic sons has a significance for the island's expectations of future prosperity. These, as I have argued, must be understood in terms divine favour. It is the gods who confer human success, and whose attentions must be sought and sensibilities charmed if hopes of continued success might be entertained. Here Lampon's progeny and his own virtues are held up, in the one case as examples of recent divine beneficence, and in the other as the

---

<sup>240</sup> With regard to Lampon's pursuit of good judgment, Burnett (2005: 87, n. 22) suggests that "the phrase will suggest a distinction between making judgments and administering them, and will then apply also to judgments given in the gymnasium." Kirkwood (1982: 296), who reads "he wisely pursues moderation and holds fast to it."

holder of commonly-held qualities that were thought to be delightful to the gods. In this sense the laudator makes him an exemplar of a special kind, one who is responsible for athletic victories that were not his own and whose glory, assimilated to that of the community, was the archetype of what made ‘the city beloved by the gods’ (πόλις θεοφιλῆς).<sup>241</sup>

---

<sup>241</sup> Lines 65–66.

## ISTHMIAN 5

The third ode for the sons of Lampon distinguishes itself from the previous two in an important way: unlike *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6 it contains no prayers. Like *Isth.* 6, however, it does construe the limits of mortal glory.<sup>242</sup> In lines 11–16 the laudator declares that:

κρίνεται δ' ἄλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.  
δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαί-  
νοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον, εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ,  
  
εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούη.  
μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι, πάντ' ἔχεις,  
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν.  
θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.

But men's valour is determined by the gods.<sup>243</sup>

There are truly two things alone that foster  
sweetness of life in blossoming prosperity:  
if a man succeeds and hears his praises sung.

---

<sup>242</sup> Currie (2005: 77–78) proposes that this is an example of “an inclusive model of κλέος in Pindar.” See Currie (2005: 72–78) for a discussion of “exclusive” and “inclusive” conceptions of immortality: the former is Homeric in quality (immortality only in renown), whilst the latter combines renown with cult or another, literal, form of immortality. Currie argues that there are suggestions of cultic renown for the young athletes in *Isth.* 5.22–34, where the laudator declares that the victors deserve song in return for toil, whilst stating that heroes are also celebrated for time beyond measure. Though this is an interesting interpretation of the passage, I am not convinced that the ode provides evidence of a historical cult for the victors.

<sup>243</sup> See François (1957: 75, 80–81, 92–93, 313–314) who proposes the synonymity of θεός and δαίμων.

Do not seek to become Zeus, you have all there is  
if a share of those blessings should come to you.  
Mortal things befit mortals.

This resembles the limits that were set out in *Isth.* 6.10–13:

εἰ γὰρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεῖς  
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς  
σύν τέ οἱ δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον, ἐ-  
σχατιαῖς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου  
βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἐών.

For if a man, delighting in expenditure and hard work,  
accomplishes divinely fashioned deeds of excellence,  
and in addition fortune plants lovely fame for him,  
at the limits of happiness he has already  
cast his anchor as one honoured by the gods.

*Isth.* 5.11–16, like *Isth.* 6.10–13, is also followed by an encomium to Aegina's greatness. In lines 24–28 the laudator, recalling the praise delivered in *Isth.* 6.19–25, urges that if the island's fame travels across roads of divinely-granted deeds then 'do not grudge to blend into your song a fitting vaunt in return for toils, for among the heroes brave warriors also gained praise and are celebrated on lyres and in the full range of pipes' harmonies for time beyond measure' (μη φθόνει κόμπων τὸν εἰκότ' ἀοιδᾶ / κιννάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων. / καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ / λόγον

ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὀμοκλαῖς / μυρίον χρόνον). The laudator concludes this encomium to the community in lines 28–29 by stating that, thanks to Zeus, reverence for the heroes has provided a theme for wise poets.

It seems, then, that the ode creates familiar parameters for human success, both for individuals and for the community: the grace of Zeus. But if there are no *prayers* for future success, on what terms does the performance engage the god, and what implications are there for the continued success of the family and the community? It is the fact that the laudator does not express future hopes or expectations that is perhaps the most distinguishing feature of the ode.

We should note that despite there being no explicit prayer, it should not be imagined that the laudator does not seek to engage the attention of the god at all. In fact Zeus features as much here as he does in *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6. What is more, we can see the same features that were used to engage the god in the previous odes being deployed here. In the urge not to become Zeus (line 14: μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι) and in attributing to Zeus the fact that Aegina possesses a long line of heroic glories (lines 28–29) the laudator places him at the top of the cosmic hierarchy, construing him as the guarantor of individual and collective honour.<sup>244</sup> Furthermore, the reference in lines 27–28 to lyres and pipes would have conjured in the minds of the listeners an image that delightfully resonated the sounds of the performance itself.<sup>245</sup> This is similar to what we have seen in *Nem.* 5.19–25, where the description of the

---

<sup>244</sup> μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς / Διὸς ἕκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι: ‘and, thanks to Zeus, reverence for them has provided a theme for wise poets.’

<sup>245</sup> κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὀμοκλαῖς / μυρίον χρόνον: ‘and are celebrated on lyres and in the full range of pipes’ harmonies for time beyond measure.’

chorus of Apollo resonates the musical performance of the ode in order to provide a delightful spectacle for Zeus.

Given these similarities and the subsequent pains the laudator takes to credit Zeus as the benefactor upon whom the entire island depends (on which more below), it seems highly unlikely that the listeners did not conjure the poetic imagery in their minds in the expectation that the god himself was paying careful attention.

Like *Isth.* 6, too, the praise for Aegina, as well as portraying the island as having a superior capacity for glory to that of individuals (which I have examined previously), is also followed by a mythological digression that demonstrates the pedigree of this glory. The mythology, however, is treated in a very different way. In the previous ode, when the laudator described the joint deeds of Telamon and Herakles, the account relied on brief, synoptic imagery to tell a story. Here, by contrast, between lines 34 and 42, having described the Panhellenic glory of Aegina and how it is comprised of the deeds of great men, the laudator deploys a series of questions, the answers to all of which are ‘Achilles.’<sup>246</sup>

In my previous analysis of *Isth.* 5 I argued that the intended effect of these questions was to prompt a heightened engagement on the part of the listeners with the performance itself, priming them for the imagery that was to follow in lines 43–54.<sup>247</sup> When describing the island as a bastion for men to scale ‘long ago’ (πάλαι) the laudator keeps the minds of the audience on the mythical age. With the description of his arrows of praise, however, he propels them ‘forward’ into the recent past. Flying

---

<sup>246</sup> *Isth.* 5.34–42. See pages 147–149.

<sup>247</sup> Pages 149–151.

through the ages into the present day the arrows rain death on the sailors at Aegina, prompting the listeners to recall vividly the dramatic events that had taken place. In recalling the battle at Salamis, the laudator thus continues to draw on the memories of the audience, though in a different manner from that which he had employed when posing questions about Achilles. For at the time of *Isth.* 5's debut this event was recent and would have been fresh in the listeners' memory. Like Phylakidas' victory at the debut of *Isth.* 6 and Xenocrates' victory at the debut of *Pyth.* 6 the imagery appealed to the listeners' awareness of a topical event to which a strong sense of pride and glory was attached. The strength of this sentiment that the laudator anticipated is presumed by the urge to 'drench your boast in silence' (ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχασμα κατάβρεχε σιγᾶ) in line 51. As well as being the harbingers of death, these arrows also created the conditions in which the sailors risked life and limb to obtain glory. Above, I proposed that, in describing his praise as arrows that fell upon the Aeginetan sailors at Salamis, the laudator memorialised the heroic deed. Doing so would have created the strongest reason for the community to wish to hear it reperformed, and thus enhanced its status as a perpetual vehicle for the praise of the family, with which the performance concludes.

The cosmological significance of this encomium to the sailors at Aegina can best be understood by considering the role of Zeus, who is mentioned three times. In lines 48–50 the arrows of praise are called 'Zeus' devastating rain;' in line 52 he is said to dispense a variety of things and in line 53 he is called 'lord of all.' For the listening audience this summoned an image of the god in his capacity as the master of mortal affairs. Let us consider lines 52 and 53 first. In one sense they articulate the position of the god at the top of the cosmic hierarchy, making him responsible for mortal glory

and death. This may well have been perceived by the listeners as an extension of the god's status implied in lines 14–15: 'Do not seek to become Zeus; you have all there is if a share those blessings should come to you.'<sup>248</sup> The sense both there and at the end of the Salamis episode is that the division between men and gods is insurmountable, and breaching it is, properly, beyond the scope of mortal ambition.

The fact that the laudator addresses the god twice in the space of two lines would also have created an effect that would surely have been striking for the audience ('*Zeus* dispenses many things, *Zeus*, lord of all'). Not only would this have focused the thoughts of the listeners on the god, but would have been seen as engaging the attention of the god himself.<sup>249</sup> Though this is not made as part of a prayer or other direct appeal, the sound of the laudator calling the name of the god twice in succession, and in the context of praise for his status and power, would surely have been perceived as forcefully impressing upon him the audience's wonder at his power. It would, in effect, have consolidated the sense in the minds of the audience that the performance was propitiating him.

Though this would no doubt have sounded like compelling euphony, a powerful effect on the ears of listeners and god alike, as far as the audience were concerned the attention of the god had already been marshaled. The emotionally charged recollection of the sailors' bravery at Salamis was cut through with the flight of arrows on their gory path. They were not, as we have seen, arrows in the ordinarily metaphorical sense. In the minds of the listeners they begin as abstract flights of

---

<sup>248</sup> Boeke (2007: 34) cites this expression in conjunction with *Pyth.* 3.84 ('your share of happiness attends you': τὴν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἔπειται) as examples of the impersonal use of μοῖρα as 'share' or 'portion.' See also Dietrich (1965: 279–281) for a Homeric context.

<sup>249</sup> See Burnett (2005: 98–99), who says that the repetition of the god's name "creates the sense of an immanent divine presence."

praise. Moments later they gain the terrifying immediacy of iron-tipped rods of wood shot from Persian bows into the sailors of Aegina, before finally falling upon the ground to drench the ‘boast’ (καύχασμα) of the latter’s glory. By calling them ‘Zeus’ rain’ (Διὸς ὄμβρος) the laudator makes them the very expression of the god’s power over the lives and glory of men.

This would have been extremely significant for the audience’s reception of the imagery of the battle. It was the arrows that strung the narrative together, which gave it its sense of immediacy and emotional force. The listeners, it seems, were encouraged to conceive of these arrows as the expression of Zeus’ power at the battle (and over the mortal sphere generally), of his agency over the lives of the sailors and the corresponding glory that the community claimed as its own. By thinking of the τοξέματα falling upon the anonymous men and dealing bloody glory, they were imagining the will of Zeus dealing favour to Aegina. The fame, glory and death he cast over the sailors were everlasting, and the performance both memorialised it and made it monumental. By imagining the arrows and experiencing the powerful emotions they conjured up, the audience themselves experienced the hand of god. This was the very proof of the special regard with which Zeus held the island community. Through the imagery of Salamis the laudator gave the listeners the chance to propitiate and delight the god; to acknowledge his superior position in the cosmic hierarchy; to re-experience the favour he had bestowed upon them, and, through this, to entertain the highest hopes that it would continue.

### **The cold shoulder?**

The final section of *Isth.* 5 is an encomium to the victorious family. This reflects the structures that we have seen in all the odes that we have looked at in this thesis. In the case of *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6 the final encomium immediately follows imagery in which praise is directed at individuals from another place and time (in the former case Peleus and in the latter Herakles). This is also the case here, though the individuals in question are unnamed and the timeframe is a recent one. In the previous two odes the means by which the laudator terminated the mythological digression was through break-off. In each case the effect of this (along with other performative devices that I have discussed earlier) was to place the victors (and Lampon, in the *Isth.* 6) at the end of the line of glorious exemplars, in effect setting their deeds in the context of a historical body of heroic achievements. In my previous analysis of *Isth.* 5 I argued that something similar happens here. In lines 53–54, immediately following the declaration that Zeus is lord of all, the laudator says that ‘in poetry’s delightful honey such honours as these also welcome joyous songs of victory’ (ἐν δ’ ἔρατεινῷ / μέλιτι καὶ τοιαῖδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον χάρμ’ ἀγαπάζοντι). This seems to provide a point of comparison between the passage on Salamis that has just ended and the encomium to Phylakidas and Pytheas that is to follow (with the mention of victories the audience presumably would have expected praise for the victorious family). These lines are, in effect, a joining device between the account of the sailors and that of the victors. There is no dramatic break-off of the kind that we have seen before. The encomium to the family is set at the end of a line of Aeginetan glory that stretches from Achilles’ mythical exploits in lines 34–42 to the recent glories of the sailors in lines 44–53. Unlike in the previous two odes, this line of glory does not move from the distant past to the present day in a flash. It is smoother, and the biggest jump, from

the glories of Achilles to the battle of Salamis is made all the easier by the fact that, as I have argued, the audience are not asked to detach themselves from the performance and resituate themselves in the mythical past when they answer the questions about Achilles. The effect of this would have been to make it very easy for the listeners to place the victors at the end of the line of great deeds to which the community itself had a collective claim.

Considered from the perspective of the emotions and sentiments that the Achilles and Salamis passages seem designed to have evoked, the tone struck by the laudator in his praise for the family is markedly different from that in the preceding account of Salamis:

μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων

ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου  
ἐκμαθῶν, οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός  
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὀπόσαι δαπάναι  
ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν.  
αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις  
Φυλακίδα πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορήσαι,  
χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.  
λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὐμαλλον μίτραν,  
καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον.

(*Isth.* 5.54–63)

... Let a man strive to perform

in the games after thoroughly learning about the family  
of Kleonikos, for the long hard work of their men  
is certainly not hidden, nor have all their costs  
vexed the zeal of their hopes.

I praise Pytheas too among those who subdue bodies  
for guiding straight the course of Phylakidas' blows,  
being quick with his hands and a good match with his  
mind.

Take up a crown for him, bring a fillet of fine wool  
and send along this winged new hymn.

Here the victories of the family are evoked in the minds of the listeners far less explicitly than the victories of Achilles or the sea battle. The proposal that the family's athletic pedigree provides a model for those seeking success at the games points to past successes, with which the listeners would of course be familiar, but does not provide any details to stir the emotions. The praise for Pytheas and Phylakidas is similarly restrained. The description of the latter's blows evokes pancratic success, but there is nothing here to compare with the emotionally charged accounts of the previous three stanzas.

The description of Pytheas' mental prowess, however, recalls praise that we have seen before. In *Pyth.* 6.44–54 the laudator comments on Thrasyboulos' glorious

attributes, including filial devotion, wealth, intelligence and a pronounced sense of justice. The first of these is supported by a comparison of the youth with Antilochus, whose glories are made explicit in the preceding mythological digression. This encomium was calculated to create an image in the minds of the listeners that would be both believable to them and delightful to the god. Whereas in *Pyth.* 6 the praise for Thrasyboulos was clearly situated in a covenant with Poseidon, however, here in *Isth.* 5 there are no evidence of a prayer or of future hopes and expectations being placed on the divine. Indeed, whereas the Akragantine performance used the examples of Antilochus and, earlier in the ode, a young Achilles, to prime the listeners and prepare them to receive the glorious praise for the young patron, here in *Isth.* 5 the association between the praise for the victorious family and the great deeds mentioned in the previous stanzas is far less pronounced. After all, the momentum of the Salamis episode came to a natural end with the declaration that Zeus is lord of all, itself having followed fluently from the Achilles questions via the ‘bastion of old’ motif in lines 43–45. The subsequent declaration that ‘in poetry’s delightful honey such honours as these also welcome joyous songs of victory’ is much less powerful than the declaration that ‘those things are past, but of men now, Thrasyboulos has come closest to the standard of filial devotion.’ Indeed a similar comparison may be made with the effect achieved by the break-offs in *Nem.* 5.40–41 (‘inborn destiny determines the outcome of all deeds’<sup>250</sup>) and *Isth.* 6.55–56 (‘after speaking thus he immediately sat down’).

In both of those cases the intended effect on the audience seems to have been thus: having prompted them to summon to their minds the glories of old and, in doing so,

---

<sup>250</sup> Boeke (2007: 33) interprets this expression in the context of fate providing limits for the scope of mortal achievement.

relive and renew the favour of the gods, the appeal to the divine for continued honour was bolstered by an account of the modern athletic victories. These themselves were calculated to delight the gods and cement the case for their continued patronage, both on behalf of the victorious family and of the community. Moreover, the emotional momentum that was gathered over the course the stories, and which preceded the account of the family's victories, was, I argued, not interrupted by the break-off clauses. On the contrary, the emotional force of the mythological imagery was maintained as the minds of the listeners were directed back to the recent achievements of Thrasyboulos or of Lampon's sons. In the case of *Isth.* 6 this move 'back' was quite literal, as I have argued that upon hearing Herakles sit down the audience would have cast their minds to the praise for Pytheas and Phylakidas that opened the ode.

In performing *Isth.* 5 the laudator sought to renew the favour that Zeus had previously shown to Aegina by encouraging the listeners to 're-experience' it. In doing so, however, the laudator does not seem to have relied on the victories of the patron to even nearly the same degree as in the previous two odes. The construal of their praise does not seem calculated to rouse the emotions of the listening audience in the same way that we have seen in *Nem.* 5 and *Isth.* 6, especially considering the wave of sentiment that has been summoned and whose force has been spent in the lines preceding the praise for the family. Though the laudator emphasises the difference between mortals and Zeus in lines 12–16 (going on to emphasise the difference again in lines 46–53), the patrons are not used to delight the god through their achievements as we have seen in *Isth.* 6, *Nem.* 5 and *Pyth.* 6.

I have argued that the Aeginetan odes under consideration here display a concern on the laudator's part to assimilate the glory of individuals to the glory of the community. I have proposed that this concern reflects the fact that at Aegina no single family was socially dominant, and that vaunting status was socially unacceptable. It is possible that, in the face of a third victory in the same family, the scope for praising individuals under the cover of praising the community was thought insufficient to stave off the perception of encroaching social dominance. It may, on the other hand, be that the victory at Salamis was felt to be of such significance that the use of the previous tactic of construing it within the context of a prayer for further glories for a single family would have been unacceptable to the listeners.

I am inclined to believe that both explanations are valid. Previously I have examined how the memorialisation of the sailors at Salamis was a sophisticated move on the part of a laudator seeking to serve his clients. Though it presented the listeners with a more appealing focus of wonder and attention than the victors and their family, memorialisation created a public 'monument,' to which the family of Lampon was forever attached, and which acted as a vehicle for the perpetuation of their own fame and glory. It was, in other words, a performative tactic that could potentially have paid social dividends— though only if handled very carefully. Given the appeal of using the battle in the ode, then, and if indeed the sentiments of the community would have been hostile to its use in the context of a prayer for future glory for the family, then a more 'discreet' role for the family is understandable. It would be practically impossible to rouse emotions that could bear comparison with those evoked by the recollection of Salamis, and it is the latter that comprise the expression of Zeus' continuing favour for Aegina, which is cast over the community in the minds of the

listeners and at the moment of the performance itself. In *Isth.* 5's appeal to the gods, it is the community that takes centre stage, with the laudator relying on the very same principles of relived memories and re-invoked sentiments as in the previous performances. Though here the praise for the victorious family is less central to this experience of communion, they are, as I have shown, just as much the beneficiaries of it.

## CONCLUSION

I have examined how the performances of Pindar's victory odes prompted the audience, including the victors, their family, the listening community and the gods, to imagine glory and how, in so doing, they imagined their relationships with each other. I have compared how this was done in the Akragantine and Aeginetan odes, and the implications this had for the relationships amongst the mortal parties and between the latter and the gods. In my analysis in the first section of the thesis, 'Imagining Glory,' I conclude that at Aegina the listening community is portrayed as drawing a greater glory from victory than the athletes or their family, whilst at Akragas the glory of the family and the patron is substantially greater than that of the listening community (and this appears to be the case even at *Isth. 2*'s debut).

When considered in the context of how the laudator encouraged the audience to imagine the divine, however, these differences are less stark than they initially appear. In both sets of odes the laudator makes explicit the dependency of mortals on the goodwill of the gods, and in both cases uses the performance to court it. The means by which this is done is through appealing to the gods, seeking their continued favour. Both in the Akragantine and in the Aeginetan odes the means by which this is achieved is exactly the same: by engendering what I have called 'communion' between the mortal parties and the divine.<sup>251</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> See Hobden (2011: 37–57), who explores how “the conversations of the symposion – the singing of songs and the reading of images on drinking vessels – facilitated the conceptualization and experiencing of the symposion by participants as a religious event, where religion is defined particularly as an experiential communion with the divine.”

In order to perceive the dynamics of communion, I have proposed that we must be prepared to understand certain passages in the odes both as accounts of ‘historical’ events from the mythical past and as ‘reperformances’ of those events.<sup>252</sup> In the former capacity scenes such as Herakles’ prayer to Zeus in *Isth.* 6 and the portrayal of the sailors at Salamis in *Isth.* 5, for example, are valuable for the metaphorical qualities that they have as images. This is because, to an extent, the ancient audiences themselves would have treated them as such. In this regard I have discussed how the listeners would have associated Herakles’ prayer for a son with the sons of Lampon; how the depictions of the arrows at Salamis represented Zeus’ power over mortal life and glory, and more generally how such motifs guided the listeners’ responses to the rest of the performance. Such imagery, however, is at least as important in its capacity as a reperformance of those events. For it is through the experience of emotion and sentiment, which such accounts were intended to stimulate, that the case for the god’s future favour was made. It was, I have argued, through mentally reliving the experiences of divine honour that the special relationship between the mortal parties and the god (which at both Akragas and Aegina was assumed already to be in place, and which was the basis of the covenant) was consolidated. Through this reading I have proposed that by extending our perception of what constitutes reperformance beyond the fact of recital, and allowing it to encompass the assumptions and expectations of the ancient listeners at any individual performance, we open up fascinating possibilities for understanding the social utilities of the odes.

---

<sup>252</sup> ‘Historical’ from the perspective of the ancient audience, for whom the myths were accounts of real people and events (even if poets and artists had a wide remit to construe them to suit purpose and occasion).

As we have seen, the relationship between the ruling family and the community at Akragas changed significantly between the debuts of *Pyth.* 6 and *Isth.* 2. At Aegina, on the other hand, the relationship between Lampon's glorious family and the community is relatively stable across all three odes. True, *Isth.* 5 appears to rely less on the victories of Pytheas and Phylakidas in order to generate a sense of communion with the gods, and appears to broaden the appeal of the ode beyond the elite listeners (with the laudator relying on an account of Achilles and the heroic Aeginetan sailors). I have argued, however, that the circumstances that account for this difference are likely to be the fact of a third victory performance itself and the huge significance of Salamis, and that even though Achilles and the sailors take centre stage, the communion that this imagery generates between the listeners and Zeus would have consolidated a special relationship between the two from which the victorious family themselves would have benefited enormously. At *both* Akragas and Aegina, however, it is through appealing to the emotions and sentiments of the audience, through moving them in a collective recollection of recent and ancient deeds, that the appeal to the gods is made and through which divine favour is re-experienced and reasonably hoped for again. In essence, imagining the divine was an act that, if it were to have any significance for the parties involved in the performance, had to be collective, even if the significance for each party, and indeed each community, was different.

What does this mean for our understanding of epinician? In this thesis I have only examined a small selection of odes, though the approach I have developed here for examining the relationships that they mediated amongst the human participants and between the latter and the gods could readily be applied to the other odes of

Pindar (or Bacchylides). Through my study I hope to have shown that by focusing on how the listeners imagined glory, and thereby imagined the divine, the social utility of the odes and their ability to accommodate divergent social norms is significant and highly complex. In doing so I hope to have demonstrated the status of the odes as important pieces of evidence about the social history of Greece outside Athens.

## SAMENVATTING

Dit proefschrift vergelijkt twee gemeenschappen uit de vijfde eeuw voor Christus: Akragas, dat werd geregeerd door een erfelijke dynastie, en Aegina, dat gedomineerd werd door een klasse van toonaangevende families. In deze analyse van een selectie uit de overwinningsoeden (*epinikia*) van Pindarus, geschreven voor opdrachtgevers uit deze gemeenschappen, onderzoek ik hoe de uitvoering (performance) van deze oden recht wist te doen aan de behoeften van zeer verschillende opdrachtgevers en doelgroepen. Deze analyse verheldert de maatschappelijke betekenis van de *epinikia*, zowel van de afzonderlijke uitvoeringen van deze oden als van het genre als geheel.

De oden waarop ik mij hier richt vallen in twee groepen uiteen: *Pyth.* 6 en *Isth.* 2 voor Akragas en *Nem.* 7, *Isth.* 6 en *Isth.* 5 voor Aegina. Ik heb deze groepen gekozen omdat elk gecomponeerd is voor één enkele, voorname familie: de Emmenidai in Akragas en de Psalychiadai op Aegina. Ik vergelijk de oden zowel binnen hun groep als met die van de andere groep. Daarnaast onderzoek ik passages uit *Nem.* 7, voor Sogenes van Aegina, en *Ol.* 7, voor Diagoras van Rhodos. Het doel van deze studie is niet om conclusies te trekken over de politieke of maatschappelijke oriëntatie van Akragas en Aegina maar vooral om te zien welke mentale en emotionele omstandigheden het mogelijk maakten de sympathie van een gemeenschap te mobiliseren ten gunste van een excellerend individu en zijn familie. Het is mijn bedoeling om met een genuanceerde analyse één aspect te belichten van het besef tot een gemeenschap te behoren en te zien hoe de uitvoering van *epinikia* dit besef kon bevorderen.

Wie waren dan de luisteraars? We kunnen gevoelig aannemen dat, behalve de opdrachtgever (die zeer zeker een luisteraar was) en zijn familie (die dat zeer waarschijnlijk was), de luisteraars bestonden uit een groep gelijken van de opdrachtgever, van wie hij zich bij uitstek wilde onderscheiden, en voorts wellicht een veel breder, meer sociaal gevarieerd publiek. Het is vooral op deze gelijken dat ik de aandacht wil richten in dit proefschrift. Deze leden van de aristocratische klasse, waartoe de opdrachtgever en zijn familie behoorden, noem ik de 'luisterende gemeenschap.'

De andere groep luisteraars, en wel de belangrijkste vanuit het perspectief van de antiek-Griekse kosmologie, waren de goden. Ze zijn alomtegenwoordig personages in Pindarus' oden, en recent groeit de belangstelling voor de religieuze betekenis van de uitvoering van deze poëzie. Het wetenschappelijk onderzoek richt zich nu op de maatschappelijke betekenis van de oden door te kijken naar de religieuze ervaringen die zij opriepen en bestendigden. Ik beschouw dit als een van de belangrijkste ontwikkelingen in de studies van Pindarus' oeuvre en besteed dan ook veel aandacht aan de religieuze aspecten van de oden. Recente studies, met name van Josine Blok, laten zien dat antiek-Griekse opvattingen van maatschappelijke waarde zich altijd binnen een religieus conceptueel kader bewegen. Hier wil ik onderzoeken hoe de laudator vorm en plaats wist te geven aan de roem van de overwinnaar en zijn familie door de luisteraars te bewegen zich de goddelijke macht voor te stellen.

In het eerste deel van het proefschrift onderzoek ik de vijf belangrijkste oden *Pyth. 6, Isth. 2, Nem. 5, Isth. 6* en *Isth. 5*, plus *Nem. 7*, om te traceren hoe de laudator

roem behandelt als een *extrinsieke* kwaliteit en deze mobiliseert in de gedachten van de luisterende gemeenschap, om zo te bemiddelen in de relaties tussen de opdrachtgever, zijn familie en zijn gelijken. In het tweede deel zie ik opnieuw de belangrijkste vijf oden plus *Ol. 7* om de *intrinsieke* aspecten van deze roem in kaart te brengen. Hier gaat het erom te begrijpen hoe de luisteraars, met inbegrip van de opdrachtgever, zijn familie en zijn gelijken, werd gevraagd hun gedachten te richten op de goddelijke macht en zich daartoe te verhouden. Daarbij stel ik de vraag welke gevolgen dit proces had voor de relaties tussen de sterfelijke partijen en de goden.

In mijn analyse in het eerste deel van het proefschrift, 'Imagining Glory,' concludeer ik dat op Aegina de luisterende gemeenschap wordt afgeschilderd als degenen die meer roem aan de overwinning ontleen dan de atleten of hun familie zelf, terwijl op Akragas de roem van de familie en de opdrachtgever aanzienlijk groter is dan die van de luisterende gemeenschap (en dit blijkt zelfs het geval zijn bij het debuut van *Isth. 2*).

Wanneer we echter bezien hoe de laudator het publiek stimuleerde zich de goddelijke macht voor te stellen, blijken deze verschillen minder groot te zijn dan ze in eerste instantie leken. In beide groepen oden maakt de laudator onmiskenbaar duidelijk dat de stervelingen afhankelijk zijn van de welwillendheid van de goden, en in beide gebruikt hij de uitvoering van de oden om deze welwillendheid op te roepen. De wijze waarop dit gebeurt is door een beroep te doen op de goden, te vragen om hun voortdurende gunst. Zowel in de Akragantijnse als in de Aeginetische oden is de manier waarop dit wordt bereikt precies dezelfde: door tot stand te brengen wat ik 'communie' noem tussen de sterfelijke partijen en de goddelijke macht.

Om de dynamiek van de communie waar te nemen, moeten we m.i. bereid zijn om bepaalde passages in de oden te begrijpen als zowel een vertelling van 'historische' gebeurtenissen uit het mythische verleden, als een hernieuwde realisatie en presentatie ('reperformance') van die gebeurtenissen. In de eerstgenoemde hoedanigheid zijn scènes zoals bijvoorbeeld het gebed van Herakles tot Zeus in *Isth.* 6 en de uitbeelding van de matrozen bij Salamis in *Isth.* 5 waardevol vanwege hun metaforische kwaliteit als beelden. Immers, tot op zekere hoogte ging het antieke publiek zelf zo met deze beelden om. In dit verband bespreek ik hoe de luisteraars het gebed van Herakles om een zoon in verband zouden hebben gebracht met de zonen van Lampon, hoe het beeld van de pijlen bij Salamis de macht van Zeus over het sterfelijk leven en de roem voorstelde, en meer in het algemeen hoe deze motieven de reacties van de luisteraars op de rest van de uitvoering in bepaalde banen leidden. Deze beelden zijn echter minstens zo belangrijk in hun hoedanigheid van hernieuwde realisatie en presentatie van de vertelde gebeurtenissen. Want het was door de ervaring van emotie en inleving, die deze vertellingen wilden stimuleren, dat de gunst van de godheid ook in de toekomst zou worden waargemaakt. Juist in de mentale herbeleving van de ervaring van de goddelijke gunst werd de bijzondere relatie geconsolideerd tussen de sterfelijke partijen en de goddelijke macht, die zowel in Akragas als op Aegina geacht werd al te bestaan en die het verbond tussen mensen en goden uitmaakte. Met deze interpretatie wil ik de gangbare opvatting van wat heruitvoering is uitbreiden tot voorbij de feitelijke uitvoering zelf. Als we in onze opvatting ook de veronderstellingen en verwachtingen opnemen die onder de antieke luisteraars bij elke individuele uitvoering leefden, openen we fascinerende mogelijkheden om de sociale functies van de oden te begrijpen.

De relatie tussen de regerende familie en de gemeenschap in Akragas veranderde significant tussen de debuten van *Pyth.* 6 en *Isth.* 2. Op Aegina, anderzijds, is de relatie tussen roemrijke familie van Lampon en de gemeenschap relatief stabiel in alle drie de oden. *Isth.* 5 lijkt minder te steunen op de overwinningen van Pytheas en Phylakidas om een gevoel van communie met de goden teweeg te brengen en lijkt de zeggingskracht van de ode uit te strekken tot een bredere groep luisteraars dan alleen de elite (namelijk wanneer de laudator een beroep doet op een verhaal over Achilles en de heldhaftige Aeginetische matrozen). Mijns inziens is dit verschil toe te schrijven aan omstandigheden, te weten waarschijnlijk het feit van een derde overwinningsuitvoering en de enorme betekenis van Salamis. Ook al staan Achilles en de matrozen centraal in deze passage, het lijkt erop dat de communie, die in deze beeldspraak tot stand komt tussen de luisteraars en Zeus, een bijzondere relatie tussen deze twee partijen consolideerde, waarvan de roemrijke familie zelf enorm kon profiteren. Zowel in Akragas als op Aegina is het echter door een beroep te doen op de emoties en de inleving van het publiek, door een collectieve herinnering in gedachten te roepen van daden in heden en verleden, dat een beroep op de goden wordt gedaan, dat de goddelijke gunst opnieuw wordt ervaren en dat redelijkerwijs de hoop mag leven deze opnieuw te verwerven. Wilde dit enige betekenis hebben voor de partijen die betrokken waren bij de uitvoering, dan was het essentieel dat de voorstelling van de goddelijke macht *collectief* was, ook al was deze betekenis voor elke specifieke partij en evenzeer voor elke specifieke gemeenschap verschillend.

Wat betekent dit voor ons begrip van de *epinikia* in bredere zin? In dit proefschrift heb ik alleen een kleine selectie van oden onderzocht, al kan de

benadering die ik hier heb ontwikkeld om te begrijpen hoe de oden de relaties bemiddelden tussen de menselijke betrokkenen en tussen dezen en de goden, gemakkelijk worden toegepast op de andere oden van Pindarus (of Bacchylides). In deze studie laat ik zien dat als we onze aandacht richten op de manier waarop de luisteraars zich roem en daarmee de goddelijke macht voorstelden, de sociale functie van de oden en hun vermogen om vorm te geven aan uiteenlopende sociale normen, van groot belang en zeer complex zijn. Hiermee wil ik de betekenis van de oden laten zien als belangrijk bewijsmateriaal voor de sociale geschiedenis van Griekenland buiten Athene.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- D'Alessio, G. B. 1994. "First Person Problems in Pindar," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 39, 117–139  
———2004. "Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Archaic Greek Lyric," *Arethusa* 37, 267–294
- Athanassaki, L. 2004. "Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's First Olympian Ode," *Arethusa* 37, 317–341  
———2011. "Pindar's *Seventh Pythian*, the Alcmaeonid Temple, and the Politics of Performance," in *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination*. Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (eds.) (Berlin: De Gruyter), 235–269  
———2011. "Giving Wings to the Aeginetan Sculptures: The Panhellenic Aspirations of Pindar's Eighth Olympian," in *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC*. Fearn, D. (ed.) (Oxford), 257–293
- Aubriot-Sevin, D. 1992. *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne*. (Lyon)
- Ausfeld, K. 1903. "De Graecorum precationibus quaestiones," *Jahrbuch für classische Philologie Suppl.* 28, 502–547
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford)
- Bakker, E. 1993. "Noun-Epithet Formulas, Milman Parry, and the Grammar of Poetry," in *Homeric Questions*, Crielaard, J. P. (ed.) (Amsterdam), 97–125  
———1997. "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," in Bakker, E. (ed.) *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek literature in its linguistic contexts* (Brill), 7–54
- Bernardini, P. A. 1983. *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindar* (Rome)  
———1985. "L'attualità agonistica negli epinici di Pindaro," in *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt. Entretiens 31 Geneva. 117–149
- Bing, P. 1993. "Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123, 181–198
- Blok, J.H. 2011. "Hosiê and Athenian law from Solon to Lykourgos," in Azoulay, V. and Ismard, P. (ed.) *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique*. (Paris), 233–54.  
———2012. "Citizenship, the Citizen Body and its Assemblies," in Beck, H. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government* (Malden/Oxford). In press  
———2013. "A covenant between gods and men: hiera kai hosiâ and the Greek polis," in Rapp, C. and Drake, H. (eds.) *The Transformation of City and Citizenship in the Classical and Post-Classical World: from the fifth century BCE to the fifth century CE*. (Cambridge/ New York)

- Boeke, H. 2007. *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes: Gnomai, Cosmology and the Role of the Poet* (Brill)
- Bonifazi, A. 2004a. "Keinos in Pindar: Between Grammar and Poetic Intention," *Classical Philology* 99, 283–99
- 2004b. "Relative Pronouns and Memory: Pindar beyond Syntax," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 102, 41–68
- Bremer, J. M. 1981. "Greek Hymns," in Versnel, H. S. (ed.) *Faith Hope and Worship* (Brill), 193–216
- 1998. "The Reciprocity of Giving and Thanksgiving in Greek Worship," in Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N. and Seaford, R. (eds.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford), 127–38.
- 2006. "Traces of the Hymn in the epinikion," *Mnemosyne* 61, 1–17
- Brown, C. 1984. "The Bridegroom and the Athlete: The Proem to Pindar's Seventh Olympian," in Gerber, D. E. (ed.) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury* (Chicago), 34–50
- Bowra, C. M. 1964. *Pindar* (Oxford)
- Bulman, P. 1992. *Phthonos in Pindar* (L.A./Berkley)
- Bundy, E. 1987 *Studia Pindarica* (Berkley)
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion* (Harvard)
- 2001. "The Logic of Cosmogony" in R. Buxton (ed.) *From Myth to Reason: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford), 87–106
- Burnett, A. P. 2005. *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford)
- Burton, R. W. B. 1962. *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford)
- Bury, J. B. 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London)
- 1892. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London)
- Calame, C. 2011. "Enunciative fiction and poetic performance. Choral voices in Bacchylides' epinicians," in Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (eds.) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* (Berlin: De Gruyter)
- Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8* (New York)
- 1989a. "Two Transitions in Pindar," *The Classical Quarterly* 39, 287–295
- 1989b. "The Performance of the Victory Ode," *The American Journal of Philology* 110: 545–65.
- 1991. "The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus," *Classical Philology* 86, 192–200
- 1993. "Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode," in Jocelyn, H. (ed.) *Tria Lustra* (Liverpool), 97–107

- 2007. “Pindar, Place and Performance,” in Hornblower, S. and Morgan C. (eds.) *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford) 199–210
- Carnes, J. 1996. “The Ends of the Earth,” *Arethusa* 29: 15–55
- Clay, J. S. 1999. “Pindar's Sympotic "Epinicia",” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 62, 25-34
- 2006. *The Politics of Olympus; Form and Meaning in the major Homeric Hymns*. (Bristol)
- Cole, T. 1987. “1 + 1 = 3. Studies in Pindar’s Arithmetic,” *American Journal of Philosophy* 108, 553–568
- 1992. *Pindar’s Feasts and the Music of Power* (Rome)
- Currie, B. 2004. “Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar’s Odes,” in Mackie C. J. (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden), 49–69
- 2005. *Pindar and The Cult of Heroes* (Oxford)
- Day, J. W. 1989. “Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, 16–28
- 1994. “Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96, 37–74
- 2000. “Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual,” in Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (eds.) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*, eds. (Cambridge, Mass.), 37–57
- Depew, M. 1997. “Reading Greek Prayers,” *Classical Antiquity* 16, 229–258
- Dietrich, B. C. 1965. *Death, Fate, and the Gods: The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular Belief and in Homer* (London)
- Dissen, L. 1830. *Pindari carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis* (Gotha)
- Eitrem, S. 1953. “The Pindaric Phthonos,” in Mylonas, G. E. and Raymond, D. (eds.) *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday, II*, (St. Louis)
- Farnell, L. R. 1930–2. *The Works of Pindar*, vols. i–iii (London)
- Fearn, D. 2007. *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford)
- 2011. “Aeginetan Epinician Culture: Naming, Ritual, and Politics,” in Fearn, D. (ed.) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC*. (Oxford), 175–226
- Felson, N. 1999. “Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's Pythian Four,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99, 1–31
- 2004. “The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar’s Ninth Pythian Ode,” *Arethusa* 37, 365–389

- Figueira, T. J. 1981. *Aegina, society and politics* (University of California)
- Finley, J. 1955. *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Fowler, D. 2000. "The Didactic Plot," in Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (eds.) *Matrices of Genre; Authors, Cannons and Society* (Cambridge Mass.), 205–19
- François, G. 1957. *Le polytheisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots θεός, δαίμων dans la littérature grecque d'Homère a Platon* (Paris)
- Froidefond, C. 1989. *Lire Pindare* (Namur)
- Gaertner, H. A. 1978. "Die Siegeslieder Pindars für die Söhne des Lampon," *Würzburger Jhb. Für die Altertumswissenschaft* 4:27–46
- Gaisser, J. H. 1974. "Noun-Epithet Combinations in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 104, 113–137
- Gelzer, T. 1985. "Mousa Authigenes: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien," *Museum Helveticum* 42, 95–120
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, tr. Cole, A.T. (Balitmore)
- Georgoudi, S. 1998. "Sacrifices dans le monde grec: de la cité aux particuliers: quelques remarques," *Ktèma* 23, 325-334
- Gerber, D. E. 1963. "Pindar, Nemean, 7, 31," *The American Journal of Philology* 84, 182-188
- 1999. "Pindar, Nemean Six: A Commentary," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99, 33-91
- Goldhill, S. 1999. "Programme notes," in Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (eds.) *Performance culture and Athenian democracy* (Cambridge), 1–29
- Grethlein, J. 2011. "Divine, Human and Poetic Time in Pindar, Pythian 9," *Mnemosyne* 64, 383-409
- Griffith, M. (2009). "Greek lyric and the place of humans in the world," in Budelmann, F. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge), 72–94
- Griffith, R. D. 1993. "In the Dark Backward: Time in Pindaric Narrative," *Poetics Today* 14, 607-623
- Hall, J. 1995. "How Argive Was the "Argive" Heraion: The Cultic and Political Geography of the Argive Plain, 900–400 B.C.," *American Journal of Archaeology* 99, 577–613
- Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion* (The Hague)

- Harrell, S. 2002. "King or Private Citizen: Fifth-Century Sicilian Tyrants at Olympia and Delphi," *Mnemosyne* 55, 439–464.
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, M. 1991. "Epinician Performance," *Classical Philology* 86, 173-91.
- Hedreen, G. 2011. "The Trojan War, Theoxenia, and Aegina in Pindar's Paeon 6 and the Aphaia Sculptures," in Fearn, D. (ed.) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford), 323–369
- Hobden, F. 2011. "Enter the Divine: Symptotic Performance and Religious Experience," in Blok, J., Lardinois, A. and van der Poel, M. (eds.) *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy, and Religion*, (Leiden), 37–57
- Hornblower, S. 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford)
- Hubbard, T. 2001. "Pindar and Athens after the Persian Wars," in Papenfuss, D. and Strocka, V. (eds.) *Gab es das Griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Mainz), 387–397.
- 2004. "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts," in Mackie C. J. (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden), 71–93
- Indergaard, H. 2011. "Thebes, Aegina, and the Temple of Aphaia: A Reading of Pindar's Isthmian 6," in Fearn, D. (ed.) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford), 294–322
- Janko, R. 1991. "Another path of song: Pindar, Nemean VII 51," *American Journal of Philology* 112, 301-2
- Johnson, B. 1980. *The Critical Difference: Essays in the Contemporary Rhetoric of Reading* (Baltimore)
- Keesling, K. 2003. *Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge)
- Kirkwood, G. M. 1963. "Review of Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*," *Gnomon*, 35. Bd., H. 2 (Apr.), 130-133
- 1982. *Selections From Pindar* (Chico, California)
- 1984. "Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician," in Gerber, D. (ed.) *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, (Chico, California), 169–183.
- Kirsten, E. 1942. "Reviews of G. Welter, *Aigina* and H. Winterscheidt, *Aigina*," *Gnomon* 18, 289–311
- Kowalzig, B. 2006. "The Aetiology of Empire? Hero-cult and Athenian Tragedy," in Davidson, J., Muecke, F. and Wilson P. (eds.) *Greek Drama III. Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies supplement* 87 (London), 79-98

- 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford)
- Kron, U. 1976. *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen* (Berlin)
- Krummen, E. 1990. *Pyros Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition bei Pindar* (Berlin)
- Kurke, L. 1990. "Pindar's Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120, 85–107
- 1991a. *The Traffic in Praise* (Ithaca: Cornell)
- 1991b. "Fathers and Sons: A Note on Pindaric Ambiguity," *The American Journal of Philology* 112, 287–300
- 1993. "The Economy of *Kudos*," in Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge), 131–168.
- Lardinois, A. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of Gnomai in Homer's Iliad," *Classical Philology* 92, 213–34
- 2001. "The Wisdom and Wit of Many: The Orality of Greek Proverbial Expressions," in Watson, J. (ed.) *Speaking volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Brill), 93–109
- Lasserre, F. 1974. "Ornements érotiques dans la poésie lyrique archaïque," in Heller, J. L. (ed.) *Serta Turyniana: Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in honor of Alexander Turyn* (Urbana), 5–33
- Lazzarini, M. L. 1989–90. "Iscrizioni votive greche," *Scienze dell'Antichità* 3–4, 845–59
- Lee, H. M. 1978. "The 'Historical' Bundy and Encomiastic Relevance in Pindar," *The Classical World* 72, 65–70
- Lesky, A. 1961. *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos* (Heidelberg)
- Mackie, H. 2003. *Graceful Errors. Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Michigan)
- Martin, R. P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca)
- 2003. "The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualising Musical Performance in Athens," in Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture; Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, (Harvard), 153–80.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1989. "Unanswered Prayers in Greek Tragedy," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, 81–98
- Miller, A. 1983. "N.4.33–43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *The Classical Journal* 78, 202–220

- Mills, M. J. 1985. “ΦΘΟΝΟΣ and Its Related ΠΑΘΗ in Plato and Aristotle,” *Phronesis* 30, 1–12
- Morrison, A. 2007. *Performances & Audiences in Pindar’s Sicilian Victory Odes* (London)
- 2011. “Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality,” in Fearn, D. (ed.) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford), 227–253
- Most, G. 1985. *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar’s Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Göttingen)
- Mucke, H. and Meeus, J. 1983. *Canon of Solar Eclipses*. (Vienna)
- Mühlh, P. Von der, 1957. “Bemerkungen zu Pindars Nemeen und Isthmien,” *Museum Helveticum* 14, 127–132
- 1964. “Weitere pindarische Notizen,” *Museum Helveticum* 21, 168–72
- Nagy, G. 1989. “The “Professional Muse” and Models of Prestige in Ancient Greece,” *Cultural Critique* 12, 133–143
- 1990. *Pindar’s Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore)
- Neer, R. T. 2001. “Framing the Gift: The Politics of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi,” *Classical Antiquity* 20, 273–336
- Nicholson, N. J. 2005. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge)
- Nisetich, F. J. 1977. “Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian 2*,” *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10, 133–156
- 1980. *Pindar’s Victory Songs* (Baltimore)
- Oakley, J. H. 2004. *Picturing Death in Classical Athens. The Evidence of the White Lekythoi* (Cambridge)
- Osborne, R. G. 1993. “Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece,” *The Classical Quarterly* 43, 392–405
- 1994. “Archaeology, the Salaminioi and the Politics of Sacred Space in Archaic Attica,” in Alcock, S. E. and Osborne, R. G. (eds.) *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford), 143–60
- Parker, R. C. T. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford)
- 1998. “Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion,” in Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N. and Seaford, R. (eds.) *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford), 105–125
- 2005. *Polytheism and society at Athens* (Oxford)

- Pavlou, M. 2008. "Review of Burnett, *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*," *Mnemosyne* 61, 306-309
- 2011. "Past and Present in Pindar's Religious Poetry," in Lardinois, A.P.M.H., Blok, J.H. and van der Poel, M.G.M. *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy, and Religion* (Brill), 59–78
- Payne, M. 2006. "On Being Vatic: Pindar, Pragmatism, and Historicism," *American Journal of Philology* 127, 159-184
- Peron, J. 1974. *Les Images maritimes de Pindare* (Paris)
- Pfeijffer, I. 1995. "The date of Pindar's *fifth Nemean* and Bacchylides' *thirteenth ode*," *The Classical Quarterly* 45, 318-332
- 1999. *Three Aeginitan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII* (Leiden)
- de Polignac, F. 1984. *La Naissance de la cité grecque* (Paris: Decouverte)
- Privitera, G. A. 1982. *Pindaro. Le Isthmiche* (Milan)
- Pulleyn, S. 1997. *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford)
- Race, W. H. 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta Ga.)
- 1997. *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes, Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*, 2 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Raiga, E. 1932. *L'Envie* (Paris)
- Reden, S. von, 1995. "Deceptive Readings: Poetry and Its Value Reconsidered," *The Classical Quarterly*, 30–50
- Rose, P. W. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. (Ithaca: Cornell)
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford)
- Sandys, J. E. 1919, *The Odes of Pindar*, (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Scodel, R. 2006. "Aetiology, Autochthony, and Athenian Identity in *Ajax* and *Oedipus Coloneus*," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 49, 65–78
- Segal, E. M. 1995. "Narrative Comprehension and the Role of Deictic Shift Theory," in Duchan, J. F., Bruder, G. A. and Hewitt, L. E. (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective* (Hillsdale, NJ), 3–17.
- Shapiro, H. 1989. *Art and Cult Under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein)
- Silk, M. 1998. "Pindar's Poetry and the Obligatory Crux: *Isthmian* 5, 56-63, Text and Interpretation," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 128, 26-88

- Slater, W. (ed.) 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin: De Gruyter)
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990. "What is *Polis* religion?" in Murray, O. and Price, S.(eds.) *The Greek city. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford), 295-322
- Stafford, E. "Themis: Religion and Order in the Archaic Polis" in Mitchell, L. G. and Rhodes, P. J. (eds.) *The development of the polis in archaic Greece* (London), 158–167.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London)  
 ————— 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London)
- Stern, J. 1971. "The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean 5*," *Classical Philology* 66, 169–173
- Straten, F. T. van, 1981. "Gifts for the Gods," in Versnel, H. S. (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden), 65–104
- Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, J. Lloyd (trans.) (Ithaca and London)
- Thummer, E. 1968–9. *Pindar: die isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg)
- Turner, V. W. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London)
- Vamvouri Ruffy, M. 2004. *La Fabrique du Divin*. (Liège)
- Verdenius, W. J. 1972, *Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode: A Commentary* (Amsterdam)  
 ————— 1982. "Pindar's Second Isthmian Ode: A Commentary," *Mnemosyne* 35, 1–37
- Versnel, H. S. 1981. "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer," in Versnel, H. S. (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden), 1–64
- Walsh, G. B. 1984. *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views on the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina and London)
- Watrous, L. V. 1982. "The Sculptural Program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi," *American Journal of Archaeology* 86, 159-172
- Whitley, J. 1994. "The Monuments That Stood Before Marathon: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Archaic Attica," *American Journal of Archaeology* 92, 213–230
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1922. *Pindaros* (Berlin)
- Young, D. C. 1968. *Three Odes of Pindar*. *Mnemosyne Supplement* 9. (Leiden)

Zaidman, L. B. and Schmitt Pantel, P. 1992. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* Paul Cartledge (transl.) (Cambridge)

Zunker, A. 1988. *Untersuchungen zur Aiakidensage auf Aigina* (St Ottilien: EOS-Verlag)

## CURRICULUM VITAE

Robert Clear holds a bachelor's degree in Ancient History from King's College London (2006) and a master's degree from the University of Cambridge (2007). His MPhil thesis is entitled *Gods, Poet and Reader on the Shield of Achilles*, and is an analysis of the shield scene in Book 18 of the *Iliad*. He began his PhD project at Utrecht in September 2008, and has an article forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*, entitled *Family, Duty and Expectation: A Case for the Joint Performance of Pindar's Isthmian 2 and Pythian 6*. He lives in London.