“Boasting for Thebes”:
A Thebanocentric Reading of Pindar’s Fourth *Pythian* Ode

By

Connor Brooks Jennings
B.A, Hood College, 2015

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Classics and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chair: Dr. Craig Jendza

_____

Dr. Paul Touyz

_____

Dr. Emma Scioli

Date Defended: 27 April 2021

The thesis committee for Connor Brooks Jennings certifies that this
is the approved version of the following thesis:

“Boasting for Thebes”:
A Thebanocentric Reading of Pindar’s Fourth *Pythian* Ode

Chair: Dr. Craig Jendza

Date Approved: 07 May 2021

Abstract:

Over the last three decades, the salience of the ancient Greek poet Pindar's Theban identity and its role in his poetics has found greater awareness among critics. Nevertheless, such discussions of Pindar's "Thebanicity" have largely been focused on the poems that were performed at Thebes or were limited to his use of Theban myth. This thesis examines the role of Thebes in Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* ode and, in so doing, shows that Pindar's Theban poetics are not limited to his Theban poetry or mythic narratives. As an ode performed at Kyrēnē, *Pythian* 4 provides an excellent opportunity to examine the city's significance in Pindar's songworld, especially due to the unusual historical circumstances of the ode's composition, in which Thebes plays a role. In *Pythian* 4, Pindar employs Thebes and Theban myth to realize his chief poetic objectives: repatriating the exile Damophilos and ending the threat of *stasis* at Kyrēnē. By drawing on an idealized mythopoetic Thebes, Pindar rehabilitates Damophilos in the eyes of Arkesilas, the king of Kyrēnē and the honoree of the poem, and promotes himself as a wise poetic advisor, allowing him to better assist the king in healing the rifts in the city. On the other hand, the poet exploits Theban mythohistorical ties with Kyrēnē to draw a series of exemplary parallels that serve as a warning to the king. These mythic connections allow Pindar to advance Thebes as Kyrēnē's ultimate *metropolis*, which both heightens Theban prestige and enhances Pindar's status as a consultatory figure. Accordingly, this thesis establishes that Thebanicity is an important structural motif within *Pythian* 4 and serves as the primary means by which Pindar achieves his poetic goals.

Table of Contents:

I. Introduction

Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* ode has always presented somewhat of a puzzle to critics. It is by far the most elaborate of his victory odes, encompassing both broad swathes of space and time and a wide array of themes. Scholars have long noted the marked epic tenor of *Pythian* 4, marveled at the unparalleled grandiosity of its mythic narrative, and attempted to reconstruct the unique circumstances of its commission.[1] More recent treatments of the ode highlight the poet's uncharacteristic chronological–genealogical precision, intricate spatial and temporal deixis, and distinctive use of metaleptic embedded speech.[2] Contemporary scholarship, however, has largely neglected or misunderstood the ode's Thebanness, or "Thebanicity" ("*tebanicità*") to use an expression coined by Oretta Olivieri.[3] By this, I mean the significance of Thebes and Theban figures in the immediate historical events leading to the production of the ode, its mythic background, and the parable of Oidipous in its epilogue.

It is my contention that examining *Pythian* 4 through the lens of Thebanicity, facilitated by the use of relevant comparanda from Pindar, the scholia, Herodotos, and other ancient sources, offers a substantial contribution to our understanding of the ode. It is apparent from this Theban reading that Pindar leverages Thebes and its connections to further his didactic-protreptic aims, which are broader and more sophisticated than has been previously recognized. By thus providing counsel to the victor Arkesilas, the hereditary ruler of Kyrēnē, the poet hopes to realize *Pythian* 4's unique poetological concerns: the repatriation of the Kyrēnaian exile Damophilos and the restoration of civic harmony at Kyrēnē.

---

[1] On the epicizing features of *Pythian* 4, see Gildersleeve (1885): 280-81; Darcus (1977); Braswell (1988): 26-28; Longley-Cook (1989): 130-58; Maslov (2015): 80. For the historic context of its commission, see below.
[2] Chronology and genealogy: Suárez de la Torre (2006): 106–09; embedded speech: de Jong (2013): 112-13; Uhlig (2020): 63–97; spatiotemporal deixis: Felson (1999); Calame (2003): 42-51; Sigelman (2016): 111-28.
[3] Olivieri (2004): 55.

Although Pindar employs Thebanicity in pursuit of the same objectives, his approach is bilateral. The first strategy relies on Thebes' rather remarkable position in the circumstances of the ode's production; by capitalizing on this unusual state of affairs, the poet draws meaningful parallels between historical Thebes and an idealized mythopoetic image of the city. Pindar's motivation for juxtaposing this "lyric Thebes", a quintessentially hospitable city that exudes poetic wisdom and embodies aristocratic concord, with its real-world counterpart, is largely to strengthen his position as an inspired poetic advisor and advance his appeal for Damophilos' return.[4] His promotion of an idealized Thebes, however, is also meant to rehabilitate his city's reputation, tarnished following the Persian Wars.

The poet's other device is to exploit Theban involvement in the mythohistorical traditions of Dorian conquest and colonization that culminate in the settlement of Kyrēnē. An analysis of these subtle intimations, however, necessitates the use of external sources. *Pythian* 5, the complementary ode of *Pythian* 4, and the oral traditions concerning Kyrēnē's foundation in Herodotos are particularly useful for this exercise. To understand Pindar's motivations here, one must recognize that these allusions constitute an act of "kinship diplomacy" extended by the Theban poet to the Kyrēnaian king.[5] In his diplomatic ploy, Pindar draws upon Dorian foundation narratives for exemplary purposes; however, he also makes use of these traditions to situate Thebes at the head of Kyrēnē's colonial genealogy. Pindar's claim of Theban primacy over Kyrēnē has several functions; like the stratagem discussed above, the poet's actions here also serve to enhance Theban prestige. Furthermore, Pindar, by asserting Thebes' leading status vis-à-vis Kyrēnē and referencing the two cities' genealogical ties, heightens his appeal as a wise

[4] Terminology first used by Berman (2015): 49.
[5] Jones (199); Hornblower (2004): 115-119; Patterson (2010).

advisor for the king. As such, the poet is better equipped to dispel civic discord at Kyrēnē and realize Damophilos' return from exile. Accordingly, the significance of Thebes, the vehicle that Pindar employs to achieve his aims, cannot be overstated. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Thebanicity is, in fact, the ode's unifying principle.

II. *Pythian* 4: The Historical Context

Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* ode, was composed—along with its sister ode *Pythian* 5—in honor of the Battiad king Arkesilas IV of Kyrēnē's (victory in the *tethrippon* ("four-horse chariot race" at Delphi in 462/461 BCE.[6] While the latter ode largely conforms to conventional expectations of Pindaric *epinikion*, *Pythian* 4 is exceptional in a number of respects.[7] At thirteen triads and 299 lines, the ode is by far the longest of Pindar's works.[8] Curiously, praise of the king's victory is limited to a mere two verses (2 and 67); similarly exceptional is the length of *Pythian* 4's mythic narrative, a depiction of the Argonautic saga; running 192 lines (70–262), this material comprises the bulk of the ode. Given its length, the myth may be viewed as an epyllion or a "epico-lyric composition" harkening back to Stesikhoran lyric and Homeric epic.[9] Another generic irregularity appears in the epilogue (263–99), which has a distinctly Hesiodic strain; this section contains a remarkable *paraklēsis* ("plea, appeal") on behalf of the Kyrēnaian exile Damophilos.[10]

[6] All dates in this paper are BCE, unless otherwise specified. For an overview of the ode's historical circumstances, see Chamoux (1953): 169-201; Burton (1962): 136-37; B. Mitchell (1966): 108-13; (2000): 93-100; Burnett (2008): 103, 143-60.
[7] Burton (1962): 136-37; Longley-Cook (1988): viii-ix, 196, 209-37.
[8] The ode closest in length to *Pythian* 4 is *Pythian* 9, which comprises five triads; *Hymn* 1, however, seems to have contained six or more triads. On this latter point, see Hardie (2000); D'Alessio (2005c).
[9] Quote taken from Kampakoglou (2019): 351; cf. Instone (1985): 11.
[10] On this point, see Halliwell (2008): 36-69, 123-35; Wells (2009): 67-68 22n; Maslov (2015): 105-116.

Scholars tend to attribute these unusual features to the exceptional circumstances of the ode's composition, namely the popular stasis that resulted in Damophilos' exile.[11] To begin with, *Pythian* 4 is part of a double commission for a single victory; for Pindar, this is unusual but not unheard of.[12] As the Fifth *Pythian* is essentially a conventional *epinikia*, it is likely that the king commissioned it himself (cf. Σ Pi. *P*. 4. inscr. a Drchmn). In the case of *Pythian* 4, a scholiast on l. 263, commenting on the poet's enigmatic parable of the wisdom of Oidipous (τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν, *P*. 4.263), claims that Damophilos solicited the ode from Pindar:

> γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν: προτρέπεται τὸν Ἀρκεσίλαον ὁ Πίνδαρος συνορᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἴνιγμα. **τὸ γὰρ Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν τοῦτο** βούλεται, ὅτι κἀκεῖνος τὸ τῆς Σφιγγὸς αἴνιγμα ἔλυσεν. ὃ δὲ αἰνίττεται, ἔστι τοιοῦτον. ἐστασίασάν τινες ἐν τῇ Κυρήνῃ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀρκεσιλάου, βουλόμενοι αὐτὸν μεταστῆσαι τῆς ἀρχῆς· ὁ δὲ ἐπικρατέστερος αὐτῶν γενόμενος ἐφυγάδευσεν αὐτοὺς τῆς πατρίδος. ἐν τοῖς οὖν στασιώταις ἦν καὶ **ὁ Δημόφιλος, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνάστατος γέγονε τῆς πατρίδος, καὶ φυγαδευθεὶς ἔρχεται εἰς Θήβας καὶ ἀξιοῖ τὸν Πίνδαρον (τινὲς δὲ, ὅτι καὶ τὸν μισθὸν τοῦ ἐπινίκου δίδωσι τῷ Πινδάρῳ αὐτός), ὥστε τῇ τοῦ ἐπινίκου γραφῇ διαλλάξαι αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀρκεσίλαον**. ἦν δὲ **αὐτῷ** καὶ πρὸς γένους (Σ *P*. 4.467 Drchmn).
>
> "Now come to know the wisdom of Oidipous": Pindar urges Arkesilas to understand his *ainigma* ("riddle"). The phrase **"the wisdom of Oidipous"** refers to the fact that he [i.e., Oidipous] solved the *ainigma* of the Sphinx. What Pindar is getting at is as follows. Certain men at Kyrēnē, wishing to alter the government, rose up against Arkesilas. But he proved himself stronger and exiled them. Now, among these insurgents **was Damophilos, who himself was also driven from the country, and since he had been made an exile, he came to Thebes and requested that Pindar (and certain individuals claim that he himself paid Pindar for the ode), by the act of writing the ode reconcile himself with Arkesilas**. He was also related **to him**.[13]

[11] Braswell (1988): 1-5, 23-26.
[12] *O*. 2 and 3 celebrate Therōn the Akragantine tyrant's *tethrippon* victory in 476; *O*. 10 and 11 were also composed in 476 for Hagēsidamos of Epizephyrian Lokri, who won the youth *pyktikē* ("boxing") competition at Olympia.
[13] Cf. Σ Pi. *P*. 4 inscr. a.

Although Damophilos and the other leading conspirators were members of the local aristocracy, a scholion on *Pythian* 5 characterizes their rebellion as demotic (Σ *P*. 5.12a Drchmn).[14] If accurate, this testimony suggests a widespread disaffection with Battiad rule at Kyrēnē and the precariousness of Arkesilas' position as *basileus* ("king"). Moreover, if, as the conventional view holds, the referent of the scholiast's αὐτῷ ("to him") is Arkesilas, the presence of his kinsman amongst the leaders of a popular revolt further indicates the insecurity of his regime.[15] However, αὐτῷ could plausibly refer to Pindar; such a relationship would thus account for Damophilos' sojourn at Thebes and Pindar's role in his repatriation.[16] Another scholiast on the ode (Σ P. 5.34 Drchmn) adds that Karrhōtos, the king's charioteer and relative by marriage, was instructed to recruit from Delphi soldiers to settle at Euesperidas (modern Benghazi). As Euesperidas was frequently at odds with its *mētropolis* ("mother-city") Kyrēnē and the Battiads, this move was likely meant to secure the city for Arkesilas.[17] This influx of mercenaries from the mainland also indicates the general instability of the king's rule. Ironically enough, Arkesilas himself was killed at Euesperidas following his flight from Kyrēnē sometime in the 450's (Σ Pi. *P*. 4 inscr. b; Arist. fr. 611.17 Rose).[18]

For the most part, critics accept the testimony of the scholia regarding the political upheavals at Kyrēnē in the 460's and 450's and their relevance to *Pythians* 4 and 5.[19] The notion that Damophilos, in order to effect his return to Kyrēnē, commissioned *Pythian* 4 as a

[14] B. Mitchell (2000): 96.
[15] E.g., Boeckh (1811-1821): 2.2, 264; Burton (1962): 168; Braswell (1989): 3 7n; Agócs (2020): 133 218n; cf. Gildersleeve (1885): 278; Lattmann (2010): 223.
[16] Wilamowitz (1922): 376 2n; Mitchell (1966): 109 60n; Robbins (2013b): 193 3n.
[17] On the relationship between Euesperidas and Kyrēnē, see *IACP* no. 1026; B. Mitchell (2000): 93-97; Robinson (2011): 130; Austin (2015). For Karrhōtos' affinity to Arkesilas, see Σ Pi. *P.* 5.34 (=Theotimos of Kyrēnē *BNJ* 140 F1); cf. Σ Pi. *P.* 5.33).
[18] B. Mitchell (2000): 95-96; Hornblower (2011): 65; *pace* Chamoux (1953): 206-10.
[19] Currie (2005): 254-55

reconciliatory gift to Arkesilas has also found broad approval among Pindarists.[20] In addition to the scholiastic support, these scholars cite textual evidence of the tumultuous state of affairs at Kyrēnē (*P*. 4.270–76; 5.10–11, 117–121) and Damophilos' commission of *Pythian* 4 as a conciliatory gift for Arkesilas (*P*. 4.298–99).[21] In this respect, Gildersleeve's views remain influential; he conceived of the ode as a "grand peace offering" that, along with the plea it contains, was sanctioned by the king in advance of its performance.[22] The opposing view, however, that the ode constitutes a genuine plea for Damophilos' restoration, continues to be advanced.[23] Another historical quandary relates to the ode's didactic element. Recent scholarship tends to reflect Gildersleeve's rejection of a didactic mode conveyed through situational or thematic parallels between the exiles Iasōn and Damophilos and the kings Pelias and Arkesilas.[24] However, such an analogy is suggested by the precariousness of both kings' rule, a general "similarity of character" between Damophilos and Iasōn, and Pindar's reference to Pelias' death while apostrophizing Arkesilas:[25]

> ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτᾷ, τὰν Πελίαο φόνον (*P*. 4.250).
> O Arkesilas, and he [Iasōn] with her own help stole away Mēdeia, the murderess of Pelias.

The juxtaposition of the ill-fated king with Arkesilas thus serves as a warning to the *laudandus* ("victor") to beware the consequences of an unjust attempt to retain power. Another probable

[20] Stasis at Kyrene: Gildersleeve (1885): 307; Longley-Cook (1989): 173, 176-183; Sobak (2013): 146-49; cf. Burton (1962): 138-39; the ode as a gift: Potamiti (2015): 2-5; Stephens (2011): 191-93; Calame (2003): 46; (2014): 334 14n; Kurke (2013); 128; Agócs (2020): 102ff.
[21] E.g., Farnell (1932): 167; Carey (1980): 143-44; Braswell (1988): 5-6. Neer and Kurke (2019): 350 21n., note that the scholiasts' claims could simply be conjecture.
[22] Gildersleeve (1885): 278; cf. Carey (1980): 148; Braswell (1988): 5-6; Neer and Kurke (2019): 350 21n.
[23] E.g., Wilamowitz (1922): 377-78; Burton (1962): 167-173; Bowra (1964): 137-41; Duchemin (1967): 87ff; Mitchell (1966): 109; Carey (1980); Cole (1992): 124-25 18n; Alley (2019): 72-86, *passim*.
[24] Gildersleeve (1885): 281. E.g., Braswell (1988): 30, 370-72.
[25] Carey (1980): 149.

view holds that Iasōn serves as a positive exemplar for Arkesilas, while Pelias constitutes his negative foil.[26]

III. *Pythian* 4 and Pindar's Thebes

Although Pindarists seeking to contextualize *Pythian* 4 continue to rely on the scholia, they have largely ignored the Theban resonances present in the ode. The scholiast quoted above, for instance, notes the connection between Pindar's citation of Oidipous and his hosting of Damophilos at Thebes. Other scholia suggest a parallel between Thebes and Thēra, Kyrēnē's mother city, that have significant implications for our understanding of the ode's Argonautic material and Pindar's position as a poetic advisor attempting to restore civic harmony at Kyrēnē. Accordingly, this study, a contextualized reading of the Theban allusions in *Pythian* 4, is meant to advance an alternative historicist perspective. By illuminating the position of Pindar's Thebes in *Pythian* 4, I hope also to contribute to the growing awareness of the city's role in Pindaric poetics.

The lack of attention paid to Pindar's identity as a Theban poet is the consequence of the sea change in the field of choral lyric following the publication of Elroy Bundy's *Studia Pindarica* in 1962.[27] The formalist methodology of Bundy and his circle, which prioritized the odes' generic function, praise of the athletic victor (Bundy's "*laudandus*"), quickly superseded the historical–biographical approach, the dominant mode of Pindaric exegesis since antiquity.[28] As a result of this movement, biographical concerns, such as Thebes' significance to Pindar, were considered outmoded.[29] However, the tides of Pindaric scholarship continue to shift; over

[26] E.g., Sandgren (1972): 12-22; Carey (1980): 144-52; Alley (2019): 137-98.
[27] Bundy (19862); cf. Young (1964): 621-622; Heath (1986): 96-98.
[28] Thummer (1968-69): 1.13.
[29] E.g., Gildersleeve (1885); Farnell (1932); Brown (1951); Bowra (1964).

the last thirty-odd years, the field has witnessed the ascendancy of the "anthropological paradigm", a grouping of related methodologies informed by New Historicism and its practice of "cultural poetics", performance studies, and structuralist and semiotic approaches.[30]

Consequently, critics are more and more willing to acknowledge the relevance of the poet's Theban identity for our understanding of Pindaric song. As mentioned above, I employ Olivieri's term "Thebanicity" ("*tebanicità*") to refer to the salience of the odes' Theban features.[31] Her work, a study of the application of Theban heroic narrative and cultic practices in Pindar, is a seminal contribution to the field.[32] Despite this, previous treatments of the poet's Theban chauvinism (with several exceptions, e.g., the Theban interlude at *P*. 9.79–90) are largely limited to his Theban songs and religious poetry.[33] Needless to say, the voicing of such sentiments at Thebes itself is rather unsurprising.[34] Of considerably greater interest is the expression of Pindar's Thebanocentrism on the pan-Hellenic stage. According to Felson and Parmentier, however, "scholars have paid too little attention to the frequent mention of Pindar's own homeland and of Theban events and themes" in the non-Theban *epinikia*.[35] Most efforts to address this topic are limited to the odes for cities (such as Aigina) or families (such as the Emmenids at Akragas) that enjoy prominent Theban connections.[36]

[30] Foster et al. (2020): 4-9; Kurke (2013): 8-11; Budelmann and Phillips (2018): 2-4.
[31] Olivieri (2004): 55.
[32] Olivieri (2007); (2011a); (2011b).
[33] E.g., Nash (1982); Cannatà Fera (1990):136-56, esp. 149–53; Hubbard (1991); van der Weiden (1991): 81-82, 116, 173, 209, 225; Hardie (2000); Rutherford (2001): 32; Wilson (2003): 175-79; Kowalzig (2007): 364-71; Kurke (2007); (2013); Currie (2011): 295-97; D'Angour (2013): 204; Lavecchia (2013): 70-75.
[34] On the Theban odes see Fenno (1995): 77ff; Kowalzig (2007): 364-71; Olivieri (2011); Larson (2017): 107-109.
[35] Felson and Parmentier (2015): 275.
[36] In the former case, the eponymous nymphs of Thebes and Aigina are sisters and—for Pindar—identical twins: see Fenno (1995); Indergard (2010); Nagy (2010). The Emmenidai, a short-lived dynasty of Akragantine tyrants, were supposedly Labdakids; their descent has been variously traced to both Eteoklēs and Polyneikēs, the sons of Oidipous: see Griffith (1991); Cummins (2010); Sicka (2015); Scirpo (2017); Tibiletti (2018); Lewis (2020): 179ff.

Nevertheless, among the flurry of recent publications on Pindar are several that examine the image of Pindar's Thebes in some detail. Asya Sigelman, in her 2016 monograph, an exploration of the "intrapoetic immortality" of Pindaric songcraft, calls attention to the salience of Pindar's Theban identity in the construction of his poetic persona. Sigelman also notes the significance of Thebes as the starting point—and sometimes the terminus—of Pindar's "song-journey".[37] In *Pythian* 4, for instance, οὖρον ὕμνων (l. 3) signals the poet's voyage from his native *polis* to Kyrēnē; accordingly, the textual position of such a phrase is tantamount to Thebes' direct reference.[38] Moreover, according to Sigelman, certain passages in the *epinikia* demonstrate that "intrapoetic Thebes *is* the poet's song."[39] Anna Uhlig raises a similar point in her study of Pindar and the biographical tradition.[40] However, despite Sigelman's great insight, her disregard for the odes' performance context is reminiscent of the radical formalism often—and wrongly—ascribed to Bundy.[41] It is true that her reading of *Pythian* 4 is felicitous in its attention to the ode's spatial and temporal complexity; yet, divorced from "conditions of reception", such analysis is of limited value.[42] Stephanie Larson, whose background in Theban history and archaeology informs her view of Pindar, rightly maintains that even in a pan-Hellenic setting, Pindar's "Theban mythopoesis" finds expression in the heroic narratives of victory odes.[43]

Yet, Larson, despite the validity of her assertions, is wrong to limit this "privileging of Thebes" to the ode's mythological material. Rather, Thebes is both immanent and eminent in the

[37] Sigelman (2016): 55ff.
[38] Sigelman (2016): 112.
[39] Sigelman (2016): 76.
[40] Uhlig (2016): 109.
[41] On this point, see Carey (2009); Silk (2012): 350-53; Maslov (2015): 12, 246ff; Waldo (2019): 2-10.
[42] Heath (2018): 103.
[43] Larson (2013).

poet's songworld. As the wellspring of his inspired verses, the city pervades the texts in their entirety. It is also apparent that, for Pindar, Thebes' mythic prestige is paramount, comprehensive, and perpetual. A continuity between epic Thebes and Pindar's conception of the contemporary city is indicated by the poet's application of Homeric epithets ἑπτάπυλος ("seven-gated", *P*.11.11; *N*. 4.19; *I*. 1.66–67; *I*. 8.15b), εὐτειχής ("high walled", *N*. 7.46) and the epic ethnonym Καδμεῖοι (e.g., *N*. 4.21; *I*. 1.66–67) or equivalent periphrases (e.g., Κάδμου στρατός, *I*. 1.11; fr. 52k.44)[44] to fifth-century Thebes and her. In fact, the poet avails himself of his city's ancient glories to spin a web of Theban myth that encompasses the families and cities of his patrons (cf. *O*. 2.46–47 with Σ *O*.2.39a Drchmn; *N*. 11.36–37; *I*. 8.15a–23, etc.).

Moreover, Pindar's poetic persona is predicated upon his identity as a Theban (e.g., *P*. 2.3; *P*. 5.72–78).[45] In fact, the *polis* ("city") of Thebes serves as the locus of Pindar's poetic authority. For instance, the Theban attributes his musical talents to his city's teachings:

> οὔτοι με ξένον
> οὐδ᾽ ἀδαήμονα **Μοισᾶν** ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταί
> Θῆβαι (Pi. fr. 198a SM).[46]
> Renowned Thebes taught me
> to be no stranger to nor ignorant
> of the Muses

Pindar can plausibly make such a claim, I suspect, because of the city's early association with immortal music; after Apollo played for Kadmos at Thebes' foundation (fr. 32 SM), the Muses sang at his wedding to Harmonia there (88–95; fr. 29.6; 70b.26–29 SM).[47] According to the *Ambrosian Life of Pindar*, the poet's celebration of "the kingship of Kadmos" (μέμνηται τῆς

[44] Pi. fr. 52k SM (=*Pa*. 9).
[45] Felson and Parmentier (1999): 268-76, 281-85; see also Sigelman (2016): 55ff.
[46] Pi. fr. 198a SM (=Chrysipp. π. ἀποφατικῶν fr. 180.2).
[47] Pindar surely reflects a Theban tradition already found in Hesiod (*Th*. 937, 975-78); cf. Pi. fr. 29 SM (=ps.-Luc. *Dem*. *Enc*. 19); fr. 32 SM (=Arist. *Or*. 3.620); fr. 70b SM (=*Dith*. 2). See also Fogelmark (1979); Gantz (1993): 467;

Κάδμου βασιλείας, *Vit. Ambr.*, 1.2.21 Drchmn)[48] is characteristic of his work.[49] Additionally, the figures of Amphiōn, a lyricist occasionally credited with the foundation of Thebes, and Linos, a son of Apollo and the muse Kalliope resident at Kadmeian Thebes may also inform Pindar's Theban inspiration.[50]

The poet also occasionally identifies the Theban spring Dirkē specifically as the source of his inspiration. Pindar's preference for Dirkē over the city's better-known waters may stem from its role in the clandestine rituals of the Theban magistrates.[51] At several points in the *epinikia*, the stream takes on a broader metaphorical role as a vehicle for Pindaric song. In these instances, he represents his compositions as poetic draughts drawn from the Dirkē.[52] The most notable of these metapoetic allusions occurs in the final lines of his Sixth *Isthmian*:[53]

> πίσω σφε **Δίρκας ἁγνὸν ὕ-**
> **δωρ**, τὸ βαθύζωνοι κόραι
> χρυσοπέπλου **Μναμοσύνας** ἀνέτει-
> λαν παρ' εὐτειχέσιν Κάδμου πύλαις (Pi. *I*. 6.73–75).
> I shall grant them a drink of **the sacred water of**
> **Dirkē**, which the deep-girdled daughters
> of golden-robed Mnemosyne made to flow
> forth by the **high-walled** gates of Kadmos.

Here again the daughters of Mnemosyne (i.e., the Muses) appear in a Theban context to inspire Pindar. The image of the poetic waters gushing forth at Thebes crowns the ode and constitutes

[48] Pi. fr. 272 SM (=*Vit. Ambr*. 1.2.21 Drchmn).
[49] Although the context of the Ambrosian Vita Pindari implies that fr. 272 refers to Pindar's contemporary Kadmos of Kos, it is rather more likely that the author has conjectured incorrectly and that Pindar commemorates the kingdom of the legendary Kadmos, i.e., Thebes, in the fragment. On this point, see Maehler (1989): 160; Rutherford (2001): 37 18n; Sider (2001): 15; Kowerski (2005): 33-36; Rawles (2018): 371-72.
[50] For Thebes as a source of poetic inspiration and mythical associations with the Muses and music, see Berlinzani (2004).
[51] I.e., the Ismēnos. See Berman (2015): 17-20 and Symeonoglou (1985): 9-11. On the ritual performed by the Theban *hipparkhos*, see Bremer (1995): 61-62.
[52] See Sigelman (2016): 73, 76-77; Boterf (2017): 92-93.
[53] Faraone (2002): 261ff.

one of Pindar's more illustrious *sphragides* (lit. "insignia"; "seal"). These metapoetic or paratextual devices, characteristic of Pindar's "dynast odes", are consistent in their identification of the poet with Thebes.[54] In their characteristic position at or near an ode's conclusion, the s*phragides* act as poetic frames that echo the proemial references (whether implicit or explicit) to the odes' inception at Thebes. In short, those odes that feature a *sphragis* highlighting the Theban provenance of the poet render the song-journey a cyclical movement from Thebes and back again.[55] In consequence, such odes exemplify the city's centrality and essentiality to Pindar's poetics.

Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* contains such a *sphragis*:

καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
εὗρε παγὰν **ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων**, πρόσφατον **Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς** (*P*. 4.298–99).
and he would tell you, O Arkesilas, what
a spring of **ambrosial verses** he discovered, while recently **a guest at Thebes.**

Here, the exile appears as a guest at Thebes and has adopted the poetic role of Pindar himself. The poem's culmination at Thebes should not be viewed in isolation from the preceding lines, Pindar's appeal to the king for the restoration of Damophilos. In fact, it is apparent that the concluding image of Thebes as an enduring bastion of aristocratic concord and poetic wisdom is thematically significant to the ode as whole. The reciprocity of *xenia* ("ritualized hospitality") and aristocratic parity, ideals that are repeatedly challenged in *Pythian* 4, are in its epilogue (ll. 263–99) fully realized at Thebes. The implication of these lines is that Thebes is the source of the healing wisdom capable of ending factionalism and restoring civic harmony at Kyrēnē.[56]

[54] Maslov (2015): 99-115; quote taken from 109; see also Peirana (2013); Phillips (2016): 274ff; Prodi (2017); Bitto (2020).
[55] Rutherford (1997): 45–46; Calame (2012): 310ff; Maslov (2015): 100ff; Sigelman (2016): 73-77.
[56] Mullen (1982): 35-36; Felson and Parmentier (2015): 270-75.

In his depiction of the city, Pindar draws upon (and perpetuates) a longstanding mythopoetic tradition of Thebes as a haven for noble foreigners.[57] These outsiders that find acceptance at Thebes are often aristocratic exiles like Damophilos. For instance, the monodic lyricist Alkaios the Mytilenean (fl. c. 600 BCE) may have spent part of his exile at Thebes.[58] Another such outcast is the Megarian elegist Theognis (fl. 552–541 BCE), who details his presence at Thebes:[59]

> Αἴθων μὲν γένος εἰμί, πόλιν δ᾽ **εὐτείχεα** Θήβην
> οἰκῶ πατρῴας γῆς ἀπερυκόμενος (Thgn. 1209–10).
> I am Aithōn by birth, and I dwell at **high-walled** Thebe
> since I am debarred from my native land.

In his interpretation of these verses, Gregory Nagy suggests a connection with Theban myth;[60] it seems likely that these would be myths of Theban hospitality (e.g., Kadmos and Harmonia, Oidipous, Amphiōn and Zēthos, Amphitryōn and Alkmēnē, etc.).[61] Significantly, Theognis also identifies Kadmos' Thebes with the inspired poetry of the Muses:

> **Μοῦσαι** καὶ Χάριτες, κοῦραι Διός, αἵ ποτε **Κάδμου**
> ἐς γάμον ἐλθοῦσαι καλὸν ἀείσατ᾽ ἔπος·
> ‘ὅττι καλόν, **φίλον** ἐστι, τὸ δ᾽ οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστίν’·
> τοῦτ᾽ ἔπος ἀθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων (Thgn. 15–18).
> Muses and Graces, daughters of Zeus, who long ago
> came to the wedding of Kadmos and sang the lovely verse:
> “That which is beautiful is **hospitable**, and that which is not beautiful
> is not hospitable; such was the song that passed from your immortal lips.

[57] See Demand (1982): 27-35; Mackil (2013): 22-41; Rockwell (2013): 44-59; *pace* Kowalzig (2007): 384-85.
[58] Walker (2000): 211-212; cf. Alc. fr. 325 Campbell.
[59] On Theognis' exile at Thebes, see Nagy (1985): *op. cit*. 52n; Compton (2006): 106-11; Bowie (2007): 45.
[60] Nagy (1985): 76-78.
[61] Kadmos as an exile: Hellanikos *BNJ* 4 F1a; Hdt. 2.49.3, 4.147.4; E. *Ph*. 638-42; Σ A.R. 3.1177-87 Wendel; Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.1.1; Ov. *Met*. 3.1-137; Stat. *Theb*. 1.5-6*;* Paus. 9.12.1 see Gaertner (2006b): 7; Harrison (2007): 149-53.

These lines suggest a close association of Theban poetry with social harmony. Nagy further observes that in Theognis, Theban space appears as a place of poetic inspiration and harmonious "social integration", denoted by the abstract substantive τὸ φίλον ("that which is hospitable"), and implied by the presence of the goddess Harmonia at Thebes.[62] Thus, it is evident that, while Pindar draws upon Thebes' illustrious position in early myth, his efforts to elevate Theban prestige are not limited to myth or the odes' mythic narratives.

In a recent article, "Stratégies pour Thèbes chez Pindare" André Hurst analyzes and contextualizes the Theban themes and allusions present in the *epinikia*. Like Hurst, I find the appearance of these themes and allusions in the non-Theban odes particularly significant for our understanding of Pindar's poetic aims. Hurst observes "a preoccupation of the poet with the reputation of Thebes" following the disgrace the city incurred for its medism, a view also endorsed by the historian Hans Beck.[63] In *Pythian* 4, for instance, Pindar is careful to avoid naming Inō, the daughter of Kadmos, as the wicked stepmother from whom Phrixos escapes (*P*. 4.162); elsewhere he identifies this figure as Demodikē (fr. 49 SM).[64] However, Pindar's concern for the reputation of his city is most apparent in the opening lines of *Isthmian* 1 and several fragments of religious songs performed at Thebes:

> μᾶτερ ἐμά, τὸ τεόν, χρύσασπι Θήβα,
> πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον
> θήσομαι (Pi. *I*. 1.1–3).
> My mother, Thebe girded by a golden shield,
> I shall place your interest far above even
> my obligations.
>
> ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαίρετο[ν
> κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων

[62] Nagy (1985): 28-29. For the semantics of φίλος, particularly in a social sense, see Benveniste (1973): 3.4.
[63] Hurst (2018); Beck (2020): 161-62, 190ff.
[64] Pi. fr. 49 SM (=Σ Pi. *P*. 4.288a). For variations of this myth, see Gantz (1993): 177.

Μοῖσ' ἀνέστασ' Ἑλλάδι κα[λ]λ[ιχόρῳ
εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοις ῥ[– Θήβαις (Pi. fr. 70b.24–26 SM).[65]
But the muse has appointed me
her chosen herald for Hellas of the wide dancing spaces
boasting for Thebes, bristling with chariots.

[sc. ὁ τῶν λόγων κόσμος]
καὶ πολυκλείταν περ ἐοῖσαν ὅμως
Θήβαν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπασκήσει θεῶν
καὶ κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἀγυιάς (Pi. fr. 194 SM)
[and my adornment of words]
will, although her fame resounds widely,
exalt Thebes still further
throughout the abodes of gods and men.

While in a Theban context, Pindar's chauvinism is overt, I argue that the allusions to Thebes and Theban myth in *Pythian* 4 perform the same corrective function outlined by Hurst; the Kyrēnaian context, however, requires more subtle expressions of Theban glory than songs performed at Thebes. Following Hurst, I contend that certain references to Thebes in *Pythian* 4 are oblique or implicit; the *ainigmata*, oracles, and prophecies that riddle the text imbue the ode with a marked ambiguity suggestive of veiled allusions.[66] As Michael Silk observes, Pindar's phraseology itself contributes to this effect; the artful and involved syntax of the ode, which is striking even for Pindar, reveal the presence of coded references and paronomasias that practically invite alternative readings.[67]

As we have seen, "lyric Thebes" serves as the source of the ode's inspired poetic wisdom. In addition, the real city is relevant to the ode's historical context. And yet, further

[65] Pi. fr. 70b SM (=*Dith*. 2). The tale of Kadmos' marriage to Harmonia in the subsequent lines (27-31) seems to confirm Grenfell and Hunt's supplement Θήβαις. Cf. Grenfell and Hunt (1908a); (1908b).
[66] For Pindar's ambiguity generally, cf. Nagy (1990a): 146-55; Pratt (1993): 103-06, 115-29; J. Hamilton (2003); Thomas (2012). For the multivalence of *Pythian* 4, cf. Sanders (2018): 1-44, 135-41.
[67] Silk (2012): 358-59. He cites Mēdeia's self-referential pun (μήδεσιν, l. 27) and a cryptic reference to Damophilos (treated below) in the ode's opening lines (ll.1-5). Cf. J. Hamilton (2003); Thomas (2012); Sanders (2018); Alley (2019): 84-85.

connections to Thebes can be found; these links appear in the mythological background of the ode, specifically the oral traditions of Kyrēnē's *ktisis* ("foundation") from Sparta by way of the island Thēra. Pindar utilizes these Kyrēnaian *ktisis* tales in crafting the mythic narratives of *Pythians* 4 and 5. In these stories, the Theban Thēras and his descendants, the Aigeidai, a storied clan of Labdakid (i.e., royal Theban) stock, feature prominently. In *Pythian* 4, however, Pindar does not explicitly name these figures; yet, in *Pythian* 5 (ll. 72–81), the poet ascribes to them a critical role in Kyrēnē's settlement. Despite the clan's absence in *Pythian* 4, certain details he does reference allude directly to Thēras. For the primary audience, his references would likely evoke the entirety of these oral traditions. However, any effort to recover the traditional knowledge of which the audience was aware must make use of accounts recorded elsewhere. One such supplementary source is *I.* 7.12–15; in these lines, Pindar attributes the success of Sparta's Dorian foundation to the Theban Aigeids. Another is the Libyan *logos* of Herodotos (4.145.2–158.3), who preserves more fully the discourse surrounding the Aigeidai at Sparta and Thēra. If we examine these traditions of the Aigeidai and their significance to Kyrēnē synoptically, we may discern additional Theban allusions implicit in the text of *Pythian* 4. In this respect, I contend that allusions to Thēras and the wider mythohistorical traditions in *Pythian* 4 and the presence of the Aigeidai in *Pythian* 5 are meant to position Thebes as the *mētropolis* at the head of the Spartan—Thēraian—Kyrēnaian chain of *apoikia*, or colonial foundations.

IV. The Proem of Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* Ode: Introduction

The Fourth *Pythian* divides readily into three principal sections: the proem (ll. 1-69), mythic narrative proper (70–262), and epilogue (263–299).[68] Although the Argonautic epyllion

[68] Braswell (1988): 23-30; Longely–Cook (1989): Other scholars vary slightly in their divisions, e.g., Burton (1962): 150-51.

comprises the heart of the ode, it largely lies outsisde the scope of my investigation, an analysis of the poet's subtle aggrandizement of Thebes in the mythic background of the Kyrēnaian *ktisis*. Naturally, the Theban allusions are concentrated in the proem and epilogue, where the ode's dynastic ideology is most apparent. Nevertheless, certain material from the mythic narrative is also relevant.

On balance, the composition of *Pythian* 4 seems rather elementary; however, this apparent simplicity is belied by the complex internal organization of its main divisions. The proem, whose structure is informed by an elaborate style of concentric ring-composition, is particularly labyrinthine.[69] The narrative, which proceeds at pace through a series of spatial and temporal frames, is analeptic or retrograde.[70] Significantly, the identification of Thēra as the site of Mēdeia's prophetic utterance (τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος…Θήραιον, ll. 9–10) marks the beginning of the narrative progression forwards in time.[71] Thus, the island is the pivot of the cyclical narrative; from here, Pindar returns to Battos' Delphi and then to the present celebration of Arkesilas' victory.

In the brief exordium (ll. 1–12) that opens the ode, Pindar first invokes the Muse and identifies the performance occasion as the victory-revel (*komos*), in honor of Arkesilas' achievement at the Pythian games (ll. 1–3):

> Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ **φίλῳ**
> στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,
> ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ,
> Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-
> θῶνί τ' αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων,

[69] On Pindaric ring-composition, see Illig (1932): 55-67; cf. R. Hamilton (1974): 61-78; Slater (1979a): 63-67; Greengard (1980).
[70] Griffith (1993); Agócs (2020): 95.
[71] Longely–Cook (1989): 95-99; Felson (1999): 16-19; Calame (2003): 50-51; Uhlig (2019): 83ff; Agócs (2020): 96.

ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος
οὐκ ἀπο**δάμοῦ** Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρεα
χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον
καρποφόρου Λιβύας, **ἱεράν**
νᾶσον ὡς ἤδη λιπὼν κτίσσειεν **εὐάρματον**
πόλιν ἐν ἀργεννόεντι μαστῷ
καὶ **τὸ** Μηδείας **ἔπος** ἀγκομίσαι
ἑβδόμᾳ καὶ σὺν δεκάτᾳ γενεᾷ **Θήραιον**, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενής
παῖς ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, δέσποινα Κόλχων. εἶπε δ' οὕτως
ἡμιθέοισιν Ἰάσονος αἰχματᾶο ναύταις (Pi. *P.* 4.1–12).

Today you must stand beside a **beloved man**
the king of horse-famed Kyrēnē, Muse, so that
while Arkesilas celebrates, you may spread the
breeze of hymns owed to Leto's children and to
Pytho, **where long ago** the priestess who sits beside
the golden eagle of Zeus foretold, when Apollo was
not **absent,** that Battos would be the colonizer of
fruit-bearing Libya and that he should without delay
leave **the holy isle** to found a city of **splendid chariots**
on a white-breasted hill and to realize in the seventeenth
generation **the Thēraian prophecy** of Mēdeia, which the
inspired daughter of Aiētēs once exuded from her immortal
mouth, the princess of Kolkhia; and she spoke thus to the
demigod sailors, [the companions] of the spearman Iasōn.

The temporal deictic adverb Σάμερον ("today"), the initial word of the ode, distinctly orients the celebration at contemporary Kyrēnē.[72] Pindar's reference to Pytho (Πυθῶνί, l. 3) allows an easy transition from the king's recent victory to his ancestor Battos' consultation of the Pythian oracle (ll. 4 –8). These lines comprise a *kephalaion*, a prefatory device that indicates the direction of the mythic narrative; the relative adverbial locative ἔνθα ("where") and the indefinite adverb ποτὲ

[72] Felson (1999): 14; Calame (2003): 43; Agócs (2020): 94.

("long ago") signal the narrative movement into the Delphic past.[73] Here, Battos appears as a divinely-sanctioned *oikist* ("founder"), commissioned by Zeus and Apollo, the leading gods at Kyrēnē.[74] This passage forms a *kephalaion*-ring with lines 59–63, which comprise Pindar's apostrophe to Battos:

> ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου, σὲ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ
> χρησμὸς ὤρθωσεν μελίσσας
> Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ·
> ἅ σε χαίρειν ἐστρὶς αὐδάσαισα πεπρωμένον
> βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράνᾳ,
> δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποι-
> νὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν (Pi. *P.*4.59–63).
>
> O blessed son of Polymnnastos, you were the one that
> the oracle, in accordance with that [i.e., Mēdeia's]
> speech, acclaimed through the spontaneous cry of the Delphic bee,
> who, crying out three times, hailed you and revealed
> you to be the predestined king of Kyrēnē,
> when you were asking what requital would come
> from the gods for your ill-sounding voice.

The *kephalaia* that surround Mēdeia's address (13–58), the centerpiece of the proem, emphasize the divine sanction of the Battiad dynasty; additionally, these passages serve to distinguish the seeress's embedded speech as a "discrete vocal performance" within the multifaceted ode.[75] The ring-composition of Mēdeia's prophecy also marks it as distinct from the mythic narrative proper, and the speech's notable metaleptic effect (a narratological term which here refers to the "blending" of the voice of poet with that of Mēdeia) only heightens its distinctiveness.[76] Pindar

[73] J. Hamilton (2003); Miller (2019): 145; Köhnken (1993). On ποτὲ, see Young (1983).
[74] Malkin (1994): 143-67; Albis (1996): 90-91; Krummel (2014): 123-39; Kurke and Neer (2019) 42-44; cf. Pi. *P.* 4.14-16; 5.60-62, 78-84, 89-93; *P*. 9. 5-7, 51-55,61-63.
[75] Uhlig (2019): 81.
[76] Longley-Cook (1989): 95-99; de Jong (2013): 112-13; Uhlig (2019): 93.

concludes the proem by transitioning eight generations forward from Battos back to Arkesilas, his initial point of departure:

> ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν,
> ὥτε φοινικανθέμου ἦρος ἀκμᾷ,
> παισὶ τούτοις ὄγδοον θάλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας·
> τῷ μὲν Ἀπόλλων ἅ τε Πυθὼ κῦδος ἐξ
> Ἀμφικτιόνων ἔπορεν
> ἱπποδρομίας (Pi. *P.* 4.64–67).
>
> Yea, verily now in times to come
> as at the height of red-flowered Spring
> the eighth generation of sons flourishes
> in Arkesilas, upon whom Apollo and Pytho
> bestowed glory from the Amphiktiones in the
> hippodrome.

The paired *eukhē* ("vaunts, boasts; praise") on behalf of the victorious king Arkesilas IV (ll. 1–3; 67–68) thus furnish the ring form of the proem with its overarching correspondence; the figure of the absent Damophilos, however, serves a comparable role for the entire ode. Michael Silk argues for the exile's subtle presence in the first five verses of the exordium (ll. 1–12):[77]

> Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ **φίλῳ**
> στᾶμεν… *(2)*
> οὐκ ἀπο**δάμοῦ** Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος… *(5)*
>
> Today you must stand together with a friend…
> when Apollo was not absent…

The allusion to Damophilos is balanced by the ode's *sphragis* (ll. 298–99), in which the exile appears as a guest at Thebes. Here, he takes up the poetic role of Pindar himself:

> καί κε μυθήσαιθ', ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
> εὗρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, πρόσφατον **Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς** (*P*. 4.298–99).
>
> and he would tell you, O Arkesilas, what
> a spring of ambrosial verses he discovered, while recently **a guest at Thebes**.

[77] Silk (2012): 359.

A similar allusion that echoes the opening lines of *Pythian* 4 is apparent at the conclusion of *Pythian* 5:

> Διός τοι νόος μέγας κυβερνᾷ
> **δαίμον**᾽ ἀνδρῶν **φίλων** (*P*. 5.122–23)
> Truly, the great mind of Zeus
> steers **the fate of hospitable men**.

Damophilos' appearance in *Pythian* 5 indicates that this ode too speaks to the exile's plight and the related civil strife at Kyrēnē (cf. *P*. 5.10–11, 117–121). I contend that these allusions to Damophilos implicitly highlight Thebes, where the Kyrēnaian has found refuge during his exile. In addition to this reference to Damophilos, the exordium also features Sigelman's Theban song-journey motif (l. 3); it seems to contain, however an additional, albeit subtle, connection to Thebes. This allusion, which likens the two cities, is the first indication of a genealogical link between Thebes and Kyrēnē. As we shall see, Pindar further develops and deploys this connection to assist Damophilos and instruct Arkesilas. The two cities' relationship is signaled by the characterization of Kyrēnē as εὐάρματος ("of splendid chariot") at l. 7. It is certainly suggestive that a scholiast on *Pythian* 4 notes Pindar's application of the adjective, which is found also in Sophoklēs (Θήβας τ᾽ εὐαρμάτου, S. *Ant*. 845), to Thebes (Εὐάρματε…Θήβα, Pi. fr. 195 SM), [78] Although the adjective does not, in its two other occurrences in Pindar (*P*. 2.5; *I*. 2.17), modify Thebes, both occasions offer a Theban connection.[79] Any such link between Kyrēnē and Thebes would only be reinforced by the latter *polis*' nearly axiomatic association with chariots (e.g., Pi. *I*. 8.20; fr. 70b.26 SM; 106.5 SM; cf. S. *Ant*. 149; E. *Supp*. 667–68).

[78] Pi. fr. 195 SM (=Σ *P*. 4.14).
[79] In the case of *P*. 2.5, εὐάρματος, although modifying Hierōn, appears in close proximity to Thebes (Θηβᾶν, *P*. 2.3), from which Pindar departs, perhaps on a chariot, on his song-journey. At *I*. 2.17, however, the adjective, which characterizes the victor Xenokratēs, may function as an indictor of his Theban ancestry.

The island Thēra, which appears in the exordium (ll. 6–7; 1. 10) and proem (1. 14; 1.20;1. 42), also bears suggestions of Thebes. The unusual prominence of Thēra in the ode's Argonautic material suggests a role for the island beyond its use as the setting of Mēdeia's prophecy and origin point of the Battiad colonization. Because of its mythohistorical ties to the Aigeids, Thēra is the ideal instrument with which to evoke exploits of these heroes. In *Pythian* 5, for instance, the more public of the two odes composed for the occasion, the poet glorifies Thebes by highlighting Kyrēnē's "Kadmeian background" via the Aigeidai and the city's Thēraian colonists (Pi. *P.* 5.72–76).[80] The differing contexts of the odes' performance likely accounts for the lack of overt references to the Aigeids in *Pythian* 4; however, the ode, I would argue, does contain coded allusions to Thēra's Kadmeian foundation. Further development of this argument, however, requires some additional context regarding the Aigeidai and Theban involvement in the Spartan–Thēraian–Kyrēnaian concatenation of colonial foundations.

V. The Aigeidai: Between Thēra, Thebes, and Sparta

By virtue of their descent from the aforementioned Thēras, the Aigeidai were Labdakids, scions of the royal house of Thebes.[81] Notwithstanding their ancestry, both Thēras and his Aigeid descendants play a significant role in the mythohistorical traditions of early Dorian Sparta. Thēras himself purportedly participated in the Dorian–Herakleid conquest of the Peloponnese and took part in the victors' subsequent settlement of the region (Paus. 4.3.4). His sister Argeia married the Herakleid Aristodēmos and bore the first two Spartan dyarchs, Eurysthenēs and Proklēs, for whom Thēras served as regent during their minority (Hdt. 4.147.2).

[80] Malkin (1994): 71. On the use of Kadmeian as a "ethonym that denotes an inhabitant of Thebes", see Berman (2004).
[81] On the Aigeidai, see *BNP* s.v. Aegidae; see also Robert (1915): 565-74; Vian (1963): 216-28; Nafissi (1980-81); (1985); Corsano (1990); Nagy (1990b): 292; Malkin (1994): 98-114.

Aigeid commanders like Timomakhos and Euryleon were instrumental in Sparta's consolidation of the Eurotas valley and expansion into Messenia.[82] Besides warfare, the Aigeidai were also closely associated with Spartan colonization, particularly that of the island Thēra. Although nominally a Spartan colony, Thēra possessed strong links to Thebes. According to Herodotos, Kadmos, the *oikist* of Thebes, first settled Kallistē, the former name of the island (Hdt. 4.147.4–5). After eight generations, his descendant, the Theban Thēras, recolonized Kallistē, which was subsequently known as Thēra. The hero then established an Aigeid *basileia* ("hereditary kingship"), c. 800 BCE that continued into the sixth century (Hdt. 4.147.1–148.4, 150.2).[83] In addition to their settlement of Thēra, the Aigeids were also involved in Spartan colonial expeditions to Libya and Sicily in the late sixth century.[84]

The scholiasts on *Isthmian* 7 and *Pythian* 5 provide a number of hypotheses regarding the genesis of the Aigeids.[85] Thebes, Sparta, Aigina, Athens, and Argos are given as possible *Urheimaten* ("original homelands"). The latter three *poleis*, however, can safely be discounted as attributions based on false etymological or onomastic suppositions.[86] Of these *aitia* ("origin stories"), only the Theban and Spartan traditions have viable origins in archaic and early classical Greece; scholia on *Isthmian* 7 provides a neat summary of the two cities' claims:

> ἔνιοι δὲ Αἰγείδας **φυλὴν ἐν Θήβῃ**, ἀφ ἧς σύμμαχοι ἐπὶ τὴν Λακεδαίμονα ἦλθον καὶ ἐκράτησαν· ἔνιοι, ὅτι οὕτως ὀνομάζονταί τινες ἐν Λακεδαίμονι **ἀπὸ Αἰγέως**

[82] On Timomakhos, see below p.18; regarding Euryleon, see below p. 24.
[83] Malkin (1994): 71, 104-11, 113-14; Vlachou (2018): 115; scf. *IG* 12.3 762: Ῥᾱκσᾱνῶρ | ἀρκι-αγέτας | Προκλῆς ("king Prokles, breaker of ranks") c. 600 BCE.
[84] Malkin (1994): 192ff.
[85] Σ Pi. *P*. 5.96b, 101a, 104b; *I*. 7.18a-b.
[86] The scholiast's (Σ Pi. *I*. 7.18a-b) claim that, according to some, the Aigeidai were Athenians descended from the Attic king Aigeus, a phylē ("tribe") on Aigina, or Argives can safely be discounted as ascriptions informed by false etymologies and similar confusions: see Vian (1963): 220-21. Respectively, these claims are based on the identity of the name of the eponymous Theban/Spartan Aigeus with the Athenian king, who served as the eponymous hero of the Attic *phyle* and that of the lineage with the with the eponymous Spartan or Theban Aigeus as well as the local Athenian tribe, its similarity to Aigina and Pindar's affinity for the island *polis*, and the name of Aristodemos' wife Argeia, who, name and Argive ancestry notwithstanding, was a Labdakid. However, for the possibility that the Athens staked a veritable claim to the Aigeidai, see Breglia Pulcia Doria (1997): 206ff.

> **τινὸς Θηβαίου**, ὃν συνεργῆσαι τοῖς Ἡρακλείδαις φασὶ πρὸς τὴν κατάκτησιν τῆς Λακωνικῆς (Σ *I.* 7.18a.7–11).
>
> Some say that the Aigeidai were **a *phylē* resident at Thebes**, from which the allies [of the Herakleidai] came to Lakedaimōn and conquered it. Others claim as follows, that **particular individuals at Lakedaimōn** were called thus **after a certain Theban Aigeus**, who they say assisted the Herakleidai in their acquisition of Lakonia.

> περὶ [sc. Αἰγειδῶν] γὰρ **Θηβῶν ὁ λόγος.** καὶ εἰσὶν **Αἰγεῖδαι φατρία Θηβαίων**, ἀφ' ἧς ἦκόν τινες εἰς Σπάρτην Λακεδαιμονίοις βοηθήσοντες ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀμυκλαεῖς πολέμῳ, ἡγεμόνι χρησάμενοι Τιμομάχῳ, ὃς πρῶτος μὲν πάντα τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον διέταξε Λακεδαιμονίοις, μεγάλων δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἠξιώθη τιμῶν· καὶ τοῖς Ὑακινθίοις δὲ ὁ χάλκεος αὐτοῦ θώραξ προτίθεται· τὸν δὲ Θηβαῖον ὅπλον ἐκάλουν (Σ Pi. *I.*7.18c.2–7).
>
> Concerning the Aigeidai, here is the version of the Thebans. **The Aigeidai are a *phratry* of Thebans**, from whom some came to Sparta to assist the Lakedaimonians in their war against the Amyklaians. Timomakhos, their leader, first instructed the Lakedaimonians in all the arts of war and was considered worthy of [receiving] great honors from them. Accordingly, his bronze cuirass is displayed publicly at the Hyakinthia. The Thebans used to call this armor.

The terms employed by the scholiasts, *phylē* and *phratry*, typically refer to citizen subdivisions in the *polis*. However, their "non-technical usage" here signifies a lineage group.[87] As the scholia attest, the clan's Labdakid filiation was axiomatic at Sparta and Thebes. Nevertheless, the Spartans insisted that the Aigeid *apospasma* ("branch, lineage") qua Aigeids (rather than Agenorids, Kadmeians, Labdakids, or Oidipodai, etc.) arose at Sparta rather than Thebes.[88] Herodotos, for instance, characterizes the Aigeidai as Kadmeians (i.e., Thebans) and notes their descent from Polyneikes, the son of Oidipous (4.147.1–2). Nevertheless, he names them "a great

[87] *LSJ* s.v. φυλή; φράτρα; N. Jones (1987): 254 §13 1n.
[88] Malkin (1994): 101-104.

tribe at Sparta" (φυλὴ μεγάλη ἐν Σπάρτη, 4.149.1) and details their emergence there from an eponymous Aigeus, the grandson of Thēras.

Notwithstanding the Spartans' efforts, at Thēra and Sparta, the clan's identity was predicated upon their Theban descent.[89] Herodotos, for instance, mentions that the Aigeids erected a sanctuary (ἱρόν) to the *Erinyes* (Furies) of their ancestors Laios and Oidipous (4.149.2). Pausanias later saw the *herōa* (hero shrines) of Kadmos, his father Agenor, and their descendants Oiolykos and Aigeus in the Spartan *kōmē* (village) of Pitane (Paus. 3.15.8). The existence of the Spartan cults, and their absence at Thebes, suggests the historicity of the Spartan Aigeids. So too does Marcello Lupi's recent assertion that the Aigeidai "constituted [a] phratry-like bod[y]", or civic subdivision, at Sparta.[90] At Thebes, however, the Aigeidai are attested neither epigraphically nor textually.[91] Despite the clan's Theban origin, only Sparta, Thēra, and likely Kyrēnē could boast of resident Aigeids in the historical period.[92] The ahistoricity of the Theban branch, however, does not preclude lineage members' association with their putative homeland. In fact, Pietro Giannini maintains that Damophilos, in light of his connection to Thebes and Pindar was likely an Aigeid.[93] If accurate, Pindar may specifically promote the significance of Damophilos' lineage to Kyrēnē as part of his efforts to restore him from exile.

Apart from Herodotos, Pindar is the principal source concerning the Aigeids. In the priamel of his Seventh *Isthmian*, written in honor of the Theban Strepsiades, Pindar celebrates the clan and their martial glories:

> Τίνι τῶν πάρος, **ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα**,
> καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεόν

[89] Malkin (1994):
[90] Lupi (2018): 171ff.
[91] D'Alessio (1994): 122.
[92] Malkin (1994): 100ff, 145-47; D'Alessio (1994): 122-23 16n; Kõiv (2003): 80; (2015): 35-36.
[93] Giannini (1979): 47-48.

εὔφρανας; ἦρα χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον
Δαμάτερος ἀνίκ' εὐρυχαίταν
ἄντειλας Διόνυσον, ἢ χρυσῷ μεσονύκτιον
νείφοντα δεξαμένα τὸν φέρτατον θεῶν,
ὁπότ' Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἐν θυρέτροις
σταθεὶς ἄλοχον μετῆλθεν Ἡρακλείοις γοναῖς;
ἢ {ὅτ'} ἀμφὶ πυκ᾽ναῖς Τειρεσίαο βουλαῖς;
ἢ {ὅτ'} ἀμφ' Ἰόλαον ἱππόμητιν;
ἢ Σπαρτῶν ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν; ἢ ὅτε καρτερᾶς
Ἄδραστον ἐξ ἀλαλᾶς ἄμπεμψας ὀρφανόν
μυρίων ἑτάρων ἐς Ἄργος ἵππιον;
ἢ **Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν οὔνεκεν ὀρθῷ**
ἔστασας ἐπὶ σφυρῷ
Λακεδαιμονίων, ἕλον δ' Ἀμύκλας
Αἰγεῖδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι, μαντεύμασι Πυθίοις; (Pi. *I*. 7.1–15)

In which of your land's former accolades, O
blessed Thebe, did your heart most exult?
Was it when you exalted Dionysos of the streaming locks
to attend upon bronze-resounding Demeter?
Or when you received the mightiest among the gods
in a snowstorm of gold, as he stood at the threshold
of Amphitryon and sought his wife to produce Herakles?
Was it in the subtle counsels of Teiresias? Or the fine
horsemanship of Iolaos? Or [in hearing of] **the tireless spears**
of the Spartoi? Or when you forced Adrastos from the
relentless onslaught back to Argive pastures deprived of
innumerable comrades? **Or because you established**
the Dorian colony of the Lakedaimonians on sure footing,
and your descendants, the Aigeidai, stormed Amyklai,
in keeping with the Pythian oracle?

The Theban performance context indicates that Pindar's remarks reflect the Aigeid tradition operative at Thebes.[94] The position of the clan's exploits as the final item in a catalogue of mythical honors (καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων, l. 2) accorded the nymph Thēbē suggests that the Thebans

[94] Malkin (1994): 101-102; Nagy (1990a): 380-81 2n.

considered the Aigeid achievements momentous and—significantly—their own. Local custom identifies Aigeus, a *Spartos* ("autochthonous Theban") and descendant of Kadmos, as the lineage founder (Σ *P*. 5.101b). According to Irad Malkin, the variant in effect at Thebes is consistent in its characterization of the Aigeidai as Theban and highlights "their crucial contributions to Spartan history."[95] In this respect, Pindar accords them a seminal role in the foundation and consolidation of the Spartan polity.[96] The poet's conception of the Dorian-Herakleid return as an ἀποικία ("colony") is itself a critical element of the Theban traditions surrounding the Aigeids at Sparta; it allows Pindar to advance the clan as founding fathers of Dorian Sparta. Evident in his promotion of the Aigeids as *sunoikists* ("co-founders") of Lakedaimōn alongside the Herakleids is a tacit Theban claim to metropolitan status over Sparta.[97] While initially the poet's claim seems outlandish, such a tradition of Theban primacy over Sparta is also evident in the fourth-century historian Timagoras' *Thebaika*:

> Σπάρτη· Λακωνικὸν χωρίον **ἀπὸ τῶν μετὰ Κάδμου Σπαρτῶν**,
> περὶ ὧν Τιμαγόρας φησίν «ἐκπεσόντας δ᾽ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν
> Λακωνικὴν Σπάρτην ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ὀνομάσαι» (*BNJ* 381 F3).
> Sparta: the Lakonian land [whose name comes] **from the Spartoi with Kadmos**,
> concerning whom Timagoras states "after being expelled [from Thebes] to
> Lakonia named [the land] Sparta after themselves".

It has been argued that the Spartid foundation of Lakedaimōn, like the tradition concerning Timomakhos' tutelage of the Spartans, reflects mid-fourth-century propaganda from the period of Thebes' ascendancy.[98] Pindar's praise of the Aigeidai in *Isthmian* 7, however, indicates that these Theban claims vis-à-vis Sparta were circulating during the poet's lifetime.

---

[95] Malkin (1994): 101.
[96] Pettersson (1992): 66-68; Malkin (1994):100-103; Kõiv (2015): 35-47.
[97] For Pindar, Herakles' Thebanness would likely also be a salient feature of this claim; see Schachter (1979); Pike (1984); Nieto Hernandez (1993).
[98] Malkin (1994): 101-103.

Another scholiast (Σ *P*. 5.101b Drchmn) cites Ephoros the Kymaian (fl. 360–330 BCE) for the content of the Herakleid oracle, which bade them to obtain as allies those whom their father had supported (ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους εὐεργηθέντας, l. 9), namely the Theban Aigeids (πρώτους δὲ τούτων Αἰγείδας παρακαλεῖν, ll. 9–10).[99] The reciprocity and mutual obligation between the two lineages suggests the ties of hospitality characteristic of a *xenia* bond; this scenario seems to be confirmed by Aristodēmos and his brothers' attendance of a Theban banquet at which the Aigeidai were honored (Σ *I*. 7.18b Drchmn; cf. Σ *P*. 5.101b). Considering the salience of *xenia* and *philia* ("friendship, hospitality") in *Pythians* 4 and 5, the lineage's exemplification of Theban hospitality may provide grounds for Pindar's juxtaposition of the Aigeids with the Herakleids in the latter ode:

> [Ἀπόλλων] μυχόν τ᾽ ἀμφέπει
> μαντήϊον· τῷ καὶ **Λακεδαίμονι**
> ἐν Ἄργει τε καὶ ζαθέᾳ Πύλῳ
> ἔνασσεν ἀλκάεντας **Ἡρακλέος**
> **ἐκγόνους Αἰγιμιοῦ τε. τὸ δ᾽ ἐμὸν** γαρύειν
> **ἀπὸ Σπάρτας** ἐπήρατον κλέος:
> ὅθεν γεγενναμένοι
> **ἵκοντο Θήρανδε φῶτες Αἰγεῖδαι**,
> **ἐμοὶ πατέρες**, οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῖρά τις ἄγεν·
> πολύθυτον ἔρανον
> ἔνθεν ἀναδεξάμενοι,
> Ἄπολλον, τεᾷ,
> **Καρνήϊ**᾽, ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν
> Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν (*P*. 5.68–81).[100]
>
> and he [Apollo] tends the recesses
> of his oracular seat, through which he
> settled the **valiant sons of Herakles and**
> **Aigimios** at Lakedaimōn, Argos, and holy Pylos

[99] Σ Pi. *P*. 5.101b (=Ephoros of Kyme *BNJ* 70 F16).
[100] For the various interpretation of these lines, see Lefkowitz (1963); (1985); (1995); Kirkwood (1981); D'Alessio (1994); Morrison (2002): 123-25; Currie (2013); Sobak (2013): 131-32; Lattmann (2016).

> **But it is mine** to celebrate the delightful glory
> [that issues] **from Sparta**, whence men,
> **begotten as Aigeidai**, **came to Thēra**,
> **my forefathers**, not without divine will,
> but a certain Fate led [them].
> From there we have received the ritual feast
> with its many sacrifices, and at your banquet
> Apollo, **Karneian**, we reverence the well-built
> *polis* of Kyrēnē.

If the scholiast is correct to assert Arkesilas' descent from Herakles (Σ *P*. 5.101a), the mutual affection of the Aigeidai and the Herakleids would comprise an implicit ancestral parallel to the *xenia* relationship of the Theban poet and his patron. Similar analogies of the poet and victor with heroic figures linked by *xenia* are not uncommon in Pindar. In two of the Aiginetan odes, for instance, Pindar correlates himself with the Theban Herakles and the victor with the Aiginetans Telamon (*N*. 7.61, 84–87) and Ajax (*I*. 6.44–46).[101]

Unsurprisingly, *P*. 5.72–81 has been embroiled in the larger controversy surrounding Pindar's narrative voice and the debate over monodic or choral performance.[102] Wilamowitz considered these lines an unambiguous claim to Aigeid ancestry on the part of the poet.[103] This is unlikely, however, as there is no evidence of a historical branch of the Aigeidai at Thebes.[104] Even in antiquity, critics have attempted to assign these lines to a Kyrēnaian chorus rather than Pindar himself.[105] Nagy considers the former possibility remote, since "the body politic of Cyrene, as ostensibly represented by the chorus, is not ideologically derivable from the single

[101] Lefkowitz (1991b): 47-48; D'Alessio (2005a): 232; Indergaard (2011): 318; H. Hansen (2016): 176; Stamatopoulou (2017): 105 8n.
[102] On this debate, see Lefkowitz (1988); (1991); Carey (1991); Lefkowitz (1991); D'Alessio (1994); Schmid (1996); (1998); Currie (2013); Nikolaidou-Arabatzi (2014); Lattmann (2016).
[103] Wilamowitz (1922): 377.
[104] D'Alessio (1994): 122.
[105] More recent proponents of this stance include Corsano (1990): 125; D'Alessio (1994); Currie (2005): 227-28; Krummel (2014): 163-66; Lattmann (2016). For a refutation of these views, see Kirkwood (1981); Lefkowitz (1991b); (1991e); (1995).

lineage of the Aigeidai".[106] Lefkowitz concurs, noting that if Pindar assigned these lines to a chorus, it would be "an extraordinary departure from tradition and from his usual style", in that the poet fails to identify the choral voice and portray the speakers.[107]

The surest explanation of τὸ δ' ἐμὸν ("it is mine") and Αἰγεΐδαι | ἐμοὶ πατέρες ("Aigeidai, my forefathers") is that of Gordon Kirkwood: Pindar, like the Aigeids (ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα… Αἰγεῖδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι, *I.* 7.1–15) a child of Thēbē (μᾶτερ ἐμά…χρύσασπι Θήβα, *I.* 1.1) is thus free to "call any Thebans of old his 'ancestors'" in a general sense.[108] It is rather likely, however, that the shift from singular (ἐμοὶ πατέρες) to plural (ἀναδεξάμενοι, σεβίζομεν) is metaleptic and intentionally ambiguous. In this case, the adoption of plural forms marks a harmonization of the epinician speaker with that of a citizen chorus.[109] This suggests that both poet and local chorus can plausibly claim identity with the Aigeidai.

Beyond the *xenia* analogy discussed above, Pindar's affinity to the Aigeidai serves an additional purpose: to evoke the Aigeid colonial traditions that link Thebes, Sparta, Thēra, and Kyrēnē. In the words of Claude Calame, the Aigeidai betoken the connection, via Sparta and Thēra, "between the place of the poem's composition (Thebes) and the place of its enunciation/performance (Cyrene)".[110] Clearly, these lines reference the Aigeid settlement of Thēra and imply the clan's subsequent movement to Kyrēnē (cf. Σ Pi. *P.* 5.96b).[111] However, as in *Isthmian* 7, Pindar refers to the Aigeidai in the context of the Dorian colonization of Sparta. For an audience well versed in tales of the Dorian–Herakleid conquest, this passage would evoke

[106] Nagy (1990a): 380-81.
[107] Lefkowitz (1991b): 63-65 (quote taken from 65); see also Hornblower (2004): 240-41.
[108] Kirkwood (1981): 18; *pace* D'Alessio (1994): 122-24. Cf. *O.* 6.84–87, which features a comparable claim of descent from Thēbē.
[109] On metalepsis in Pindar, see de Jong (2009); (2013).
[110] Calame (2003): 80.
[111] Floyd (1965): 191-92; Malkin (1994): 105; Kõiv (2003): 80; Fragoulaki (2013): 109.

claims of Theban involvement in Sparta's foundation.[112] Such a scenario is suggested by the scholia:

> Αἰγείδας δὲ κέκληκε τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους διὰ τὸ κατοικισθῆναι τοὺς παρὰ Θηβαίοις καλουμένους Αἰγείδας ἐν Λακεδαίμονι (Σ Pi. *P.* 5.96b)
> And he [Pindar] called the Aigeidai Lakedaimonians because of the settlement of those called Aigeidai among the Thebans at Lakedaimōn.

As Malkin notes, "the presence of the Aigeidai in both Sparta and Thēra probably served as a constant reminder of their relationship as mother city and colony".[113] Such ties, however, would also include both Thebes and Kyrēnē, if the Aigeids there maintained, as at Sparta and Thēra, claims of Theban descent. In this case, Pindar's allusion to these traditions in *Pythian* 5 would be easily apparent to the audience.[114] Unlike *Pythian* 4, *Pythian* 5, which treats at length Kyrēnē's foundation, allows Pindar to thus highlight the Aigeidai and their presence at Sparta, Thēra, and Kyrēnē.

For the Kyrēnaians, the obvious implication is that Thebes, due to the Aigeid involvement in the foundations of Sparta and Thēra (and, it seems, Kyrēnē) is their city's ultimate *mētropolis*. While this relationship is made quite explicit in *Pythian* 5, it is rather less obvious in *Pythian* 4; nevertheless, it is evident that the texts were meant to complement one another;[115] in fact, Thebes' metropolitan status can be taken as another of the odes' unifying features. It is also significant that the same audience was likely present at each performance.[116]

[112] Krummel (2014): 156; Agócs (2009): 45.
[113] Malkin (1994): 105.
[114] On the Theban identity of the Aigeidai at Sparta, see Malkin (1994): 104–05.
[115] E.g., Burton (1962): 140-41; Longely-Cook (1989): 184-208; Neer and Kurke (2019): 189-217; Waldo (2019): 106.
[116] Morrison (2007); (2010); (2010); (2012).

If, as scholars' conjecture, *Pythian* 5 was the first of the two to be performed, the audience would be already receptive to these references.[117] It thus plausible that the audience would grasp the import of Pindar's allusions to these traditions. Thebes' metropolitan status over Kyrēnē grants the Theban poet additional authority as a guest in the city. Pindar subsequently wields this Theban prestige, which permits his intervention in local affairs, including royal matters, to realize his poetics aims:[118] the dissolution of *stasis* among the Kyrēnaians and the end of exile for Damophilos.

The poet's commemoration of Apollo Karneios also serves to highlight Theban primacy over Kyrēnē. Although the reference is obscure, the passage implies a connection between the Aigeidai, the cult of Apollo Karneios, and the foundation of Kyrēnē. This relationship is more fully detailed by the Kyrēnaian poet Kallimakhos (fl. 280–245 BCE), who credits the Oidipodai (i.e., the Aigeidai) with the cult's transfer from Sparta to Thēra:

> Φοῖβος καὶ βαθύγειον ἐμὴν πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττῳ
> καὶ Λιβύην ἐσιόντι κόραξ ἡγήσατο λαῷ,
> δεξιὸς οἰκιστῆρι, καὶ ὤμοσε τείχεα δώσειν
> ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν· ἀεὶ δ' εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων.
> ὤπολλον, πολλοί σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι,
> πολλοὶ δὲ Κλάριον, πάντη δέ τοι οὔνομα πουλύ·
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Καρνεῖον· ἐμοὶ πατρώιον οὕτω.
> **Σπάρτη τοι, Καρνεῖε, τόδε πρώτιστον ἔδεθλον,**
> **δεύτερον αὖ Θήρη, τρίτατόν γε μὲν ἄστυ Κυρήνης.**
> **ἐκ μέν σε Σπάρτης ἕκτον γένος Οἰδιπόδαο**
> **ἦγαγε Θηραίην ἐς ἀπόκτισιν· ἐκ δέ σε Θήρης**
> **οὖλος Ἀριστοτέλης Ἀσβυστίδι πάρθετο γαίῃ,**
> δεῖμε δέ τοι μάλα καλὸν ἀνάκτορον, ἐν δὲ πόληι
> θῆκε τελεσφορίην ἐπετήσιον, ᾗ ἔνι πολλοί
> ὑστάτιον πίπτουσιν ἐπ' ἰσχίον, ὦ ἄνα, ταῦροι (Call. *Ap.* 65–75).

[117] E.g., Burton (1962): 137; Neer and Kurke (2019): 193, 350 22n.
[118] Pindar's leverage of Theban connections to the victor's *polis* is not unheard of. He makes use of such ties frequently (e.g., *O*. 6.84-87; *N*. 7.61-63; *I*. 6.19-21).

> Phoibos too revealed my fertile city to Battos
> and as a raven—auspicious to our founder—guided
> his host as they entered Libya and pledged an oath
> to provide a fortified settlement to our kings; and Apollo
> always honors his oaths. O Apollo! Many are there who call
> you Boëdromoios, and many invoke you as Klarios,
> everywhere your names are many. **But I name you Karneian**
> **in the manner of my fathers. Sparta, O Karneios, was your**
> **first foundation; and next in order was Thēra; but third came**
> **the city of Kyrēnē. From Sparta the sixth generation**
> **of Oidipous' line led you to the colony Thēra; and from Thēra,**
> **unimpaired, Battos deposited you on Asbystian territory and**
> **erected for you a most pleasing temple**. Likewise, in the city
> he established [for you] annual rites during which many bulls,
> O lord, fall upon their haunches for the last time.

As Kallimakhos attests, the Karneian Apollo is a colonial deity responsible for the foundation of Sparta, Thēra, and Kyrēnē. In fact, the worship of Karneios, the quintessential Dorian god, was closely associated with the Dorian–Herakleid invasion and its aftermath, namely the colonization of Sparta and her daughter-cities.[119] It is clear from Pindar and Kallimakhos that the god and his festival, the Karneia, were linked to the heroized founder-kings of Thēra and Kyrēnē (and/or their descendants, the Aigeidai and Battiadai, who transferred the cult to the new colonies. At Kyrēnē, for instance, the king administered the cult, whose festivities likely "encompassed the cults of Apollo, Battos…and the dead Battiad" rulers.[120] Similarly, the *oikist* cult at Thēra may have been linked to Apollo Karneios, with the Aigeids as its hereditary priests.[121] The lineages' relationship with the god is signaled by the specialized title *arkhēgetēs* ("founder, leader"),

[119] Th. 5.54; Paus. 3.13.3; Pettersson (1992): 58ff; Malkin (1994): 145ff; Kõiv (2015): 30-33.
[120] Currie (2005): 229. On the Battiads' hereditary priesthood and associations with Apollo Karneios, see Chamoux (1953): 138-42, 310; Krummel (2014): 123-26, 129ff; Neer and Kurke (2019): 163, 173ff.
[121] Kõiv (2004): 87; cf. Neer and Kurke (2019): 169-75.

which they shared with the colonial Apollo (Pi. *P*. 5.60; fr. 140a.58 SM).[122] In the view of many scholars, however, Pindar, unlike Kallimakhos, credits the Aigeidai, rather than the Battiads, with the establishment of the cult at both Thēra and Kyrēnē.[123] Moreover, *Pythian* 5 seems to contain a coded reference to the hero Thēras as cult founder (ὁ δ᾽ ἀρχαγέτας… θῆρας, *P*. 5.60–61).

Despite the cult's strong Spartan associations, a scholiast on the ode (Σ *P*. 5.104b) offers an intriguing connection to Thebes. According to the scholiast, the Aigeid association with Apollo Karneios originated at Thebes; from there, the god was conveyed to Sparta with the Aigeidai and their Herakleid allies.[124] In reality, the cult is unlikely to have truly arisen at Thebes. Nevertheless, it may be significant that Apollo was also "the chief god of the Theban polis".[125] It is apparent that the scholiast's assertion belongs to the traditions of Sparta's Theban foundation outlined above. As Pindar himself reflects these traditions, it is quite possible that *P*. 5.72–81 alludes to the contested origins of the cult. Regardless of the veracity of this allusion, it is evident that Pindar highlights Theban involvement in the settlement of Sparta, Thēra, and Kyrēnē via the cult of Apollo Karneios, whose worship "serves as the repository of Cyrenaean identity and origins".[126]

VI. The Proem of Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* Ode: Thebes and Holy Thēra

In the previous section, we have seen how, in *Pythian* 5, Pindar manipulates the contested status of the Aigeidai and their cultic connections to provide Thebes a significant role in the foundation of

[122] *IG* xii[3] 762: *SEG* 9.3.27. On the significance of the title *arkhēgetēs* at Sparta, Thēra and Kyrene, see Malkin (1993): 107-09, 111, 134n 145, 149, 170, 214; Beck–Schachter (2016): 133. See also A. Graham (1960); Lane (2009): 17, 129, 211, 248ff; L. Mitchell (2013): 64, 74-75, 78, 80.
[123] E.g., Malkin (1994): 105; Calame (2005): 6; Fragoulaki (2013):109.
[124] See Kõiv (2015): 35.
[125] Schachter (2016): 56-57.
[126] Krummel (2014): 158. See also Golinski (2016): 143-46.

Kyrēnē. In a similar vein, I contend that Thebes' links to Thēra are the reason for the island's unusual prominence in the proem of *Pythian* 4. To begin with, the island's later significance as the springboard of the Battiad colonization (ll. 257–61) is not adequate to explain its role as the site of Mēdeia's address (τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος…Θήραιον) or its designation as ἱερός (holy).[127] This emphasis on the prophecy's Thēraian setting is evident even in the syntax; the hyperbaton between ἔπος and its modifier Θήραιον strongly accentuates the location of Mēdeia's prophetic vision.[128] In his commentary, Bruce Braswell observes that "Pindar brought the Argonauts to Thēra so that the island can serve as the setting for Medea's speech".[129] Braswell's contention, however, offers no real explanation for Pindar's choice, which seems arbitrary. As Sigelman astutely notes, Braswell merely "highlights the strangeness of the poet's decision" to place the prophecy on Thēra.[130]

Therefore, I suggest that one of Pindar's aims in locating Mēdeia's prophecy on the island, the departure point of Battos' colonial expedition, is to insert it into the mythical episodes that prefigure Kyrēnē's foundation. Since the Aigeids' Theban origins had already been emphasized in *Pythian* 5, the island's introduction into the *ktisis* story of *Pythian* 4 would recall these traditions for the audience. Pindar's use of Thēra to suggest a Theban role in these events would have two effects; for one thing, it would presumably tighten the bonds between the two cities, particularly if an Aigeid lineage group was present at Kyrēnē. In addition, this tactic would raise, or at least call to mind, Thebes' standing at Kyrēnē. Both of these effects serve the poet's principal objectives in *Pythian* 4: the restoration of civic harmony at Kyrēnē and the return of Damophilos from exile. Pindar's allusions to the island's Theban connections, however, are not limited to the Aigeidai.

[127] Sigelman (2016): 116.
[128] Felson (1999): 15.
[129] Braswell (1988): 79.
[130] Sigelman (2016): 116.

Regarding Thēra's epithet ἱερός, the scholia provide an intriguing possibility: that Pindar's use of the adjective alludes to Kadmos' connection to the island:

> **ἱερὰν νᾶσον τὴν Θήραν** οὐχ ἁπλῶς ὀνομάζει, ἀλλ' ὅτι **Κάδμος** κατὰ ζήτησιν Εὐρώπης τῆς ἀδελφῆς στελλόμενος προσ-ορμισθεὶς τῇ νήσῳ **ἀνέκτισε Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν αὐτόθι**, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Θεόφραστος (Σ Pi. *P.* 4.10f Drchmn).
>
> He does not call Thēra a holy island casually, but because **Kadmos**, when engaged in the search for his sister Europa, put in at Thēra and **erected a temple of Poseidon and Athena there**, as Theophrastos observes.
>
> **ἱερὰν** δὲ εἶπε **τὴν Θήραν** ἤτοι διὰ τὸ περὶ τὴν γῆν ἰδίωμα· κισσηρώδης γὰρ οὖσα πολυφόρος ἐστὶ καὶ πολύκαρπος· ἢ ὅτι **Κάδμος** ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ **τὴν νῆσον οἰκίσας βωμοὺς ἱδρύσατο Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς** (Σ Pi. *P.* 4.10b Drchmn).
>
> And he called Thēra holy either on account of the peculiar nature of the land—although composed of pumice stone, it is productive and fruitful—or because **Kadmos**, after arriving at the island, **settled it and established altars [there] for Poseidon and Athena.**

Herodotos does not relate this detail in his overview of Thēraian history; however, he does place Kadmos on Thēra, where he founds a settlement (Hdt. 4.147.4–5). After eight generations these Kadmeians are joined by settlers from Sparta under the eponymous Thēras, who obtains the local kingship from his relatives due to his descent from the hero (Hdt. 4.147.1–3, 148.1–3). As these tales seem to have been circulating during the fifth century, the scholiasts' reading seems plausible.[131] Pindar's fondness for the Kadmos myth, which he at times alludes to quite obliquely (e.g., Pi. *N.* 5.22–25) only reinforces their assertions.[132]

Braswell, however, discounts any connection to Kadmos. Instead he attributes Thēra's designation as ἱερά to the island's history of volcanic activity.[133] In support of his position, he

[131] On oral tradition in Herodotos, see Evans (1991b); Luraghi (2001). On the accuracy of Pindaric scholia, cf. Lefkowitz (1975); (1991): 147-60; Dickey (2007): 38-40.
[132] On Kadmos in Pindar, see Fogelmark (1979); Olivieri (2011a): 19-46.
[133] Braswell (1988): 69.

offers the parallel of the Aiolian island Thērasia (Roman Vulcano) which, as the purported location of Hephaistos' smithy, was labeled ἱερά.[134] Considering the congruence between Herodotos and the scholia, Braswell's rejection of the latter in favor of this "obvious" solution is over-hasty.[135] For comparanda, Braswell notes Homer's habitual application of ἱερός to cities and certain islands, namely Euboia (*Il*. 2.535) and the Ekhinades (*Il*. 2.625–26). He further cites Hesiod's description of the distant Tyrsenian isles at the conclusion of the *Theogony* (μάλα τῆλε μυχῷ νήσων ἱεράων, Hes. *Th*. 1015). The latter comparison is misguided, as it belongs to a discrete tradition of the Isles of the Blessed (Νῆσοι μακάρων), the mythical western islands inhabited by heroes granted immortality by Zeus.[136]

Yet Braswell's reference, however inadvertent, may be more relevant than he realizes; according to a local Theban tradition, the city's akropolis, the Kadmeia, was also termed the Island of the Blessed.[137] In his *Thebaika*, the Theban historian Armenidas (fl. c. 500) attests to the Kadmeia's designation as such:

> Μακάρων νῆσος· ἡ ἀκρόπολις τῶν ἐν Βοιωτίαι Θηβῶν τὸ παλαιόν, ὡς ᾽Αρμεν<ί>δας (*BNJ* 378 F 5).[138]
> Isle of the Blessed: the akropolis of Thebes in Boiotia in ancient days, according to Armen<i>das.

Lykophron (*Alex*. 1204–05) also references this custom in his *Alexandra* (ll. 1204–05).[139] If the scholiast on these lines is to be trusted, the title was epigraphically attested on the Kadmeia: [140]

> νήσοις δὲ Μακάρων· τὸ ἑξῆς <****> οὐχ ὡς ἄλλοι τὰς μακάρων νήσους ἐν τῷ Ὠκεανῷ λέγει ὁ Λυκόφρων εἶναι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν Θήβαις. τὰ {τοῦ} Ἕκτορος ὀστᾶ κατὰ χρησμὸν οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐκ Τροίας

[134] Th. 3.88.3.
[135] Braswell (1988): 69.
[136] Hom. *Od*. 4.563; Hes. *Op.* 171.
[137] Tufano (2019): 169-77; Beck (2020); 171.
[138] *BNJ* 378 F 5 (=Hesychius M §110 s.v. Μακάρων νῆσος).
[139] McNelis and Sens (2016): 193-98.
[140] Hurst (2012); Cook (2018): 360-62.

> κομίσαντες ἔθηκαν εἰς τὴν Οἰδιποδείαν κρήνην καλουμένην. τὴν τοῦ Διὸς γένεσιν οἱ μὲν ἐν Κρήτῃ, οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ, οὗτος δὲ ἐν Θήβαις (5) λέγει, ἔνθα καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται ταῦτα· αἵδ' εἰσὶ Μακάρων νῆσοι, τόθι περ τὸν ἄριστον Ζῆνα θεῶν βασιλῆα Ῥέα τέκε τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ (Σ Lyc. *Alex*. 1204b).
>
> on the Islands of the Blessed: as follows […] Lykophron does not locate the Islands of the Blessed in Ocean, but rather at Thebes. In accordance with an oracle, the Greeks conveyed the bones of Hektor from Troy and placed them at the beside a spring named [sc. after] Oidipous. Concerning the birth of Zeus, some ascribe it to Krete, others to Arkadia, but he [i.e., Lykophron] places it at Thebes, where these words have been inscribed: Here are the Islands of the Blessed, there Rhea, queen of the gods bore mightiest Zeus.

The identification of the Kadmeia as the Island(s) of the Blessed is bound up in epichoric myth surrounding the semi-divine house of Kadmos; of particular significance are the marriage of Kadmos and Harmonia (cf. Pi. *P*. 3.86–95; frr. 29; 32; 70b.26–32) and various traditions concerning their descendants. The birth of Herakles and his family's residence in Thebes are also relevant. Amid the Mykenaian ruins, monuments on the Kadmeia anchored cultural memories such as the Theban wars in real historical space (cf. Pi. *N*. 9.16–26; *N*. 10.8–9), creating a Theban Erinnerungsraum ("memory space");[141] the most notable mytho-historic landmarks are the "holy" walls and gates of Thebes (ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης, Hom. *Il*. 4.378; cf. Pi. fr. 94b.59–60 SM)[142] and the Kadmeion ("the house of Kadmos"), the location of Semele's death and Dionysos' birth (cf. *O*. 2.22–45; *P*. 3.97–99); 11.1 –11; *I*. 7.3–5; fr. 75.9–12 SM).[143] Other divinities, namely Zeus and Herakles, are also said to have been born on the Kadmeia (cf. Pi. *P*. 9.76–88; *N*. 1.33– 72; 10.13–18; *I*. 1.15–30; 7.5–7; fr. 52s SM).[144] However, the city's

[141] See A. Assmann (1999); J. Assmann (2011). For Thebes in particular, see Ganter (2006a); Manolova (2009); Berman (2015); Hawes (2016); (2017b).
[142] Pi. fr. 94b SM (=*Parth*. 2).
[143] Dakouri-Hild (2001); (2006); Manolova (2009).
[144] Pi. fr. 52s SM (=*Pa*. 18).

exceptional status as the birthplace of immortals was not merely an epichoric tradition, as a fragment of Sophokles attests:

> Θήβας λέγεις μοι καὶ πύλας ἑπταστόμους, οὗ δὴ μόνον τίκτουσιν αἱ θνηταὶ θεούς (S. fr. 773 Radt).[145]
>
> You speak to me of Thebes and its seven-mouthed gates, the only [place] where mortals give birth to gods.

In the historic period, these deities were honored among the ruins of palatial Thebes.[146]

Unsurprisingly, Pindar primarily evokes this conception of Thebes in works written for his fellow Thebans; Pindar's apostrophe to "blessed Thebe" (ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα, *I*. 7.1), in the opening lines of *Isthmian* 7, as well as the remains his First *Hymn* (fr. 29–35), a Thebanocentric cosmogony, are the most notable examples.[147] However, the poet's engagement with this tradition is neither limited to his religious poetry nor his compositions for a Theban audience; in *Olympian* 2, which was performed before the tyrant Theron at Akragas, Pindar promotes the Labdakids' affinity with the gods.[148] Significantly, Pindar also accords Kadmos a place among the blessed heroes in the ode's description of the mythical islands (ll. 68–80).[149] The ambrosial waters of the Dirkē may also allude to this mythopoetic image of Thebes (*P*. 4.298–99; cf. *I*. 6.73–75; fr. 198b; 52k.35 SM).[150]

Therefore, it is likely that Thēra's epithet ἱερά evokes several traditions; the scholiasts' explanation, that the periphrasis ἱεράν νᾶσον refers to Kadmos' establishment of cults sanctuaries on Thēra, recalls the island's *oikist* myth, which features further Theban

[145] S. fr. 773 Radt (=Heraclid. *Pol*. 1.17).
[146] See also Schachter (1981-94): 1.11, 13-16, 30-31, 38-41, 151-52, 165-68, 187-91, 230, 233-34; 2.14-30, 62-65, 111, 118, 191-93, 200-01; 3.22-27, 30, 145-49; Symeonoglou (1985): 122-32.
[147] *Isthmian* 7: Young (1973): 16-37; Willcock (1995): 60-64; Agócs (2009); *Hymn* 1: Hardie (2000).
[148] This is a notable feature of *Hymn* 1 as well. See Hardie (2000): 20-21.
[149] See Currie (2005): 42-44, 397-404.
[150] On this point, see pp. 7-8 above.

involvement. Thus, an intimation of Thebes' status as an "Island of the Blessed" would be quite likely here. If I am correct, the adjective also seems to allude to Kadmos' place among the heroes that enjoy immortality on the Fortunate Isles; that ancient authorities sometimes locate these islands near Libya further suggests that the poet intended resemblance of Thēra to Thebes and the Islands of the Blessed.[151] The Thēraian setting of Mēdeia's prophecy (τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος… Θήραιον, ll. 9–10) seems deliberately chosen to evoke these correspondences, which are activated by ἱερός.[152] This allusion further magnifies Thebes' role, through Thēra, in the Kyrēnaian *ktisis* myth. Availing himself of this Theban prestige, the poet has greater means prevail upon Arkesilas and obtain his chief poetic aims: to bring to a close Damophilos' exile and curtail the king's autocratic rule, which would do much to end the threat of *stasis* in the city.

VII. Thēra and Mēdeia's Prophecy

In their analysis of *Pythian* 4, critics have largely failed to note the relevance of the Battiad *aition* ("origin story") to the tumultuous political scene at Kyrēnē and the perilous circumstances of Arkesilas in particular. In this respect, I contend that certain parallels within the ode itself, as well as intertextual echoes with *Pythian* 5, expose the poet's didactic aims. This analysis also necessitates a broader contextualization of the Euphēmid origin myth. For this I turn primarily to Herodotos, whose presentation of the Thēraian-Kyrēnaian *ktisis* relies upon the same oral traditions as *Pythian* 4.[153] By comparing the two, it is evident that Pindar, in his efforts to advise the king, alludes to elements of the broader oral tradition present in Herodotos.

[151] D.S. 5.19.1; cf. Str. 3.2.12. See Sulimani (2017): 224-25.
[152] See Matthews (1965): 1-3; Braswell (1988): 7-19; Dräger (1993): 229ff.
[153] Malkin (1994): 25; Giangiulio (2001): 120-25; Corcella (2006): 36-38; Bremmer (2020): 449-50; 38; cf. *EGM* II 48 n.17, 57-58.

The correspondences that I observe within the ode are character based, namely analogies of the poet and victor with various figures within the narrative itself. One such analogy is that between the poet and the prophetess Mēdeia, noted already by Sigelman.[154] Pindar's identification with such prophetic figures is a common trope in the *epinikia* (e.g., *O.*7.32–55; 8.2–6; *P.* 8.44–55; *N.* 1.64–72; *I.* 6.51–54).[155] This metaleptic voice blending is often signaled by the use of direct speech (*oratio recta*), a technique the poet employs for Mēdeia's prophecy.[156] Structurally, the spatiotemporal framing of her address recalls that of the ode as whole. Uhlig notes that her speech "like the poem in which it is quoted, travels freely through time and space, demonstrating the spatio-temporal boundary crossing that is a hallmark of Pindar's poetry".[157] Specific spatiotemporal correspondences and semantic echoes also serve to blend the two narrative voices. One such example is the repetition of Battos' Delphic oracle, which is first recounted by Pindar (ll. 3–8) and then echoed by Mēdeia (ll. 53–56). Furthermore, Pindar's use of the adjective ἀλλοδαπός ("alien", l. 254) to characterize the Battiads' Lemnian ancestry recalls Mēdeia's use of the term at l. 50.

Another significant parallel is that between Arkesilas and his royal ancestors, the *Stammvater* ("lineage founder") Euphēmos and the *oikist* Battos. Both figures serve as heroic analogues to the victor, a device which Pindar utilizes elsewhere in the *epinikia* (e.g., *P.* 1.50–57; 2.13–20; 6.19–54; *I.* 1.14–3; 4.34–55).[158] These analogues often have an exemplary or didactic function, particularly in the dynastic odes (e.g., *O.* 1.54–66; *P.* 1.92–100; *P.* 2.21–48; 3.8–37, 80–109).[159] The use of ancestral exemplars in particular has precedent in *Olympian* 2, in which

[154] Sigelman (2016): 118-19.
[155] Hubbard (1986):33 19n; Mackie (2003): 88; Sigelman (2016): 45; Uhlig (2019):21-62.
[156] De Jong (2013): 99-103, 112-13; Uhlig (2019): 81.
[157] Uhlig (2019): 81-82.
[158] Young (1971): 39-43; Rutherford (2014): 110.
[159] Cole (1981): 127-36; Morgan (2015): 1-15, 169-88; Alley (2019): 7-48, 87-99.

Pindar instructs the tyrant Thēron using the example of the Labdakids (ll. 22–45; cf. Σ Pi. *O*. 2.22 Drchmn).[160] In *Pythian* 4, the unusual emphasis on the continuity of the king's lineage across seventeen generations from Euphēmos to Battos (ll. 9–11) and eight generations from Battos to Arkesilas (l. 65) suggests such a relationship. According to Sigelman, this correspondence between the king and his ancestors is heightened by their role as addressees for the various prophetic figures with which Pindar identifies, namely Mēdeia, the Pythia, and the mysterious Eurypylos.[161] Of these connections, that between Arkesilas and Battos is particularly pronounced. At *P*. 4.59–67, for instance, the two appear in juxtaposition as rulers of Kyrēnē and favorites of Apollo. By implying the god's continued favor, this parallel is surely meant to promote the divine sanction of Battiad rule, and thus justify its current existence.[162]

The parallel between Arkesilas and Euphēmos, the divinely-chosen recipient of Libyan territory, clearly serves the same purpose. I would suggest, however, that Euphēmos also functions as a negative exemplar with broad thematic relevance, although his portrayal is specifically intended to influence the king. To me, the hero's exemplary status is apparent from his unflattering portrayal in Mēdeia's speech. While certain critics also consider his depiction to be unfavorable, such an interpretation of Euphēmos has not been previously offered. This failure to acknowledge Euphēmos as a negative exemplar is understandable. Such an unflattering depiction of a victor's ancestor could reflect poorly on his descendants and thus violate the overarching encomiastic principle of the ode. However, ancestral exemplars of this sort have precedence elsewhere in the *epinikia*. The most prominent of these would be the Labdakids in *O*.

[160] Griffith (1991).
[161] Sigelman (2016): 118-19.
[162] Athanassaki (2009): 438-49.

2 cited above. It is also suggestive that negative exemplars are a common feature of the dynastic odes.[163]

The relevant passage describes the Argonauts' encounter with the Libyan god Eurypylos-Tritōn on their journey home from Kolkhis. Prior to her admonishment of the hero, Mēdeia first reveals that the *xenion* ("gift of hospitality") that the god bestows upon him, a divine clod of Libyan earth (δαιμονίη βῶλαξ, *P*. 4.37), presages his descendants' hegemony over Libya:

> κεῖνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μεγαλᾶν πολίων
> ματρόπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι, τόν ποτε
> Τριτωνίδος ἐν προχοαῖς
> λίμνας θεῷ ἀνέρι εἰδομένῳ γαῖαν διδόντι
> ξείνια πρῴραθεν Εὔφαμος καταβαίς
> δέξατ' (Pi. *P*.4.13–23).
> this sign will make Thēra the mother-city
> of great cities—that which once
> Euphamos received amid the channels
> of Lake Tritonis, when he descended
> from the prow and accepted the gift of earth
> given by a god in the form of a man.

Significantly, this act of *xenia* serves to liken Euphēmos to the victor. It is well established that the hero's acceptance of the soil is meant to parallel Arkesilas' receipt of his own *xenia* gift, the victory ode itself. [164] Since *Pythian* 5 alone fulfills the requirement of an *epinikion*, the gift-like status of its sister ode would be even more apparent to the king and other participants in the victory *komos*.[165]

Mēdeia continues by describing the hero's interaction with the god and his subsequent carelessness, which results in the clod's loss:

[163] Cole (1981): 127-36; Morgan (2015): 1-15, 169-88; Alley (2019): 7-48, 87-99.
[164] Calame (2003): 46; (2014): 334 14n; Stephens (2011): 191-93; Potamiti (2015): 2-5; Agócs (2020): 102ff.
[165] On the questionable status of *P*. 4 as a victory ode, see Alley (2019).

τουτάκι δ’ οἰοπόλος δαίμων ἐπῆλθεν, φαιδίμαν
ἀνδρὸς αἰδοίου πρόσοψιν
θηκάμενος· **φιλίων δ’ ἐπέων**
ἄρχετο, ξείνοις ἅ τ’ ἐλθόντεσσιν εὐεργέται
δεῖπν’ ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον.
ἀλλὰ γὰρ νόστου **πρόφασις** γλυκεροῦ
κώλυεν μεῖναι. φάτο δ’ Εὐρύπυλος Γαι-
αόχου παῖς ἀφθίτου Ἐννοσίδα
ἔμμεναι· γίγνωσκε δ’ ἐπειγομένους· ἂν δ’ εὐθὺς ἁρπάξαις ἀρούρας
δεξιτερᾷ προτυχὸν ξένιον μάστευσε δοῦναι.
οὐδ’ ἀπίθησέ νιν, ἀλλ’ ἥρως ἐπ’ ἀκταῖσιν θορὼν,
χειρί οἱ χεῖρ’ ἀντερείσαις
δέξατο βώλακα δαιμονίαν.
πεύθομαι δ’ αὐτὰν κατακλυσθεῖσαν ἐκ δούρατος
ἐναλίαν βᾶμεν σὺν ἅλμᾳ
ἑσπέρας ὑγρῷ πελάγει σπομέναν. **ἦ**
μάν νιν ὕστρυνον θαμά
λυσιπόνοις θεραπόντεσ-
σιν φυλάξαι· τῶν δ’ ἐλάθοντο φρένες
καί νυν ἐν τᾷδ’ ἄφθιτον νάσῳ κέχυται Λιβύας
εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα πρὶν ὥρας (Pi. *P.* 4.28–43).

It was then the solitary god approached [us],
bearing the radiant appearance of a man;
and he began [to speak] **with friendly words**,
the sort that hosts first [use] when offering
strangers a meal upon their arrival.
Yet, the **excuse** of our sweet return home
prevented us from staying. He said that he was Eurypylos
son of the immortal earth-holder and shaker,
and he recognized that we were pressed for time.
After immediately seizing some soil
with his right hand he sought to offer what was first at hand
as a guest-gift. Nor did he [the god] fail to persuade him [Euphēmos],
rather the hero, leapt upon the shore
and, planting his hand firmly in his [the god’s],
received the divine clod.
I heard that it [the clod] was washed off the ship
by a wave at evening and was gone

following [the paths] of the watery main.
And truly I often urged him to guard it
using his attendants to lighten his labor,
but their minds were thoughtless
and now the undying seed of expansive
Libya has been shed on this island prematurely.

It is worth noting that the interpretation of ll. 40–41 is disputed; Braswell and other scholars prefer ὥτρυνον ("urged", l. 40) to take a dative object (λυσιπόνοις θεραπόντεσσιν, the labor-lightening servants, ll. 40–41), rather than the more typical accusative person and infinitive construction rendered above (νιν, l. 40 referring to Euphēmos, with φυλάξαι "to guard", l. 41).[166] In such a construction, νιν would be construed as the object of the complementary infinitive φυλάξαι ("to guard", l. 41) and have αὐτὰν ("it", l. 38), which itself refers to the βώλακα ("lump of earth, l. 37), as its antecedent instead of ἥρως ("hero, l. 37): "I often urged the servants to guard it". Braswell contends that "ὥτρυνον θαμά [often urged, l. 40] is something "Medea might have done with the servants, but hardly with Euphemus".[167] However, his rejection, based on conventions of conduct rather than philological principle, is unwarranted. This is particularly true for a characteristically transgressive figure such as Mēdeia, who is consistently depicted violating behavioral norms.[168]

The necessities that shape Pindar's presentation of the myth in *Pythian* 4 are best illuminated through comparison with other literary sources that treat Kyrēnē's foundation.[169] Scholars working with this material have largely concluded that Pindar and Herodotos—as well as later literary authorities on Kyrēnē's foundation, in this case Apollōnios Rhodios and

[166] Farnell (1932): ad loc; see also Braswell (1988): 120.
[167] Similarly, Barnett suggests that we may infer an elliptical "him", which would permit the conventional reading of νιν as the clod; see Braswell (1988): 120.
[168] Krevans (1997): 72-75; O'Higgins (1997): 103–05, 122ff.
[169] For the various constructions of Libyan mythology in Pindar, Apollonios Rhodios and Kallimakhos, see Köhnken (2003); (2012).

Herodotos, draw on the same sources, be they oral or already textual, detailing a Minyan Return.[170] Nevertheless, examining the idiosyncrasies in their various accounts can be constructive and help the reader better recognize each author's influences and intent.[171] Although Mēdeia's prophecy is unique to Pindar, both Herodotos and Apollōnios depict the Argonauts' encounter with the Libyan god Tritōn (Hdt. 4.179.1–3; A.R. 4.1537–1619). Juxtaposing Apollōnios' depiction of this event, which he seems to conflate with an anecdote in Herodotos' Libyan *logos* (4.179.1–3), with its intertext in *Pythian* 4 is particularly useful for this exercise in Pindaric exegesis.[172]

In both Apollonios and Pindar, Euphēmos receives a "divine clod" (δαιμονίη βῶλαξ, 4.1734; cf. βώλακα δαιμονίαν, *P*. 4.37) as a guest-gift (γαίης… ξείνι'… δέχθε, 4.1552–54; cf. γαῖαν…ξείνια…δέξατ', *P*. 4.21–23) from Tritōn, whom both authors identify with the prefoundational Kyrēnaian king Eurypylos.[173] However, in the *Argonautika* (4.1547–50), the men, lost in the environs of Lake Tritōnis, initiate this human–divine interaction by propitiating the god with a tripod. In Herodotos' version (4.179.1–3), Iasōn is on a separate adventure, but is similarly lost; Tritōn then appears of his own accord and asks for the tripod. This last detail is more consistent with Mēdeia's representation of the Libyan god's epiphany in *Pythian* 4.

The analogous episode in the *Argonautika* reads as a distorted version of these events in *Pythian* 4; specifically, the precise nature of the handful of earth, its relationship with Thēra, and the island's part in the ensuing events are all remarkably inconsistent with Pindar. Although the

[170] Malkin (1994): 25; Giangiulio (2001): 120-25; Corcella (2006): 36-38; Bremmer (2020): 449-50; 38; cf. *EGM* II 48 n.17, 57-58.
[171] On Pindar and Herodotos' sources in particular, see Huxley (1975): 37-38; Malkin (1994): 50-56; (2003); Giangiulio (2001); Pavlou (2012): 98-101; Thomas (2019): 105, 182; Bremmer (2020).
[172] On the relationship between each author's depiction of this event, see Jackson (1987); Stephens (2011): 191-98; Adorjáni (2012); (2013); Agócs (2020): 102-19.
[173] Köhnken (2003): 70-73.

bōlax is the "central image" of the Fourth *Pythian*'s proem and possesses a talismanic power, in a fundamental sense it is simply a handful of soil; Apollōnios' earth, however, is more than a mere lump of clay: she is also the nymph Kallistē, the daughter of Tritōn and Libya, which she reveals to Euphēmos in a prophetic dream at Anaphē:

> "Τρίτωνος γένος εἰμί, τεῶν τροφὸς ὦ φίλε παίδων,
> οὐ κούρη, Τρίτων γὰρ ἐμοὶ Λιβύη τε τοκῆες.
> ἀλλά με Νηρῆος παρακάτθεο παρθενικῇσιν
> ἂμ πέλαγος ναίειν Ἀνάφης σχεδόν· εἶμι δ' ἐς αὐγάς
> ἠελίου μετόπισθε τεοῖς νεπόδεσσιν ἑτοίμη." (A.R. 4.1741–45)
> 'I am of Triton's line, friend, the nurse of your children,
> not your daughter; Triton and Libya are my parents.
> Simply commit me to the maiden daughters of Nereus
> to dwell in the depths near Anaphē, and I shall arise into the
> sunlight one day, at hand for your offspring."

Following the interpretation and advice of Iasōn, rather than that of his wife, Euphēmos casts the clod into the sea, from which Apollōnios confirms it eventually reappears as the island Kallistē–Thēra (ll. 1746–64), the future refuge of Euphēmos' lineage prior to their arrival in Libya. The circumstances in Pindar are rather different; as we have already noted, Mēdeia utters her prophecies on Thēra, whose existence is independent of the Euphēmids and Battos' colonial destiny. Moreover, the inevitability of the Euphēmids' return to the site of the prophecy (ll. 257–58), where the lineage is reunited with the clod, further heightens Thēra's role in the ensuing events. In *Pythian* 4, this Euphēmid return is itself mirrored by the fictive journey of Arkesilas—and any other putative Battiads among the audience— to the island, as signaled by the τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος…Θήραιον ("the Thēraian utterance of Mēdeia"). [174] This suggests Pindar's desire to remind the Kyrēnaians and their king of their origins on the Kadmeian island. This

[174] Felson (1999): 15.

includes, as we shall see, the redemptive role of the Thebans in delivering the Euphēmid line to Thēra, where it was subsequently preserved under their rule.

In Pindar's version, by contrast, Euphēmos and the Argonauts leave Eurypylos-Tritōn unrequited. After accepting the clod, the heroes suddenly depart, professing that their need to return home prevents their acceptance of further hospitality. Given the salience of *xenia* ties throughout the ode, Euphēmos' failure to form such a bond with his host is both significant and unflattering; the hero's lack of reciprocity arguably contributes to his unfavorable characterization in Mēdeia's prophetic outburst. The hero's πρόφασις ("excuse") may bear negative connotations as well.[175]

Recent work on reperformance and the various regional corpora of the *epinikia* demonstrate the utility of reading the victory odes intertextually; this can be a fruitful exercise for odes performed in relative proximity, in both a spatial and temporal sense.[176] Thus, readers of Pindar should be alert for possible intertextual correspondences in odes composed for a single *polis* or family. This is particularly true for *Pythians* 4 and 5, which were both performed at Kyrēnē as part of the celebrations for Arkesilas' victory in 462/461. As several scholars have observed the two odes contain several significant correspondences and should be read together.[177] One could certainly argue that, at *P.* 4.32 πρόφασις has a neutral connotation.[178] However, the unequivocally negative context of the term in *Pythian* 5, which occurs in a *eukhos*

[175] On the semantics of πρόφασις, see Rawlings (1975); on Pindar's use of the term in these two instances, see Rawlings (1975): 23-27.
[176] Morrison (2010).
[177] E.g., Burton (1962): 140-41; Longely-Cook (1989): 184-208; Neer and Kurke (2019): 189-217; Waldo (2019): 106.
[178] LSJ s.v. πρόφασις; Braswell (1988): 110.

("vaunt, boast; praise") for the charioteer Karrhōtos, suggests that πρόφασις is also semantically loaded in *Pythian* 4:[179]

> [sc. τῷ σε μὴ λαθέτω]…
> φιλεῖν δὲ Κάρρωτον ἔξοχ᾽ ἑταίρων·
> ὃς οὐ τὰν Ἐπιμαθέος ἄγων
> ὀψινόου θυγατέρα **Πρόφασιν**, Βαττιδᾶν
> ἀφίκετο δόμους θεμισκρεόντων (Pi. *P*. 5.26–29).
> [sc. Therefore, do not forget]…
> to esteem above other companions Karrhōtos,
> who did not return to the house of the justly-ruling
> Battiadai bearing Prophasis, the daughter
> of unobservant Epimētheos above other companions.

Remarkably, πρόφασις appears here in a genealogical metaphor, which distinguishes it from the three other occurrences of the noun in Pindar (*P*. 4.32; fr. 228 SM; fr. 245 SM).[180] Despite the term's singular deification at *P*. 5.28, the rarity of the noun alone suggests a respondence between its appearances in *Pythians* 4 and 5; and yet, there are additional reasons to suspect such a connection.

The metrics of *P*.4.32, the first verse of antistrophe 2, and *P*. 5.28, the sixth verse of epode 2 further support such a semantic correspondence. Even though the colometry of the two lines differs, the similar metrical position of πρόφασις in each is highly suggestive:

> ἀλλὰ γὰρ νόστου **πρόφασις** γλυκερoῦ (*P*. 4.32): |– –| –|– – –┤
> ὀψινόου θυγατέρα **Πρόφασιν**, Βαττιδᾶν (*P*. 5.28): |– | – –|– –┤

Although πρόφασις comprises parts of larger metra (dactylic and reversed dondran, respectively), both instances of the noun scan as an anapest (–) that precedes the final three syllables of the two verses. Consequently, πρόφασις in *P.* 4.32 is likely colored by the negative

[179] See Maslov (2012): 74.
[180] W. Slater (1969): s.v. πρόφασις.

associations of its use at *P*. 5.28; this would be particularly true if *Pythian* 5 was the first of the two odes to be performed.[181]

In his analysis of *Pythians* 4 and 5, Wilamowitz associates *P*. 5.28 with a Pindaric fragments in which πρόφασις occurs:[182]

> τιθεμένων **ἀγώνων πρόφασις**
> ... ἀρετὰν ἐς αἰπὺν ἔβαλε σκότον (Pi. fr. 228 SM).[183]
> when **contests** are appointed, **excuse**
> casts excellence into utter darkness.

Like Pindar's acclamation of the charioteer Karrhōtos, the agonistic context of this *gnomē* ("wisdom saying") is apparent.[184] Wilamowitz further suggests a common derivation from an Ibykean *paroimia* ("proverb") preserved by Zenobios:

> **ἀγών πρόφασι**ν οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται οὔτε **φίλια** (Ibyc. fr. 344 Page).[185]
> neither **contest** nor **friendship** admit of **excuse**.

Tellingly, Ibykos' coordination of ἀγών ("contest, trial") with φίλια ("friendship, affection, hospitality") is apparent in both *Pythians* 4 and 5. Admittedly, the former ode contains only brief references to Arkesilas' victory (l. 2, l. 267); nevertheless, merely by virtue of its performance context, Arkesilas' victory *komos*, the king's athletic achievement overshadows the Fourth *Pythian* in its entirety.[186] In the latter ode, the contest itself receives unusual distinction, most notably in the poet's tribute to Karrhōtos (ll. 26–53). [187] *Philia* and the allied concept of *xenia*, on

[181] E.g., Burton (1962): 137; Neer and Kurke (2019): 193, 350 22n.
[182] Wilamowitz (1922): 381 2n.
[183] Pi. fr. 228 SM (=Plu. *an seni* 1.783B)
[184] Burton (1962): 142-43. Incidentally, Pi. fr. 245 SM (πρόφασιν βληχροῦ γενέσθαι νείκεος) also has a proverbial flavor.
[185] Ibyc, fr. 344 Page (=Zen. *Par*. 2.45).
[186] On the need to seek genre in occasion, see Nagy (1994); Dougherty and Kurke (1998b): 6; Agócs (2012): 193-98; Olsen (2020).
[187] For the marked prominence of Karrhōtos and his performance at Delphi, see Burton (1962): 143-44; Wilhelm (1973): 23-25; Longley-Cook (1989): 230-47.

the other hand, recur prominently in both odes. The incidence and textual position of *philos* and *xenos* derivations in *Pythian* 4 and 5 suggest that these terms possess programmatic importance (e.g., ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ, *P*. 4.1; φιλίαν νόστοιο μοῖραν, *P*. 4.196; Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς, *P*. 4.299; πολύφιλον *P.* 5.4; φιλεῖν, *P*. 5.26; ξενωθείς, *P*. 5.31, δαίμον᾽ ἀνδρῶν φίλων, *P*. 5.123, etc.).[188] Suggestively, one of the ode's *angeliai* ("proclamations"), a eulogy of the king, contains the cognate synonym ἀγωνία in close proximity to the adjective φίλος ("beloved, dear"):

> **ἀγωνίας** δ᾽, ἔρκος οἷον, σθένος·
> ἔν τε Μοίσαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς **φίλας** (*P*. 5.113–14).
> and in the *agōn*, his strength is like that of a bulwark;
> he flits among the Muses from [the side of] his dear mother.

The salience of *xenia* and *philia* in the royal Kyrēnaian odes, when taken with the allusions to Ibykos' *paroimia*, suggest that Pindar's engagement with the proverb to further his didactic aims. The poet's intent, it seems, is to suggest that, just as Karrhōtos met the challenges of the *agōn* without excuse, the king must fulfill the obligations of *philia* by restoring Damophilos to his rightful position and healing the divisions amongst his citizens. In this respect, Thebes, the source of Pindar's poetic wisdom and the site of Damophilos' refuge, is central to Pindar's message.

As Mēdeia continues her speech, she emphasizes the consequences of the clod's loss by providing a "counterfactual vision of the future":[189]

> εἰ γὰρ οἴ-
> κοι νιν βάλε πὰρ χθόνιον
> Ἀίδα στόμα, Ταίναρον εἰς ἱερὰν Εὔφαμος ἐλθών,
> υἱὸς ἱππάρχου Ποσειδάωνος ἄναξ,
> τόν ποτ᾽ Εὐρώπα Τιτυοῦ θυγάτηρ

[188] Potamiti (2015). See Benveniste (1973): 3.4, for the relationship between *xenia* and *philia*; for *philia* in Pindar, see Crotty (1982): 76-103.
[189] Uhlig (2019): 84.

τίκτε Καφισοῦ παρ’ ὄχθαις,
τετράτων παίδων κ’ ἐπιγεινομένων
αἶμά οἱ κείναν λάβε σὺν Δαναοῖς εὐ-
ρεῖαν ἄπειρον. τότε γὰρ μεγάλας
ἐξανίστανται Λακεδαίμονος Ἀργεί-
ου τε κόλπου καὶ Μυκηνᾶν.

Since, if lord Euphēmos, son of Poseidon horse-lord,
whom once Europa the daughter of Tityos bore by
the banks of the Kēphisos, had returned to holy
Tainaron and cast it at the infernal opening of Hades
the blood of the fourth generation of children
born after him would have seized that broad land
with the Danaans, for at that time they are to set forth
from mighty Lakedaimōn and the gulf of Argos and Mykenai (Pi. *P*. 4.43–49).

For scholars such as Pietro Vannicelli, Mēdeia’s counterfactual prophecy underscores the incidental part of Thēra in Kyrēnē’s foundation. To Vannicelli, the island is merely a placeholder, a steppingstone on the Euphēmids’ destined journey from Sparta to Kyrēnē.[190] Thēra’s marginality thus serves to magnify Sparta’s role in these events. Interpretations such as Vannicelli’s, however, fail to account for Thēra’s prominence in the ode; Pindar, for instance, could have utilized other mythic material that offered an unmitigated Spartan connection to Sparta, such as the Battiads’ kinship ties, through Penelope, to the house of Tyndareus.[191] In the associated myth, to which Mēdeia’s vision of an unrealized earlier expedition may allude, the Greeks, rather than stopping at Thēra, reach Libya directly from the Peloponnese.[192] Pindar’s rejection of this *ktisis* narrative suggests a specific desire to highlight Thēraian involvement in Kyrēnē’s foundation.

[190] Oddly enough, Vannicelli contends that Thēra plays a more significant role in Apollonios’ version, although his Argonauts do not stop there.
[191] As detailed in Eugammōn the Kyrēnaian’s (fl. 567/66 BCE) *Telegony*: fr. 2 Davies (fr. 3 Bernabé). For Pindar’s choice of myths in his Kyrenaian odes, see Neer and Kurke (2020): 165-68, 189ff; Robbins (2013b); (2013c).
[192] Tsagalis (2015): 382-84; Giangiulio (2001): 123-24; Malten (1911): 95ff; Huxley (1960); (1969): 168-72.

In their analysis of Pindar's "historical" and "mythical" Kyrēnaian *ktisis* narratives, Richard Neer and Leslie Kurke offer a more plausible explanation for Pindar's inclusion of Thēra. Neer and Kurke argue that the mythical foundation of the *polis* in *Pythian* 9 (d. 474/473 BCE), which is achieved by the nymph Kyrēnē and the god Apollo, was favored by local elites dissatisfied with the Battiad regime. The ode's honorand, the Kyrēnaian aristocrat Telesikrates, is likely one such malcontent. In contrast, the "historical" foundation narrative of *Pythians* 4 and 5, which features the Thēraian colonial expedition headed by Battos, was monopolized by his descendants and deployed to legitimize their continued rule at Kyrēnē. Therefore, the island's prominence in *Pythian* 4 is an aspect of Battiad ideology, whose ultimate aim is to justify their continued rule at Kyrēnē. Neer and Kurke are surely correct in their supposition; however, there are likely additional reasons for the island's prominence in *Pythian* 4. The Aigeid connection to Thēra has already been noted above; as noted above, the lineage's appearance in *Pythian* 5 highlights Theban involvement in the Dorian colonizations and thus provides the poet with a further reason to promote the role of Thēra. Therefore, rather than utilizing the Battiads' genealogical connection to Sparta via Penelope, Pindar seems interested in drawing a larger genealogical and mythological complex that reaches Thebes via Sparta.

As discussed above, the Theban link in the chain of colonial foundations is found in Herodotos' account of the happenings at Sparta and Thēra that culminate with Kyrēnē's foundation (4.145.2–149.2). Pindar also references these events. His narrative, although compressed compared to that of the historian, comprises the same key elements. Therefore, one should not assume that, if the poet neglected to mention certain details, of which the audience would be well aware, that he did not intend to convey them. This narrative compression is a hallmark of the *epinician* genre, whose audiences would be expected to fill in any narrative

gaps.[193] Consequently, Pindar's myth likely evokes the entirety of the oral traditions detailed by Herodotos in his Thēraian and Kyrēnaian *ktisis* narratives.

One such common detail of the two accounts is the Lemnian–Minyan heritage of the Euphēmid line. Herodotos notes as much in his discussion of the lineage's arrival at Sparta:

> τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀργοῦς ἐπιβατέων παίδων παῖδες ἐξελασθέντες ὑπὸ **Πελασγῶν** τῶν ἐκ Βραυρῶνος ληισαμένων τὰς Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκας, ὑπὸ τούτων ἐξελασθέντες ἐκ, **Λήμνου** οἴχοντο πλέοντες ἐς Λακεδαίμονα, ἱζόμενοι δὲ ἐν τῷ Τηϋγέτῳ πῦρ ἀνέκαιον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἰδόντες ἄγγελον ἔπεμπον πευσόμενοι τίνες τε καὶ ὁκόθεν εἰσί· οἳ δὲ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ εἰρωτῶντι ἔλεγον ὡς **εἴησαν μὲν Μινύαι, παῖδες δὲ εἶεν τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ πλεόντων ἡρώων, προσσχόντας δὲ τούτους ἐς Λῆμνον φυτεῦσαι σφέας** (Hdt. 4.145.2–3).
>
> The grandsons of the crew of the Argo were driven out by **Pelasgians**, the ones who abducted the Athenian women from Braurōn; after their expulsion, they departed **Lēmnos** and sailed to Lakedaimon and, after establishing themselves on Taÿgetos, they kindled a fire. But, when the Lakedaimonians saw this, they sent a messenger so they might learn who the men were and from where [they had arrived]: and they told the inquiring messenger that **they were Minyans, the descendants of the heroes that voyaged on the Argo, and that these men [i.e., the Argonauts] after putting in at Lēmnos, sired them**.

Like the historian, Pindar identifies the Argonauts and the Battiad heritage as Minyan (Μινυᾶν, l. 69).[194] He elsewhere characterizes their Lemnian ancestry as ἀλλοδαπός ("alien", l. 50), an adjective that often bears a negative connotation;[195] its use here alludes to the Greeks' ascription of Pelasgian–Tyrrhenian ethnicity to the Lēmnians, whose identity Pindar confirms later in the ode:[196]

> ἔν τ᾽ Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ᾽ ἐρυθρῷ
> **Λαμνιᾶν τ᾽ ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων**·
> ἔνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοις ἐπέδεί-
> ξαντο ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς

[193] Pfeijffer (2004): 220-21.
[194] Race (2012): 275 n.22.
[195] E.g., E. *Ion* 1070; Meinel (2015): 237. The adjective appears again in a similar context at line 254.
[196] Braswell (1988): 131. See also Race (2012): 273 16n.

καὶ συνεύνασθεν. καὶ ἐν **ἀλλοδαπαῖς**
σπέρμ᾽ **ἀρούραις** τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀ-
κτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον
ἦμαρ ἢ νύκτες· **τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφά-**
μου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν αἰεὶ
τέλλετο· **καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μιχθέντες ἀνδρῶν**
ἤθεσι τάν ποτε Καλλίσταν ἀπῴκησαν χρόνῳ
νᾶσον: ἔνθεν δ᾽ ὔμμι Λατοί-
δας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον
σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄστυ χρυσοθρόνου
διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας
ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις (Pi. *P*. 4.251–262).

they [i.e., the Argonauts] entered upon the expanse
of Okeanos and the Red Sea and **came among the**
man-murdering race of Lemnian women:
and there in contests of limbs they displayed
the strength of their limbs in contests for [the prize of]
a cloak **and slept [with the women]**. Then it was that in
foreign fields the fated days or nights received
the seed of your radiant prosperity; for there the line
of Euphēmos is rooted and reaches into perpetuity.
And, after inhabiting the abodes of Lakedaimonian men,
in time they settled on the island once called Kallistē. And
from there the son of Leto provided to your lineage the
plain of Libya to make prosper with divinely-sent honors
and the holy city of golden-throned Kyrēnē to govern
to you who devised an undertaking of right counsel.

Here the same key elements that appear in Herodotos' account are present: the Lēmnian Minyai come to dwell at Sparta, where they intermix sexually with the local women (Hdt. 4.145.4–5) before departing to settle Kallistē–Thēra (Hdt. 4.147.1–148.4). Despite the broad semantic range of μείγνυμι ("mix, mingle, have intercourse"), Pindar's usage of the verb at l. 257 implies ethnic admixture, much like its sexual connotations at ll. 251–52.[197]

[197] Braswell (1988): 355. Slater (1969): s.v. μείγνυμι 1-2n.

Although Pindar's account of the Minyan diaspora generally accords with Herodotos' picture of events, the poet omits the messy details of the Minyans' stay at Sparta; the historian tells us that the refugees from Lēmnos become insolent, demand access to the kingship, and commit other outrages.

> χρόνου δὲ οὐ πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος αὐτίκα οἱ Μινύαι ἐξύβρισαν, τῆς τε βασιληίης μεταιτέοντες καὶ ἄλλα ποιέοντες οὐκ ὅσια. τοῖσι ὧν Λακεδαιμονίοισι ἔδοξε αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι, συλλαβόντες δὲ σφέας κατέβαλον ἐς ἐρκτήν (Hdt. 4.146.1–2).
> But in no time at all the Minyans began to act outrageously; they demanded a share of the kingship and committed other impious acts. And so, the Lakedaimonians decided to kill them, and after seizing them threw them in prison.

Following their escape, the Minyan rebels face the threat of a Spartan army and only evade destruction through the efforts of the Kadmeian (i.e., Theban) Thēras, a Labdakid descended from Polyneikēs, the son of Oidipous:

> Θήρας ὁ Αὐτεσίωνος τοῦ Τισαμενοῦ τοῦ Θερσάνδρου τοῦ Πολυνείκεος (Hdt. 4.147.1).
> Thēras the son of Autesiōn, the son of Tisamenos, the son of Thersander, the son of Polyneikes.
>
> ἦν δὲ ὁ Θήρας οὗτος, γένος ἐὼν Καδμεῖος (Hdt. 4.147.2).
> This Thēras, by race was a Kadmeian.

In his contextualization of the adjective ἀλλοδαπός (l. 50), a scholiast provides a narrative nearly identical to that of Herodotos:

> οἱ δὲ φύντες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἦλθον εἰς Λακεδαίμονα κατὰ ζήτησιν τῶν πατέρων, καὶ προσδεχθέντες παρὰ Λάκωσι καὶ πολιτευσάμενοι συνέθεντο ἐπιθέσθαι τῇ Σπάρτῃ. γνωσθέντες δὲ συνελήφθησαν καὶ καθείρχθησαν ἐν εἱρκτῇ· κατὰ δέ τινας αἱ μητέρες ἐλθοῦσαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ἐσθῆτας ἐκείνοις περιέθεσαν καὶ αὐτόθι ἔμειναν, ἐκείνους δὲ ὡς γυναῖκας ἀποπέμψασαι κατακαλυψαμένους ἔσωσαν, οἱ δὲ παῖδες τῷ μηχανήματι λαθραίως ἀπέφυγον. τῶν δὲ Λακώνων βουλομένων αὐτοὺς ἀνελεῖν, Θήρας ὁ Αὐτεσίωνος κατὰ συντυχίαν τότε ἀποικίαν στέλλων καθικέτευσε τοὺς Λάκωνας εἰς τὴν ἀποικίαν αὐτῷ τοὺς ἄνδρας παρασχεῖν καὶ δεξάμενος εἰς τὴν Θήραν ἐκτοπίζει. συνῆν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ Σάμος, οὗ

> ἀπόγονος Βάττος, ὃς πρῶτος ἀποικίαν εἰς Κυρήνην ἔστειλεν (Σ *P*. 4.88b Drchmn).
>
> The descendants born from them [the Argonauts and Lemnians] came to Sparta seeking their forefathers; and after being received favorably among the Lakonians and obtaining citizenship they resolved to attempt a coup d'etat at Sparta. But after being judged guilty they were seized and cast into prison. And according to some, their mothers came to them and bedecked them [the prisoners] with their [the mothers'] clothes; and there they remained, but they delivered them [the men] by concealing them and sending them out as women; and by this device their sons secretly escaped. Consequently, the Lakonians wished to do away with them, while Thēras the son of Autesiōn was fortuitously preparing to dispatch a colony; he earnestly entreated the Lakonians to grant him the men [so as to convey them] to the colony, and after receiving them he took them off to Thēra. And with him was also Samos, from whom, Battos, the first to dispatch a colony to Kyrēnē, was descended.

All the essential elements of Herodotos' narrative (the Minyans' arrival, their attempt at a coup, subsequent imprisonment and escape, and deliverance at the hands of Thēras, who conveys them to Kallistē–Thēra) appear here. Their presence among the scholia suggests that the oral traditions preserved in Herodotos' Libyan *logos* were known to *Pythian* 4's primary audience.[198] Furthermore, the inclusion of varied and additional details absent from the *Histories*, such as the figure Samos and the substitution of the Minyans' wives (as in Herodotos) for their mothers, seems to indicate that these foundation stories were operative in the oral culture independent of Herodotos.

Another meaningful commonality is the Lakonian settlers' adoption of the eponym Thēra for their island (Hdt. 4.147.4, 148.4), to which Pindar's τάν ποτε Καλλίσταν alludes. As Irad Malkin notes, "the change of the name from 'Kalliste' to 'Thera' is an essential attribute of Thera's colonization" by its eponymous hero.[199] In fact, the inclusion of this detail in *Pythian* 4

[198] Giangiulio (2018): 124-25.
[199] Malkin (1994): 95.

is tantamount to an explicit reference. In light of the poet's tendency to aggrandize Thebes, why does he remain silent concerning Thēras, a veritable hometown hero? The explanation lies in the nature of the ode itself; according to Sigelman, the grand sweep of time and the myriad heroic exploits of the Argonauts, whose recitation comprises the bulk of the ode, "threaten[s] to make Arcesilaus himself insignificant…Arcesilaus, Battos, and even their Argonaut ancestor, Euphamos, are all but marginal characters on the rim of the grand Argonautic enterprise."[200]

Although Pindar characteristically exploits Theban figures that feature in the genealogies of his victors or the myths of their *poleis* (e.g., Pi. *O*. 2.25–45; *O*. 6.82–87; *N*. 4.24–32; *N*. 11.36–37), openly naming Thēras or his descendants, the Aigeidai, to glorify Thebes, could potentially invite *phthonos* ("envy") on the part of the king.[201] It is certainly suggestive that Pindar does introduce these connections in *Pythian* 5, an ode that devotes greater attention to Kyrēnē's *oikist* and his descendant's athletic achievement.[202] Highlighting Thēras in *Pythian* 4 would also invite a comparison with his contemporary Samos, one of the hubristic Minyans conveyed to the island. Such a juxtaposition would reflect poorly on the monarchy and thus was likely avoided. Thēras subsequently conveys a small number of Minyans to Kallistē–Thēra alongside Dorian colonists to join the settlement of his relatives established there by Kadmos (Hdt. 4.147.3–148.4). The continued significance of these events for both the Battiad kings and the broader Kyrēnaian populace ensures that even their brief sketch in *Pythian* 4 would evoke the larger narrative for the local audience, including details such as these that reflect negatively on the royal house.[203] Consequently, a mere reference to Thēras in this context could potentially offend the king, one of Pindar's more illustrious patrons.

[200] Sigelman (2016): 123.
[201] On *pthonos* in Pindar, see Kirkwood (1984); Bulman (1992); Morgan (2008).
[202] Burton (1962): 137; Agócs (2020): 88.
[203] See Lewis (2020): 10-11, for an analogous supposition regarding the Aiakids at Aigina in *Pythian* 8.

Herodotos' presentation of the rival Kyrēnaian and Thēraian accounts of the city's foundation (4.150.1–158.3) provides the context necessary to unravel the complexities of *Pythian* 4's narrative. Unsurprisingly, of Herodotos' two versions, the former (4.154.1–158.3) is informed by Battiad ideology and magnifies the hero's status as Kyrēnē's *arkhēgetēs*: a founder or leader in a generic sense, an adjectival form of the word is attested as an *epiklesis*, or cult epithet, of Apollo in his colonial aspect (Pi. *P*. 5.60; fr. 140a.58 SM); in the context of Sparta and its colonial foundations, the term seems to designate heroized founder–kings and their descendants, namely the Battiads at Kyrēnē (*SEG* 9.3.27), the Aigeid *basileis* ("kings") of Thēra (*IG* xii^3 762: Ϝεκσεν̄ο̄ρ | ἀρκ‧αγέτας | Προκλῆς, c. 650–600 BCE; Paus. 3.1.8), and the dual lines of Herakleid kings, the Agiads and Eurypontids, at Sparta itself (Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 118).[204]

The influence of the Thēraian Aigeidai is also apparent in the *Histories*. Malkin's contention that the Aigeids comprise some of the historian's Thēraian sources is surely correct.[205] According to Nafissi, who plausibly reconstructs these traditions, "I principi terei e Tera stessa si atteggiano a benefattori dei Battiadi: prima Theras, intercedendo presso gli Spartani, salva i Minii dalla morte; poi Grinnos di fronte alla Pizia investe Battos della autirà di ecista e quindi, in propspettiva, di rei di Cirene; infine la metropoli, a tutela del futuro dei coloni, organizza le spedizioni a Creta e a Platea."[206] As Nafissi notes, the Aigeids are represented in the Spartan–Thēraian tradition as benefactors or saviors of the Minyan Euphēmids; the Aigeid Thēras delivers the Minyai from the hostile Spartans in the aftermath of their hubristic power play. The Euphēmid lineage is subsequently preserved during the period of Aigeid rule on Thēra.

[204] On the significance of the title *arkhēgetēs* at Sparta, Thēra and Kyrene, see Malkin (1993): 107-09, 111, 134n 145, 149, 170, 214; Beck–Schachter (2016): 133. See also A. Graham (1960); Lane (2009): 17, 129, 211, 248ff; L. Mitchell (2013): 64, 74-75, 78, 80.
[205] Malkin (1994): 104.
[206] Nafissi (1981): 189.

Also significant is the Thēraian representation of the Delphic oracle authorizing the Greek settlement in Libya, the point at which Herodotos' unified narrative splinters into rival versions:

> Μέχρι μέν νυν τούτου τοῦ λόγου Λακεδαιμόνιοι Θηραίοισι (1)
> κατὰ ταὐτὰ λέγουσι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου μοῦνοι Θηραῖοι ὧδε
> γενέσθαι λέγουσι. (2) **Γρῖννος ὁ Αἰσανίου, ἐὼν Θήρα τούτου**
> **ἀπόγονος καὶ βασιλεύων Θήρης τῆς νήσου**, ἀπίκετο ἐς
> Δελφοὺς ἄγων ἀπὸ τῆς πόλιος ἑκατόμβην· εἵποντο δέ οἱ καὶ (5)
> ἄλλοι **τῶν πολιητέων καὶ δὴ καὶ Βάττος ὁ Πολυμνήστου,**
> **ἐὼν γένος Εὐφημίδης τῶν Μινυέων**. (3) χρεωμένῳ δὲ τῷ
> Γρίννῳ τῷ βασιλέϊ τῶν Θηραίων περὶ ἄλλων χρᾷ ἡ Πυθίη
> κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν. ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων· Ἐγὼ μέν, ὦναξ,
> πρεσβύτερός τε ἤδη εἰμὶ καὶ βαρὺς ἀείρεσθαι· σὺ δέ **τινα** (10)
> **τῶνδε τῶν νεωτέρων** κέλευε ταῦτα ποιέειν. **ἅμα τε ἔλεγε**
> **ταῦτα καὶ ἐδείκνυε ἐς τὸν Βάττον**. (4) τότε μὲν τοσαῦτα, μετὰ
> δὲ ἀπελθόντες ἀλογίην εἶχον τοῦ χρηστηρίου, οὔτε Λιβύην
> εἰδότες ὅκου γῆς εἴη οὔτε τολμῶντες ἐς ἀφανὲς χρῆμα ἀποστέλλειν
> ἀποικίην (Hdt. 4.150.1–4).
>
> Up to this point, the Lakedaimonians are consistent with the Thēraians in their account. But as for what follows, only the Thēraians claim that the following event occurred**. Grinnos, the son of Aisanios, a descendant of the aforementioned Thēras, ruled the island of Thēra as king**. He arrived at Delphi conveying an hekatomb from his polis and in his train was **Battos the son of Polymnestos, of the Euphēmid line of Minyai, and others of his citizens**. When Grinnos consulted the oracle about other affairs the Pythia's reply was that he found a city in Libya. But he made reply as follows: "I, O lord, am already elderly and it pains me even to stir. Bid **one of the younger men** to carry out these commands**." And while he was saying these things, he pointed at Battos**. Such was the matter left at the time. But after departing, they considered the oracle's response to be senseless, since they were ignorant of Libya and did not where the land lay; nor did they dare to dispatch a colonial expedition towards an unknown end.

In contrast to the subsequent Kyrēnaian version, here Battos is not a destined *oikist*; his status as such is dependent upon the Aigeid king Grinnos. Moreover, the Thēraian populace collectively is

credited with the city's foundation, rather than just Battos himself.[207] The prioritization of Thēra and her citizens in Herodotos recalls Mēdeia's prophecy and the glaring absence of Battos within it. A scholiast on the ode (Σ *P*. 4.10a Drchmn) offers an alternative version, which features Battos' involvement in civil strife at Thēra.[208] As the leader of the losing faction, he was exiled and advised by the Pythia to lead a colony to Libya rather than continuing his struggle. Battos' direct association with *stasis* at Thēra provides Pindar with further incentive to highlight Euphēmos' lack of reciprocity as a warning to Arkesilas to avoid the errors of his ancestors.[209] To briefly summarize my conclusions here, Pindar provides the Battiad origin story with contemporary relevance by fashioning the hero Euphēmos as a negative exemplar for Arkesilas. The poet achieves this through his characterization of Euphēmos, intertextual connections to *Pythian* 5, proverbial references, and allusions to Kyrēnaian *ktisis* narratives, oral traditions of which Herodotos also makes use.

Now that we have examined the broader mythohistorical context of *Pythian* 4, we can flesh out the parallelisms that allow for an alternative reading of the ode. Let us begin with Thēra, the island settled by Kadmos; in Herodotos, Thēra serves as a refuge for the Euphēmid line following the Minyans' outrages at Sparta, much like Thebes, "the island of the Blessed" does for the exile Damophilos. The role of the poet is also significant and recalls that of the proto-Aigeid Thēras, the author of the Minyans' salvation. To begin, Pindar, in propagating Battiad ideology and providing frank advice to the king, attempts to preserve the regime and ensure civic harmony at Kyrēnē; the allusion to the Minyans' overreaching at Sparta thus becomes a warning to the king to avoid the failings of his ancestors. Pindar, by safeguarding

[207] Malkin (1994): 169ff; Calame (2003): 86-102; Bremmer (2020): 447-52; cf. Ogden (1997): 53-59.
[208] Σ *P*. 4.10a Drchmn (=Menekles *BNJ* 270 F 6).
[209] Cf. Hdt. 4.156.2-3, who describes a violent encounter between Battos' expedition and the Thēraians.

Damophilos and ensuring his integration into the community, also acts in a comparable manner to Thēras. We should also consider this correspondence in light of the poet's claim to Aigeid heritage in *Pythian* 5 (ll. 72–76); Pindar, a descendant of Thēras, advises Arkesilas, a descendant of Euphēmos and Samos, to beware making the same mistakes as his ancestors, which required Thēras' intervention. To further illuminate the Thebanicity of Pindar's Fourth *Pythian* ode, we must turn to its epilogue (ll. 263–99), which has a notable Theban tenor; of particular importance is Pindar's instruction to Arkesilas, that "he know the wisdom of Oidipous" (γνῶθι νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν, l. 263).

VIII. The Wisdom of Oidipous and the Thebanicity of *Pythian* 4

This section comprises an analysis of the ode's epilogue (263–299), the poet's plea on behalf of the exile Damophilos. Here, I argue that the "Parable of the Oak", the riddle that Pindar offers Arkesilas, is pertinent to both the king and the exile and highlights the Theban provenance of the poet's wisdom. The Thebanicity of Pindar's counsel is once again apparent in the final lines of the ode, in which he mentions Thebes explicitly. The beginning of the epilogue is marked by a shift from the mythical glorification of the Battiad lineage to a didactic mode with contemporary relevance. In offering guidance to Arkesilas, Pindar advises that Damophilos, the Kyrēnaian exile resident at Thebes, be allowed to return home. In contrast to the poet's allusion to Kadmos and the implicit reference to Thēras and the Aigeidai, here the Theban references are explicit. The first of these is Pindar's counsel that Arkesilas learn the wisdom of Oidipous:

> γνῶθι νῦν **τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν**· εἰ
> γάρ τις ὄζους ὀξυτόμῳ πελέκει
> ἐξερείψειεν μεγάλας δρυός, αἰσχύ-
> νοι δέ οἱ θαητὸν εἶδος,
> καὶ φθινόκαρπος ἐοῖσα διδοῖ ψᾶφον περ᾽ αὐτᾶς,
> εἴ ποτε χειμέριον πῦρ ἐξίκηται λοίσθιον,

ἢ σὺν ὀρθαῖς κιόνεσσιν
δεσποσύναισιν ἐρειδομένα
μόχθον ἄλλοις ἀμφέπει δύστανον ἐν τείχεσιν,
ἑὸν ἐρημώσαισα χῶρον (Pi. *P*. 4.262–69).

Know now the **wisdom of Oidipous**: if someone with a sharp-bladed axe should
strike off the boughs of a mighty oak,
thus marring its admirable form,
even though it has lost its fruitfulness, it gives an account of itself,
if ever it comes at last to a winter's fire,
or if supported by the upright columns of a master
it engages in wretched toil within alien walls,
having forsaken its own place.

The solution to this *ainigma* is the exile Damophilos, as the scholion quoted above notes and as Pindar makes clear in subsequent lines.[210] What is significant is the provenance of the *sophia* ("wisdom") that the poet wishes to impart. The king is told to emulate the Theban Oidipous, famed for his skill in riddles. Critics such as Braswell dismiss the mention of Oidipous as merely a citation of a wisdom figure skilled at solving *ainigma*.[211] However, Pindar's choice of Oidipous, as opposed to other sage figures, is indicative of Thebes' significance as a source of wisdom.[212] The hero's appearance here may also signal an Aigeid connection. This would most likely be that of Damophilos, as alleged by Pietro Giannini. However, Oidipous' presence could also signal Arkesilas' own ancestral ties to the Aigeidai; assuming that the exile was indeed an Aigeid and that the king was, in fact, related to him, as suggested by the scholion quoted above (Σ *P*. 4.467 Drchmn), this could indeed be the case. As Pindar identifies himself with hero

[210] Above pp. 2-3. The quotation is taken from Braswell (1988): 361.
[211] Braswell (1988): 361.
[212] Susan Stephens alleges that the Battiads claimed descent from Oidipous, which would suggest an additional reason for Pindar's citation of the hero. However, her claim relies on a confused reading of Call. *Ap*. 74-75; see Stephens (2011): 194.

through their shared attribute of *sophia*, which has a common origin at Thebes, Oidipous' Theban identity does appear to be salient:

> πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγημαι **σοφίας** ἑτέροις (Pi. *P*. 4.248).
> and I lead the way in **skilled wisdom** for many other men.

Moreover, the hero's fate seems relevant to both Damophilos and Arkesilas. Like Damophilos, Oidipous suffers exile; his status as a dethroned king, however, may serve as a warning to Arkesilas.[213]

The following epode clearly indicates the context of Pindar's didactic message:

> ἐσσὶ δ' ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος, Παι-
> �άν τέ σοι τιμᾷ φάος.
> χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλ-
> λοντα τρώμαν ἕλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.
> ῥᾴδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖσαι καὶ ἀφαυροτέροις·
> ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἔσσαι δυσπαλὲς
> δὴ γίγνεται, ἐξαπίνας
> εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἀγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται.
> τὶν δὲ τούτων ἐξυφαίνονται χάριτες.
> τλᾶθι τᾶς εὐδαίμονος ἀμφὶ Κυρά-
> νας θέμεν σπουδὰν ἅπασαν (Pi. *P*. 4.270–76).
> But you are a most fitting healer, and Paian bestows upon you as an honor his redeeming light.
> one ought to apply a gentle hand to treat a festering wound.
> It is easy even for rather weak men to disturb the city;
> but to set it aright again is a difficult business,
> unless suddenly a god comes as a guide for its leaders.
> But for you the blessing of such things are woven out.
> Dare to apply all your zeal to the cause of fortunate Kyrēnē.

These verses provide clear indication of the troubled state of affairs at Kyrēnē. As Peter Agócs notes, Pindar implies that civic harmony will be restored through reconciliation rather than

[213] Gildersleeve (1885): 302. On exile and dethronement in the Oidipous myth, see Edmunds (1981): 223ff; (1985): 9-10, 15-16.

violence.[214] That Pindar specifically advises a gentle touch likely indicates Arkesilas' propensity to employ violent repression. This tendency may have been seen as ancestral in light of the oral traditions of the Euphēmids' involvement with *stasis* at Sparta and Thēra as well as the Battiads' "ancestral predisposition…towards violence and ill-rule" attested by Herodotos (4.160.1ff).[215] Tellingly, Emily Baragwanath notes a parallel between the Battiads' "inherited guilt and the corruption of the family line" and the misdeeds of the Theban Labdakids, among them Oidipous.[216] Such a correspondence may provide another reason for Pindar's citation of the hero's wisdom. Pindar himself portrays the Battiads' Lemnian ancestry in a similar light using the adjective ἀνδροφόνος ("man-slaying", l. 252). Accordingly, Pindar's advice to Arkesilas may be predicated upon the mythohistorical traditions of the king's violent predecessors.

As Pindar continues, he makes clear that this healing involves the repatriation of the exile Damophilos:

ἐπέγνω μὲν Κυράνα
καὶ τὸ κλεεννότατον μέγαρον Βάττου δικαιᾶν
Δαμοφίλου πραπίδων. κεῖνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος,
ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρ-
σαις ἑκατονταετεῖ βιοτᾷ,
ὀρφανίζει μὲν κακὰν γλῶσσαν φαεννᾶς ὀπός,
ἔμαθε δ᾽ ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν,
οὐκ ἐρίζων ἀντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς,
οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει.
εὖ νιν ἔγνωκεν: θεράπων δέ οἱ, οὐ δράστας ὀπαδεῖ. φαντὶ δ᾽ ἔμμεν
τοῦτ᾽ ἀνιαρότατον, καλὰ γιγνώσκοντ᾽ ἀνάγκᾳ
ἐκτὸς ἔχειν πόδα. καὶ μὰν κεῖνος Ἄτλας οὐρανῷ
προσπαλαίει νῦν γε πατρώ-

[214] Agócs (2020): 130.
[215] Agócs (2020): 121 155n.
[216] Baragwanath (2020): 171.

ας ἀπὸ γᾶς ἀπό τε κτεάνων·
λῦσε δὲ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτος Τιτᾶνας. ἐν δὲ χρόνῳ
μεταβολαὶ λήξαντος οὔρου
ἱστίων. ἀλλ᾽ εὔχεται οὐλομέναν νοῦ-
σον διαντλήσαις ποτὲ
οἶκον ἰδεῖν, ἐπ᾽ Ἀπόλλω-
νός τε κράνᾳ συμποσίας ἐφέπων
θυμὸν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, **ἔν τε σοφοῖς**
δαιδαλέαν φόρμιγγα βαστάζων πολί-
ταις ἡσυχίᾳ θιγέμεν,
μήτ᾽ ὤν τινι πῆμα πορών, ἀπαθὴς δ᾽ αὐτὸς πρὸς
ἀστῶν.
καί κε μυθήσαιθ᾽ ὁποίαν, Ἀρκεσίλα,
εὗρε **παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων**,
πρόσφατον **Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς** (Pi. *P*. 4.279–99).

Kyrēnē and the most famed hall of Battos have come
to recognize the just mind of Damophilos. For that man,
a youth among boys, but in counsel an elder that has reached
a life of one hundred years, deprives a wicked tongue of its radiant voice
and has learned to despise the violent man,
he does not vie against noble men
nor delay any task, since for humans fit
opportunity possesses a short span.
He has come to know this well; he serves it as an attendant, not as a day laborer.
They say that the most painful thing is to recognize the good
but be forced by compulsion to stand away. And indeed, that Atlas even now is
struggling with the heavens
away from his ancestral land and his possessions;
but immortal Zeus freed the Titans. And in time,
when the wind dies down there are changes of sails.
But he [Damophilos] prays that, after enduring this cursed disease, someday he
may see his home; that attending symposia at the fountain of Apollo,
he may often give his heart over to youthful merriment,
and raising the ornate lyre among the cultured citizens
may attain tranquility,
neither causing pain to anyone, nor suffering any from the citizens.
And he would tell [you], Arkesilas, of the **spring of ambrosial** verses he found
While recently **hosted at Thebes.**

The ode's *sphragis* (ll. 298 –99), like that of *Isthmian* 6, highlights the Theban provenance of Pindar's inspired poetry. Significantly, Damophilos is also found at Thebes. As noted above, the exile's presence at Thebes may signal his Aigeid heritage.[217] Moreover, the obvious implication is that, like Pindar, Damophilos obtained the *sophia* he displays among like-minded citizens (ἔν τε σοφοῖς, l. 295) at Thebes.[218]

Furthermore, it is suggestive that the exile's Theban sojourn recalls that of Theognis; Pindar, it seems, is drawing upon the mythopoetic image of the city as a place of social harmony and inspired poetry that often serves as a haven for noble foreigners.[219] At Thebes, the reciprocity of *xenia* and aristocratic parity, ideals that are repeatedly challenged in *Pythian* 4, become fully realized and transferred along with Damophilos, back to Kyrēnē. Consequentially, it is apparent that Thebes itself is the source of the wisdom necessary to heal Kyrēnē's civic wounds. According to Anna Potamiti, these final lines imply "the ode's offering as a gift" to Arkesilas; such a gift, which clearly parallels the clod his Euphēmos receives, strengthens the correspondence between the king and his ancestor.[220] The apparent implication of this parallelism is that Arkesilas should not similarly neglect Pindar's gift (and the wisdom that it contains within).

IX. Conclusion

This study of Thebanicity in *Pythian* 4, has, I believe, proven the utility of such a lens for reading Pindar. I hope that my efforts to demonstrate Thebes' essentiality to the ode will contribute to the field by spurring awareness of Thebanicity and the city's broad significance in

[217] Above, p. 21.
[218] Calame (2003): 66.
[219] Above pp. 8-9.
[220] Potamiti (2015): 10.

Pindaric poetics. To me, Pindar's reliance on Thebes and Thebans, both of which he harnesses to achieve his chief poetic aims, is indicative of Thebanicity's programmatic and unifying functions in *Pythian* 4; the appearance of Thebes or Theban allusions in the exordium, proem, and epilogue, sections that are all in some sense programmatic, is also suggestive of this.

As any Pindarist can attest, the fundamental role of Thebes in Pindaric poetics is to serve as a source of inspired poetry. In *Pythian* 4, Pindar conveys the city's status as such through his Theban waters motif; although present only in the *sphragis* (l. 298), Thebes and its inspired streams, which are emblematic of the ode itself, pervade the text. Nevertheless, the motif has a specific relevance to the epilogue, in which it is deployed to achieve the restoration of Damophilos and the harmonization of Kyrēnē. Thebes' remedial function, I have demonstrated, is reliant on a broader mythopoetic conception of the city, aspects of which Pindar derives from his poetic predecessors. The salient feature of this tradition in *Pythian* 4 is the association of Thebes' and Theban poetry with social harmony. Theognis, the source of this connection, also attests to a developing mythohistorical tradition placing noble exiles at Thebes, to which Pindar in turn contributes. The phrase Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς (l. 299), which occupies a programmatic position at the conclusion of the text, surely serves to convey this notion to the audience. By this point, "lyric Thebes", the embodiment of both *xenia* and *philia*, emerges as the quintessentially harmonious *polis*; it is both a refuge for aristocratic exiles as well as the source of salvific verses intended to restore order to Kyrēnē.

The Thebanicity of *Pythian* 4, unlike that of other odes, extends beyond the city's function in Pindar's poetics; we also find Pindar exploiting Theban mythohistory, namely traditions of the Aigeids, whose kinship ties stretch from Thebes to Sparta and her colonies. The poet utilizes these links both for didactic reasons and to highlight the formative Theban role in

the Kyrēnaian *ktisis*. These purposes, however, are in service of Pindar's larger corrective aims, to restore Damophilos to Kyrēnē and prevent the return of *stasis* to the city.

Pindar's vehicle for the expression of these mythic affiliations is Thēra. The island is an astute choice; its deep-rooted Kadmeian past offers an unmitigated connection to Thebes, while its links to Sparta and Kyrēnē have the power to evoke the Aigeid traditions in their entirety. The very name of the island, as well as the introduction of its earlier name (τάν ποτε Καλλίσταν…νᾶσον, ll. 258–59), serves to manifest Thēras and the Aigeidai within the text. The Aigeids' appearance at *P*. 5.72–81, a glorious rendition of their colonial exploits, provides further support for their implicit presence in *Pythian* 4. By alluding to the heroes and their exploits, Pindar is able to both evoke the wider traditions and advance Thebes as a *mētropolis* ("mother-city") of Kyrēnē.

Following this survey of the Thēraian-Aigeid traditions, I draw the conclusion that *Pythian* 4 is, in fact, a diplomatic act. Such a conception is highly effective as an analytical tool due to its ability to account for the unconventional aspects of *Pythian* 4, such the remarkable gift-like length of the mythic narrative. This interpretation is felicitous in that it foregrounds the ode's chief political aims, which are achieved through both didactic means and the use of kinship diplomacy. It also highlights the analogy that the poet constructs, through allusion to the broader mythohistorical traditions, between himself and the Aigeid line on the one hand, and Arkesilas and the Euphēmids on the other. With this allusion, Pindar compares himself favorably with Thēras and the Aigeids, the heroes who ensure the Euphēmids' survival, in order to raise his own status as a consultatory figure, yet he simultaneously compares the king to his flawed ancestors to provide a warning that he avoid such hubristic behavior. Thus, Thebanicity serves key programmatic, political, diplomatic, and didactic functions in *Pythian* 4 and constitutes an

important mode of analysis that could be applied more broadly to Pindaric scholarship as a whole.

Abbreviations

BNJ	I. Worthington, ed., Brill's New Jacoby: The Fragments of the Greek Historians I–III (Jacoby Online), http://www.brill.com/publications/online-resources/jacoby-online.
BNP	H. Cancik, Landfester and Schneider, M.H., eds. Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World, (New Pauly Online), http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-pauly.
Bernabé	Bernabé, A., ed. (1996). *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum*. *Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Corrected edn. Stuttgart.
Campbell	Campbell, D.A., ed. (1991). *Greek Lyric Poetry*: *A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. 2nd edn. Bristol.
Davies	Davies, M., ed. (1988). *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen.
Drchmn	Drachmann, A.B., ed. (1903–1927). *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
IACP	Hansen, M.H., and Nielsen, T.H., eds. (2004). An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation. Oxford.
IG	(1873–). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S., eds. (1925–40). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., with a Supplement. Oxford.
Page	Page, D.L., ed. (1962). *Poetae Melici Graecae*. Oxford.
Rose	Rose, V., ed. (1886). *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Leipzig (Reprinted 1966).

SEG (1923–). *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Leiden and Amsterdam.

Wendel Wendel, C., ed. (1974). *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera*. Berlin.

Bibliography

Adorjáni, Z. (2012). "Euphamos, Pindar, und Apollōnios Rhodios: Zu Arg. 4.1731–1772." *RhM* N.F. 155.1: 108–112.

Agócs, P. (2009). "Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's Seventh *Isthmian*", in Doležalová, L., ed., *Strategies of Remembrance*: *From Pindar to Hölderlin*. Newcastle upon Tyne: 33–92.

—— . (2012). "Performance and genre: Reading Pindar's κῶμοι", in Agócs, Carey and Rawls (2012): 191–223.

—— . (2015). "Preface to Pindar: Early Classical Choral Songs and the Language of Genre" *CHS Research Bulletin* 4.1: <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn3:hlnc.essay:AgocsP.Preface_to_Pindar.2016>.

—— . (2020). "Pindar's *Pythian* 4: Interpreting History in Song." *Histos* Supplement 11: 87–154.

Agócs, P., Carey, C. and Rawles, R., eds. (2012). *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge.

Angeli Bernardini , P., ed. (2000). *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura Greca*. *Atti del Convegno Internazionale* (*Urbino 7-9 luglio 1997*). Pisa-Roma.

Alley, D.R. (2019). *Pindar and the Poetics of Autonomy*: *Authorial Agency in Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode*. Ph.D. Diss. Cornell University: <https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/67389>.

Asheri, D., et al. (2007). *A Commentary on Herodotus*: *Books I–IV*. Oxford.

Athanassaki, L. (1990). *Mantic Vision and Diction in Pindar's Victory Odes*. Ph.D. Diss. Brown University: <http://hdl.handle.net/10442/hedi/4204>.

—— . (2009). "Apollo and his Oracle in Pindar's Epinikians: Poetic Representations, Politics, and Ideology", in Athanassaki et al. (2009): 405–471.

—— . (2011). “Song, politics, and cultural memory: Pindar’s *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid temple of Apollo”, in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 235–268.

—— . (2016). “*Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari*: Greek and Roman civic performance contexts (Pindar’s *Fourth* and *Fifth Pythians* and Horace’s *Odes* 4.2)”, in Delignon, B., N. Le Meur, and O. Thévenaz, eds., *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique*: *Les Odes d'Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque*. Lyon: 131–158.

Athanassaki, L., et al., eds. (2009). *Apolline Politics and Poetics*: *International Symposium*. Athens.

Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie, eds. (2011). *Archaic and Classical Choral Song*: *Performance*, *Politics and Dissemination*. Trends in Classics: supplementary vol. 10. Berlin.

Austin, M. (2004). “From Syria to the Pillars of Herakles”, in The Greeks in Libya”, in Hansen and Nielsen (2004): 1233–1249. Tsetskhladze, G.R., ed., *Greek Colonisation*: *An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, vol. 2. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 193. Leiden: 187–217.

—— . (2015). “The Greeks in Libya”, in Tsetskhladze, G.R., ed., *Greek Colonisation*: *An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, vol. 2. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 193. Leiden: 187–217.

Baldassi, C. (2019). *The Leucippides in Greek Myth*: *Abductions, Rituals and Weddings*. Ph.D. diss. University of Edinburgh: < https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/36169>.

Baragwanath, E. (2020). “History Ethnography, and Aetiology in Herodotus’ Libyan *Logos*”, *Histos* Supplement 11: 155–188.

Barker, G., Lloyd, J., and Reynolds, J., eds. (1985). *Cyrenaica in Antiquity* Society for Libyan Studies Occasional Papers 1. BAR International Series 236. Oxford.

Beck, H., (2014). “Ethnic Identity and Integration in Boeotia: The Evidence of the Inscriptions (6th and 5th Centuries BC)”, in Papazarkadas (2014): 19–44

—— . (2020). *Localism and the Ancient Greek City-State*. Chicago.

Beck, H., Buraselis, K., and McAuley, A., eds., (2019). *Ethnos and Koinon*: *Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*. Heiedelberger Altihistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien: Bd. 61. Stuttgart.

Beck–Schachter. A.J. (2016). “The Lysandreia”, in Figueira, T., ed., *Myth, Text, and History at Sparta*. Piscataway, NJ: 105–168.

Beecroft, A., (2015). *An Ecology of World Literature*: *From Antiquity to the Present Day.* London.

Benveniste, E. (1973). *Indo-European Language and Society*, trans. E. Palmer. Miami Linguistics Series 12. Oxford, OH.

Berlinzani, F. (2004). *La Musica a Tebe di Beozia*. *Tra Storia e Mito*. Milano.

Berman, D.W. (2004). “The Double Foundation of Boiotian Thebes.” *TAPhA* 134.1: 1–22.

—— . (2015). *Myth, Literature, and the Creation of the Topography of Thebes*. Cambridge.

—— . (2017). “Cities-Before-Cities: ‘Prefoundational’ Myth and the Construction of Greek Civic Space”, in Hawes (2017): 32–51.

Bierl, A. et al., eds. (2017). *Time and Space in Ancient Myth, Religion, and Culture*. MythosEikonPoiesis 10. Berlin.

Boeckh, A., ed. (1811–1821). *Πινδάρου* τὰ σωζόμενα. *Pindari opera quae supersunt*. Leipzig (reprinted 2013).

Bornemann, L. (1884). “Über die Aegeiden, von denen angeblich Pindar stammte.” *Philologus* 43.1:79–85.

Braswell, B.K. (1988). *A Commentary on Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Texte und Kommentare 14. Berlin.

Breglia Pulcia Doria, L. (1997). "Tradizioni Beotiche in Eforo: Esiodo, Pindaro, gli Egeidi", in Bintliff, J., ed. *Recent Developments in the History and Archaeology of Central Greece*: *Proceedings of the 6th International Boeotian Conference*. Bar International Series 666. Oxford: 201–213.

Bremmer, J., ed. (1987a). *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. London.

——— . (1987b). "Oedipus and the Greek Oedipus Complex", in Bremmer (1987a): 41–59.

——— . (1983). "The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium." *ZPE* 50: 173–186.

——— . (1999). "Fosterage, kinship, and the circulation of children in ancient Greece", in Silk, M. and D. Ricks, eds., *Dialogos*: *Hellenic Studies Review*, vol. 6: 1–20.

——— . (2006). "The Myth of the Golden Fleece." *JANER* 6.1: 9–38.

——— . (2020). "Myth and History: The Foundation of Cyrene", in Bremmer, J., ed. *The World of Greek Religion and Mythology*: *Collected Essays II*. Tübingen: 447–462.

Boedeker, D. and Sider, D., eds. (2001). *The New Simonides*: *Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford.

Boterf, N. (2012). *Lyric Cities*: *Poet, Performance, and Community*. Ph.D. Diss. Stanford University: <https://classics.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj10936/f/publications/boterf_dissertation.pdf>.

——— . (2017). "Placing the Poet: The Topography of Authorship", in Bakker, E.J., ed., *Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance*. Studies in

Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 3. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 402: Leiden: 80–98.

Bowie, E. (2007). “Early Expatriates: Displacement and Exile in Archaic Poetry”, in Gaertner (2007a): 21–50.

Bowie, E. (2009). “Wandering poets, archaic style”, in Hunter and Rutherford (2009): 105–136.

—— . (2012). “Epinikians and ‘Patrons’”, in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012): 83–92.

Bowra, C.M. (1961). *Greek Lyric Poetry*. 2nd edn. Oxford.

—— . (1964). *Pindar*. Oxford.

Broggiato, M., et al. (2014). “By Way of Conclusion”, in Colesanti and Giordano (2014): 178–187.

Buck, R.J. (1979). *A History of Boeotia*. Edmonton, CA.

Budelmann, F., ed. (2009). *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge.

—— . (2017). “Performance, Reperformance, Preperformance: The Paradox of Repeating the Unique in Pindaric Epinikian and Beyond”, in Hunter and Uhlig (2017): 42–61.

Bulman, P. (1992). *Phthonos in Pindar*. Classical Studies, vol. 35. Berkeley.

Bundy, E.L. (1962). *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley. (Digital Version: 2006) UC Berkeley: Department of Classics. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2g79p68q>.

Burnett, A.P. (2008). *Pindar*. Ancients in Action. London.

Burton, R.W.B. (1962). *Pindar’s Pythian Odes*: *Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford.

Calame, C. (1987) “Spartan Genealogies: The Mythical Representation of a Spatial Organisation”, in Bremmer (1987a): 153–186.

—— . (1990) “Narrating the Foundation of a City: The Symbolic Birth of Cyrene”, in Edmunds (1990a): 275–341.

—— . (2003). *Myth and History in Ancient Greece*: *The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*, trans. D. Berman. Princeton.

—— . (2005). *Masks of Authority*: *Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca.

—— . (2009). *Poetic and Performative Memory in Ancient Greece*: *Heroic Reference and Ritual Gestures in Time and Space*. Hellenic Studies 18. Cambridge, MA.

—— . (2011). “Enunciative fiction and poetic performance. Choral voices in Bacchylides’ Epinikians”, in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 115–138.

—— . (2012). “Metaphorical travel and ritual performance in epinikian poetry”, in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012): 303–320.

—— . (2014) “Narrative Semantics and Pragmatics: The Poetic Creation of Cyrene”, in Edmunds (2014a): 280–352.

Cannatà Fera, M., ed. (1990). *Pindarus. Threnorum Fragmenta*. Lyricorum Graecorum Quae Exstant 7. Rome.

Carey, C. (1980). “The Epilogue of Pindar’s Fourth *Pythian*.” *Maia* 32: 143–152.

—— . (1981). *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*: *Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*. Monographs in Classical Studies. Salem, NH: The Ayer Company.

—— . (2007). “Pindar, Place, and Performance”, in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 199–210.

—— . (2009). “Genre, occasion and performance”, in Budelmann (2009): 21–38.

Cartledge, P. (2009). “Sparta’s Apollo(ne)s”, in Athanassaki et al. (2009): 643–654.

Cecchet, L. (2017). “Re-shaping and Re-founding Citizen Bodies: The Case of Athens, Cyrene and Camarina”, in Cecchet, L. and A. Busetto, eds., *Citizens in the Graeco-Roman World*: *Aspects of Citizenship from the Archaic Period to AD 212*. Leiden: 50 –77.

Chamoux, F. (1953). *Cyrène sous la Monarchie dés Battiades*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. 177. Paris.

Christesen, P. (2010). “Kings Playing Politics: The Heroization of Chionis of Sparta.” *Historia* 59.1: 26 –73.

Clauss, J.J. and Johnston, S.I., eds. (1997). *Medea*: *Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art*. Princeton.

Cohen, I.M. (1952). *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women: *Studies on the Fragments of an Early Greek epic*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Toronto.

Cook, J.G. (2018). *Empty Tomb, Apotheosis, and Resurrection*. Mohr Siebeck. Tübingen.

Colavito, J. (2014). *Jason and the Argonauts through the Ages*. Jefferson, NC.

Cole, T. (1992). *Pindar’s Feasts or the Music of Power*. Filologia e Critica 69. Roma.

Colesanti, G. and Giordano, M., eds., (2014). *Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture*: *An Introduction*. Berlin.

Compton, T.M. (1990). *Victim of the Muses*: *Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior*, *and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*. Hellenic Studies 11. Washington, DC.

Corcella, A. (2006). “The New Genre and its Boundaries: Poets and Logographers”, in Rengakos, A. and A. Tsakmakis, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden: 33–56.

—— . (2007). “Book IV”, in Asheri et al. (2007): 545–721.

Corsano, M. (1990). “Mini ed Egidi a Cirene”, in Gentili (1990): 123–129.

Cummins, M.F. (2010). “Sicilian Tyrants and Their Victorious Brothers I: The Emmenids.” *CJ* 105.4: 321–339.

Currie, B.G F. (2004). “Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar’s Odes”, in C. Mackie (2004): 49–70.

——— . (2005). *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford.

——— . (2011). “Epinikian *choregia*: funding a Pindaric chorus”, in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 269–310.

——— . (2012). “Choral Lyric: Pindar and Bacchylides”, in de Jong, I. J. F., ed., *Space in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, vol. 3. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 339. Leiden: 285–303.

——— . (2013). “The Pindaric First Person in Flux.” *CA* 32.2: 243–282.

——— . (2017). “Festival Symposium, and Epinikian (Re)performance: The Case of *Nemean* 4 and Others”, in Hunter and Uhlig (2017): 187–208.

——— . (2018). “Choral Lyric: Pindar and Bacchylides”, in De Temmerman, K. and E. van Emde Boas, eds., *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, vol. 4. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 411: 293–314.

Dakouri-Hild, A.Alessio, G.B. (2001). “The House of Kadmos in Mycenaean Thebes Reconsidered: Architecture, Chronology, and Context”, *ABSA* 96: 81–122.

——— . (2006). “Something old, something new: current research on the ‘Old Kadmeion’ of Thebes”, *BICS* 48: 173–186.

D’Alessio, G.B. (1994). “First-Person Problems in Pindar.” *BICS* 39: 117–139.

——— . (2005a). “The *Megalai Ehoiai*: a survey of the fragments”, in Hunter (2005): 176–216.

—— . (2005b). “Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic genealogical poetry”, in Hunter (2005): 217–238.

—— . (2005c). “Il primo *Inno* di Pindaro”, in Grandolini, S., ed., *Lirica e Teatro in Grecia*: *Il Testo e la sua ricenzione*. *Atti del II incontro di studi, Perugia 23–24 gennaio 2003*. Napoli: 113–149.

—— . (2009). “Defining local identities in Greek lyric poetry”, in Hunter and Rutherford (2009): 137–167.

Darcus, S. (1977). “An Echo of Homer in Pindar, *Pythian* 4”, *TAPhA* 107: 93–101.

Davidson, J. (1999). “Rhadymanthys and the Family of Herakles.” *AC* 68: 247–252.

Davies, M. (1989). *The Greek Epic Cycle.* London.

—— . (1991). *Sophocles. Trachiniae*. Oxford.

—— . (1998). “Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Handbook.” *CQ* 38: 54–62.

—— . (2014). *The Theban Epics*. Hellenic Studies 69. Cambridge, MA.

—— . (2019). *The Cypria*. Hellenic Studies 83. Cambridge, MA.

Debiasi, A. (2004). *L’epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l’occidente*. Hesperìa 20. Rome.

Demand, N.H. (1982). *Thebes in the Fifth Century*: *Heracles Resurgent*. London.

Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (2000). *Matrices of Genre*: *Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge.

Detienne, M. (1996). *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*. 2nd edn. New York.

Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship*: *A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. American Philological Association: Classical Resources Series. Oxford.

Donlan, W. (1985). “The Social Groups of Dark Age Greece.” *CPhil* 80.4: 293–308

—— . (1999). *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers*. Wauconda, IL.

Donnellan, L. (2015). “*Oikist* and Archegtes in Context: Representing the Foundation of Sicilian Naxos”, in Mac Sweeney (2015): 41–70.

Dougherty, C. (1993). *The Poetics of Colonization*: *From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.

—— . (1994). “Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion.” *JHS* 114: 35–46.

—— . (1998). “It’s Murder to Found a Colony”, in Dougherty and Kurke (1998): 178–200.

Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L.V., eds., (1998a). *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. *The Poetics of Colonization*: *From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.

Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L.V. (1998b). “Introduction”, in Dougherty and Kurke (1998a): 1–12. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. *The Poetics of Colonization*: *From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.

Dräger, P. (1993). *Argo Pasimelousa*: *Der Argonatenmythos in der Griechischen und Römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.

Edmunds. L. (1981). “The Cults and Legend of Oedipus.” *HSPh* 85: 221–238.

—— . (1985). *Oedipus*: *The Ancient Legend and Its Later Analogues*. Baltimore.

—— . (1987). *Cleon, Knights, and Aristophanes’ Politics*. Lanham MD: University Press.

—— ., ed. (1990a). *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Baltimore.

—— . (1990b). “Introduction: The Practice of Greek Mythology”, in Edmunds (1990): 1–22.

—— . (2006). *Oedipus*. Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World. London.

—— ., ed. (2014a). *Approaches to Greek Myth*. 2nd edn. Baltimore.

—— ., ed. (2014b). “General Introduction”, in Edmunds (2014a): 1–41.

Evans, J.A.S. (1991a). *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past*. Princeton.

—— ., (1991b). “Oral Tradition in Herodotus”, in Evans (1991a): 89–146.

Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C., eds. (2015). *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception*: *A Companion*. Cambridge.

Faraone, C.A. (2002). “A Drink from the Daughters of Mnemosyne: Poetry, Eschatology and Memory at the End of Pindar’s *Isthmian* 6”, in Miller, J.F., et al., eds., *Vertis in usum*: *Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde: Bd 161. Leipzig: 259–270.

Farnell, L.R. (1932). *The Works of Pindar*. vol 1: *Translation in rhythmical prose with literary comments.* Amsterdam.

—— ., ed. (1965) [1932]. *The Works of Pindar*, vol. 2: *Critical commentary to the works of Pindar*. Amsterdam.

Fearn, D., ed. (2011a). *Aegina*: *Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.

—— . (2010b). “Introduction: Aegina in Context”, in Fearn (2011a): 1–28.

Felson, N. (1999). “Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's Pythian Four.” HSPh 99: 1–31.

Felson, N. and Parmentier, R.J. (2015). “‘The Savvy Interpreter’: Performance and Interpretation in Pindar’s Victory Odes.” *Signs and Society* 3.2: 261–305.

Figueira, T.J., ed. (2004). *Spartan Society*. Swansea.

Finglass, P.J. (2008). *Pindar*: *Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 45. Cambridge.

Floyd, E.D. (1965). “The Performance of Pindar *Pythian* 8.55–70. *GRBS* 6: 187–200.

Fogelmark, S. (1979). "καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22", in Bowerstock, G.W., W. Burkert, and M.C.J. Putnam, eds., *Arktouros*: *Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Berlin: 71–80.

Ford, A. (2019). "Linus: The Rise and Fall of Lyric Genres", in Foster, Kurke and Weiss (2019): 57–69.

Fossey, J.M. (1988). *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia*. 2 vols in 1. Chicago.

Fossey, J.M., and Schachter, A., eds., (1979). *Teiresias Supplement 2*: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*. Montreal.

Foster, M., Kurke, L.V., and Weiss, N., eds. (2020). *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry*: *Theories and Models*. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 4. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 428. Leiden.

Fowler, R.L. (1998). "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's 'Catalogue', and the Creation of the Hellenes." *PCPhS* 44: 1-19.

——— . (2000-2013). *Early Greek Mythography*. *i. Text and Introduction*; *ii*. *Commentary*. Oxford.

——— . (2018). "The *nostoi* and Archaic Greek Ethnicity", in Hornblower and Biffis (2018): 43–64.

Fragoulaki, M. (2013). *Kinship in Thucydides*: *Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford.

Gaertner, J.F., ed. (2007a). *Writing Exile*: *The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden.

——— . (2007b). "The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity", in Gaertner (2007a): 1–20.

Ganter (née Kühr), A. (2006a). *Als Kadmos nach Boiotien Kam*: *Polis und Ethnos im Spiegel thebanischer Gründungsmythen*. Hermes Einzelschriften B 98. Stuttgart.

—— . (2006b). "Invading Boeotia. *Polis* and *Ethnos* in the Mirror of Theban Foundation Myths." *Hermes* 134.3: 367–372.

—— . (2014). "Ethnicity and Local Myth", in McInerney (2014): 228–240.

—— . (2020). "Καδμεία νίκη: Politicising the 'Seven against Thebes' in the 5th century B.C", in Cecconi, P. and C. Tornau, eds., *Städte und Stadtstaaten zwischen Mythos, Literatur, und Propaganda*. Beiträge zur Altertrumskunde, vol. 383. Berlin: 11–28.

Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth*: *A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.

Gentili, B., ed. (1990). *Cirene, Storia, Mito, Letteratura*. Urbino.

—— ., (1993). *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*: *From Homer to the Fifth Century*. Ithaca.

Gentili, B., et al. (2012). *Pindaro*: *Le Pitiche*. Pindaro. Le Odi, vol. 2. 5th edn. Rome.

Gerber, D.E. (1997). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 173. Leiden.

Giangiulio, M. (2001). "Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene", in Luraghi (2001a): 116–137.

Giannini, P. (1979). "Interpretazione della *Pitica* 4 di Pindaro", *QUCC* n.s., 2: 35–63.

—— . (1990). "Cirene nella poesia greca: tra mito e storia", in Gentili (1990): 51-96.

—— . (2000). "Le antiche tradizioni tebane negli epinici di Pindar", in Angeli Bernardini (2000): 163–178.

Gildersleeve, B.L. (1885). *Pindar*: *The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York.

Giordano, M. (2014). “Out of Athens. Ritual Performances, Spaces, and the Emergence of Tragedy”, in Colesanti and Giordano (2014): 151–177.

Golinski, P. (2016). *Kollektive Identitäten in der antiken Kyrenaika*. Ph.D. Diss. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen: <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-1735-0000-002B-7D32-9>.

Graham, A.J. (1960). “The Authenticity of the Orkion ΤΩΝ ΟΙΚΙΣΤΗΡΩΝ of Cyrene.” *JHS* 80: 94–111.

Graham, P.C. (1978). *The Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*: *Imagery*, *Myth*, *Teaching*. Ph.D. Diss. Northwestern University.

Greengard, C. (1980). *The Structure of Pindar’s epinikian odes*. Amsterdam.

Grenfell, B. and Hunt, A. S. eds (1908a) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part V*. London.

Grenfell, B. and Hunt, A. S. (1908b). “Pindar, *Paeans*”, in Grenfell and Hunt (1908a): 11–110

Griffith, R.D. (1991). “Oedipus’ Bloodthirsty Sons: Love and Strife in Pindar’s Second *Olympian Ode*.” *CA* 10.1: 46–58.

——— . (1993). “In the Dark Backward: Time in Pindaric Narrative.” *PT* 14.4: 607–623.

Guess, R. (2013). “The Wisdom of Oidipous and the Idea of a Moral Cosmos.” *Arion* 20.3: 59–89.

Hadjimichael, T.A. (2019). *The Emergence of the Lyric Canon*. Oxford.

Hall, J.M. (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.

——— . (2002). *Hellenicity*: *Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.

——— . (2007). “Politics and Greek Myth”, in Woodard (2007): 331–354.

——— . (2014). *A History of the Archaic Greek World ca.1200–479 BCE*. 2nd edn. Blackwell History of the Ancient World. Malden, MA.

——— . (2015). “Ancient Greek Ethnicities: Towards a Reassessment.” *BICS* 58.2: 15–29.

Hamilton, J.T. (2003). *Soliciting Darkness*: *Pindar, Obscurity, and the Classical Tradition*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 47. Cambridge, MA.

Hamilton, R. (1974). *Epinikion*: *General Form in the Odes of Pindar*. De Proprietatibus Litterarum. Series Practica 91. The Hague.

Hansen, H.J. (2016). *Pindar's Isthmian 6*: *A Commentary and Literary Study*. Ph.D. Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. < https://doi.org/10.17615/ntjm-gn60>.

Hardie, A. (2000). "Pindar's 'Theban Cosmogony (the First Hymn)." *BICS* 44: 19–40.

Harrison, S.J. (2007). "Exile in Latin Epic", in Gaertner (2007a): 129–154.

Hawes, G. (2016). "Stones, Names, Stories, and Bodies: Pausanias before the Walls of Seven-Gated Thebes", in McInerney, J. and I. Sluiter, eds., *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity*: *Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*. Leiden: 431 –458.

—— ., ed. (2017a). *Myths on the Map: The Storied Landscape of Ancient Greece*. Oxford.

—— . (2017b). "Thebes on Stage, on Site, and in the Flesh", in Hunter and Uhlig (2017): 63–84.

Heath, M. (2018). "Subject Reviews: Greek Literature." *G&R* 65.1: 103–108.

Herman, G. (1987). *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.

Hirschberger, M. (2004). *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai*: *Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen*. München.

Hodkinson, S. (2009). "Introduction", in Hodkinson and Powell (2009): i–xxxiii.

Hodkinson, S., and Powell, A., eds. (1999). *Sparta*: *New Perspectives*. Swansea.

—— ., eds. (2009). *Sparta*: *Comparative Approaches*. Swansea.

Hornblower, S. (2004). *Thucydides and Pindar*: *Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.

—— . (2006). “Pindar and kingship theory”, in Lewis, S., ed., *Ancient Tyranny*. Edinburgh: 151–163.

—— . (2008). “Greek Identity in the Archaic and Classical Periods”, in Zacharia (2008): 37–58.

—— . (2009). “Greek lyric and the politics and sociologies of archaic and classical Greek communities”, in Budelmann (2009): 39–57.

—— . (2012). “What happened later to the families of Pindaric patrons – and to epinikian poetry?” In Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012): 93–07.

Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C., eds. (2007a). *Pindar’s Poetry, Patrons, & Festivals*: *From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

—— . (2007b). “Introduction”, in Hornblower and Morgan (2007): 1–43.

Hornblower, S. and Biffis, G., eds. (2018). *The Returning Hero*: *Nostoi and the Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement*. Oxford.

Hose, M. (2018). “The Journey as Device for Structuring Poetic Knowledge: A Poetic Method in Pindar’s Epinicia”, in Ferella, C. and C. Breytenbach, eds., *Paths of Knowledge*: Interconnection(s) between Knowledge and Journey in the Greco-Roman World. Berlin: 35–46.

Hubbard, T. K. (1986). “Pegasus’ Bridle and the Poetics of Pindar’s Thirteenth *Olympian*”, *HSPh* 90: 27–48.

—— . (1987a). “Two Notes on the Myth of Aeacus in Pindar.” *GRBS* 28: 5–22.

—— . (1987b). “The ‘Cooking’ of Pelops: Pindar and the Process of Mythological Revisionism, *Helios* 14: 3–21.

—— . (1991). “Theban Nationalism and Poetic Apology in Pindar, *Pythian* 9.76-96.” *RhM* Neu Folge 134.1: 22–38.

—— . (2001). “Pindar and Athens after the Persian Wars”, in Papenfuß, D. and V.M. Strocka, eds., *Gab es das Griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Mainz: 387–400.

—— . (2004). “The Dissemination of Epinikian Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts”, in C. Mackie (2004): 71–94.

—— . (2011). “The dissemination of Pindar’s non-epinikian choral lyric”, in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 347–363.

Hunter, R. (1993). *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge.

—— ., ed. (2005). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R. and Rutherford, I., eds. (2009). *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*: *Travel, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism.* Cambridge.

Hunter, R. and Uhlig, A., eds. (2017). *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture*: *Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric*. Cambridge.

Hurst, A. (2012). “Hector chez les Bienheureux. Matière de Troie et matière de Thèbes dans l’*Alexandra* de Lycophron. ” *Gaia* 15 : 59–77.

—— . (2018). “Stratégies pour Thèbes chez Pindare.” *Gaia* 21: <https://doi.org/10.4000/gaia.391>.

Huxley, G. (1960). “Homerica II: Eugammon.” *GRBS* 3.1: 23–28.

—— . (1962). *Early Sparta*. Cambridge, MA.

—— . (1969). *Greek Epic Poetry*: *from Eumelos to Panyassis*. London.

—— . (1975). *Pindar’s Vision of the Past*. Belfast.

—— . (1983). “Herodotos on Myth and Politics in Early Sparta.” *Proc. Royal Irish Acad.* 83C: 1-16.

Illig, L. (1932). *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*. *Interpretationen und Untersuchungen*. Berlin.

Indergaard, H. (2011). “Thebes, Aegina, and the Temple of Aphaia: A Reading of Pindar’s *Isthmian* 6”, in Fearn (2010a): 294–322.

Instone, S.J. (1985). *Studies in Pindar*. Ph.D. diss. Bedford College, London: <https://repository.royalholloway.ac.uk/items/63ced9bd-c59c-4a26-a850-4f4a23ab4c96/1/>.

Irwin, E and Greenwood, E., eds. (2007). *Reading Herodotus*: *A Study of the logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus’ Histories*. Cambridge.

Istumi, K. (2009). *Pindaric Metre*: *The ‘Other Half’*. Oxford.

Jackson, S. (1987). “Apollonius’ *Argonautica*: Euphemus, a Clod, and a Tripod.” *ICS* 12.1: 23–30.

Jones, C.P. (1996). “ἔθνος and γένος in Herodotus.” *CQ* 46.2: 315–320.

—— . (1999). *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA.

Jones, N.F. (1987). *Public Organization in Ancient Greece*: *A Documentary Study*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 176. Philadelphia.

de Jong, I.J.F. (2009). “Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature”, in Grethlein, J., and A. Rengakos, eds., *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin: 87–115.

—— . (2013). “Metalepsis and Embedded Speech in Pindaric and Bacchylidean Myth”, in Eisen, U.E. and P. von Möllendorf, eds., *Über die Grenze*: *Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums*. Narratologia 39. Berlin: 97–118.

Kampakoglou, A. (2019). *Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Ptolemaic Poetry*. Trends in Classics; supplementary vol. 76. Berlin.

Kaplan, P. (2016). “Location and dislocation in early Greek geography and ethnography”, in Kennedy, R.F. and M. Jones–Lewis, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Identity and the Environment in the Classical and Medieval Worlds*. London: 299–314.

Kirkwood, G.M. (1981). “*Pythian* 5.72–75, 9.90–92, and the Voice of Pindar”, *ICS* 6.1: 12–23.

—— . (1984). “Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician”, in Gerber, D.E., ed., *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*: *Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*. Chico, CA: 169–183.

Köhnken, A. (1971). *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar.* Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte; Bd. 12. Berlin.

—— . (1983). “Time and Event in Pindar *O*. 1.25 –53.” *CA* 2.1: 66–76.

—— . (1993). “Narrative Peculiarities in Pindar’s Fourth *Pythian* Ode.” SCI 12: 26–35.

—— . (2003). “Der Argonaut Euphemos”, in Harder, A. and M. Cuypers, eds., *Beginning from Apollo*: *Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition*. Caeculus 6. Leuven: 70–75.

—— . (2012). “Libysche Mythologie bei Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios”, in C. Cusset et al., eds., *Mythe et Pouvoir à l’Époque Hellenistique*. Hellenistica Groningana 18. Leuven.

Kõiv, M. (2003). *Ancient Tradition and Early Greek History*: *The Origins of States in Early-Archaic Sparta*, *Argos, and Corinth*. Tallinn.

—— . (2005). “The Origins, Development, and Reliability of the Ancient Tradition about the Formation of the Spartan Constitution.” *Historia* 54.3: 233–264.

—— . (2015). “Sanctuaries and Traditions in ancient Sparta”, in Kämmerer, T. R. and M. Kõiv, eds., Cultures *in Comparison*: *Religion and Politics in Ancient Mediterranean Regions*. *Acta Antiqua Mediterranea et Orientalia*. Bd. 3. Münster: 25–66.

Kowalzig, B. (2007). *Singing for the Gods*: *Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford.

Kowerski, L.M. (2005). *Simonides on the Persian Wars*: *A Study of the Elegiac Verses of the “New Simonides*”. Studies in Classics. New York.

Krummel, S. (2014). *Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar’s Victory Odes*: *A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian* 3. ARCA 52. Prenton, UK.

Krevans, N. (1997). “Medea as Foundation-Heroine”, in Clauss and Johnston (1997): 71–82.

Kurke, L.V. (2007). *“*Visualizing the Choral: Epichoric Poetry, Ritual, and Elite Negotiation in Fifth-Century Thebes”, in Kraus, C. *et al*., eds., *Visualising the Tragic*: *Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature*. Oxford: 63–101.

—— . (2013). *The Traffic in Praise*: *Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. 2nd edn. Berkeley.

Kurke, L.V. and Neer, R. (2019). *Pindar, Song, and Space*: *Towards a Lyric Archaeology*. Cultural Histories of the Ancient World. Baltimore.

Lane, C.S. (2009). *Archēgetēs, Oikistēs, and New-oikistēs*: *The Cults of Founders in Greek Southern Italy and Sicily*. Ph.D. Diss. University of British Columbia: <http://hdl.handle.net/2429/24158>.

Lardinois, A. (2001). “The Wisdom and Wit of Many: The Orality of Greek Proverbial Expressions: 93–108.

Larson, S. (2013). “Pindar’s Theban Mythopoesis.” *Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*. San Antonio, TX. 7 January 2011. <10.2139/ssrn.1597208>.

—— . (2017). “Meddling with Myth in Thebes”, in Hawes (2017a): 106–121.

—— . (2018). “Seventh Century Material Culture in Boiotia”, in Loney and Scully (2018): 31-42.

Lattmann, C. (2010). *Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen*. *Metapher Des Sports und Lob des Siegers in Pindars Epinikien*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, vol. 102. Berlin.

—— . (2017). “Pindar’s Voice(s): The Epinikian *Persona* Reconsidered”, in N. Slater (2017): 123–148.

Lefkowitz, M.R. (1975). “The Influential Fictions in the Scholia to Pindar's *Pythian* 8.” *CPh* 70.3: 173–185.

—— . (1988). “Who Sang Pindar’s Victory Odes?” *AJP* 109.1: 1–11.

—— . (1991a). *First-Person Fiction*s: *Pindar’s Poetic ‘I’*. Oxford.

—— . (1991b). “The First Person in Pindar”, in Lefkowitz (1991a): 1–71.

—— . (1991c). “Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar”, in Lefkowitz (1991a): 127–146.

—— . (1991d). “The Pindar Scholia”, in Lefkowitz (1991a): 147–160.

—— . (1991e). “Pindar’s *Pythian* 5”, in Lefkowitz (1991a): 169–190.

Lewis, V.M (2020). *Myth, Locality, and Identity Pindar’s Sicilian Odes*. Greeks Overseas. Oxford.

Lidov, J.B. (1972). *The Structure of the Dactylo-Epitrite in Pindar*. Ph.D. Diss. Columbia University.

Loney, A.C. and Scully, S., eds. (2018). *The Oxford Handbook of Hesiod*. Oxford.

Lombardo, M. (2012). "Greek colonization: small and large islands." *MHR* 27.1: 73–85.

Longley–Cook, I.A. (1989). *A Literary Study of Pindar's Fourth and Fifth Pythian Odes*. Ph.D. Diss. University of St. Andrews: < http://hdl.handle.net/10023/2644>.

Lulli, L. (2014). "Local Epics and Epic Cycles: the Anomalous Case of a Submerged Genre", in Colesanti and Giordano (2014): 76–89.

Lupi, M. (2018). "Citizenship and Civic Subdivisions: The Case of Sparta", in Duplouy, A. and R. Brock, eds., *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: 161–178.

Luraghi, N., ed. (2001a). *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford.

—— . (2001b). "Local Knowledge in Herodotos' Histories", in Luraghi (2001a): 138-160.

"Citizenship and Civic Subdivisions: The Case of Sparta", in Duplouy, A. and R. Brock, eds., *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: 161–178.

Maas, P. (1962). *Greek Metre*, trans. H. Lloyd-Jones. Oxford.

Mac Sweeney N., ed. (2015a). *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies*: *Dialogues and Discourses*. Philadelphia.

—— . (2015b). "Introduction", in Mac Sweeney (2015a): 1–19.

Mackie, C.J., ed. (2004). *Oral Performance and its Context*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, vol. 5. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 248. Leiden.

Mackie, H. (2003). *Graceful Errors*: *Pindar and the Performance of Praise*. Ann Arbor.

Mackil, E. (2013). *Creating a Common Polity*: *Religion, Economy, and Politics ing the Making of the Greek Koinon*. Berkeley.

—— . (2014). “Creating a Common Polity in Boeotia”, in Papazarkadas (2014): 45–67.

—— . (2019). “Ethnic Arguments”, in Beck, Buraselis and McAuley (2019): 11–28.

Creating a Common Polity in Boeotia”, in Papazarkadas (2014): 45–67.

Maehler, H. (1989). *Pindarus*. *Pars II*: *Fragmenta, Indices*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana (repr. 2001). Leipzig.

Manolova, T. (2009). “The Mytho-Historical Topography of Thebes” *Hirundo* 8: 80–94.

Malkin, I. (1985). “What’s in a Name? The Eponymous Founders of Greek Colonies." *Athenaeum* 63: 115–130.

—— . (1987). *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Studies in Greek and Roman Religion, vol. 3. Leiden.

—— . (1994). *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge.

—— . (1998). “Myth, Religion, and Spartan, ‘Ideology’”, in Schuller, W., ed., *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum*. Darmstadt: 43–49.

—— . (2003). “‘Tradition’ in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene”, in Derow, P. and R. Parker, eds., *Herodotus and his World*: *Essays from a Conference in Memory George Forrest*. Oxford: 153–170.

—— . (2011). *A Small Greek World*: *Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.

—— . (2015). “Foreign Founders: Greeks and Hebrews”, in Mac Sweeney (2017): 20–40.

—— . (2016a). “Greek colonisation: The Right to Return”, in Donnellan, L. et al., eds., *Conceptualising early Colonisation*. Bruxelles: 27–50.

—— . (2016b). “Migration and Colonization: Turbulence, Continuity, and the Practice of Mediterranean Space. (11th – 5th centuries BCE). In Dabag, M., et al., eds., *New Horizons*: *Mediterranean Research in the 21st Century*. München: 285–308.

—— . (2018). “Returning Heroes and Greek Colonists”, in Hornblower and Biffis (2018): 83–104.

Malten, L. (1911). *Kyrēnē. Sagengeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.

Manakidou, F.P. (2009). “Callimachus’ Second and Fifth Hymn and Pindar: a reconstruction of *Syggeneiai* between old and new Greece” *RFIC* 137.3–4: 350–379.

Manuello, P. (2013). “Theban Myths and Cults”, *CR*, n.s., 63.1: 20–22.

Martin, R.P. (2009). “Read on arrival”, in Hunter and Rutherford (2009): 80–104.

Maslov, B. (2009). “The Semantics of ἀοιδός and Related Compounds: Towards a Historical Poetics of Solo Performance in Archaic Greece”, *CA* 28: 1–28.

—— . (2012). “From (Theogonic) Mythos to (Poetic) Logos: Reading Pindar’s Genealogical Metaphors after Freidenberg”, *JANER* 12: 49– 77.

—— . (2015). *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*. Cambridge.

Mastronarde, D.J. (1994). *Euripides*: *Phoenissae*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries. Cambridge.

Matthews, V.J. (1965). *The Early History of the Myth of the Argonauts.* M.A. thesis. McMaster University: < http://hdl.handle.net/11375/9533>.

Matzner, S. (2016). *Rethinking Metonymy*: *Literary Theory and Poetic Practice from Pindar to Jakobson*. Classics in Theory. Oxford.

Meinel, F. (2015). *Pollution and Crisis in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.

Meister, F.J. (2020). *Greek Praise Poetry and the Rhetoric of Divinity.* Oxford.

McInerney, J., ed. (2014). *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient* Mediterranean. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA.

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2016). *The Alexandra of Lycophron: A Literary Study*. Oxford.

Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L., eds. (1967). *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford.

Millender, E. (2009). "The Spartan Dyarchy: a comparative perspective", in Hodkinson (2009): 1–68.

—— . (2018). "Kingship: The History, Power, and Prerogative of the Spartans 'Divine' Dyarchy", in Powell (2018): 452–479.

Miller, D.A. (1998). "The Spartan Kingship: Some Extended Notes on Complex Duality." *Arethus a* 31.1: 1–17.

Mitchell, B.M. (1966). "Cyrene and Persia." *JHS* 86: 99–113

—— . (2000). "Cyrene: Typical or Atypical?" In Brock, R. and S. Hodkinson, eds., *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: 82–102.

Mitchell, L. (2013). *The Heroic Rulers of Archaic and Classical Greece*. London.

Momrak, K. (2007). "The Myth of the Metropolis – Colonisation, Cosmopolitanism, and its Consequences." *ElAnt* 11.1: 169–190.

Morgan, K. (2008). "Generic Ethics and the Problem of Badness in Pindar", in Sluiter, I. and Rosen R.M., eds. *KAKOS*: *Badness and Anti-Value in Classical Antiquity*. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 307. Leiden; 29–58.

—— . (2015). *Pindar and the Construction of the Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* Greeks Overseas. Oxford.

Morrison, A.D. (2007). *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. *BICS* Supplements, vol. 95. London.

—— . (2010). "Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality", in Fearn (2011a): 227–253.

—— . (2011). “Pindar and the Aeginetan *patrai*: Pindar’s intersecting audiences”, in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011): 311–335.

—— . (2012). “Performance, re-performance, and Pindar’s audiences”, in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012):111–133.

Mullen, W. (1982). *Choreia*: *Pindar and Dance*. Princeton.

Murray, O. (1990). “Cities of Reason”, in Murray, O. and S. Price, eds., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*. Oxford: 1–25.

—— . (1997). “Rationality and the Greek City: the Evidence from Kamarina”, in Hansen, M. H., ed., *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Politcal Community*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, vol. 4. Copenhagen: 493–504.

Murray, P. (1981). “Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece”, *JHS* 101: 87–100.

Nafissi, M. (1980-81). “A proposito degli Aigheidai: grandi géne ed emporía nei rapporti Sparta-Cirene.” *AFLPer* 18, n.s., 4: 185–213.

—— . (1985). “Battiadi ed Aigheidai: per la storia dei rapporti tra Cirene e Sparta in età arcaica.” In Barker, Lloyd and Reynolds (1985): 375–86.

—— . (1999). “From Sparta to Taras: *Nomima*, *ktiseis*, and relationships between colony and mother city”, in Hodkinson and Powell (1999): 245–272.

Nagy, G. (1985). “Theognis and Megara: A Poet’s Vision of his City”, In Figueria, T. and G. Nagy, eds., *Theognis of Megara*: *Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore.

—— . (1990a). *Pindar’s Homer*: *The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

—— . (1990b). *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.

—— . (1994). “Genre and Occasion”, *Mètis* 9.1: 11–25).

—— . (2010) “Asopos and his multiple daughters: Traces of the preclassical epic in the Aiginetan Odes of Pindar”, in Fearn (2011a): 40–78.

Nash, L.L. (1982). “The Theban Myth at *Pythian* 9, 79-103.” *QUCC* n.s., 11: 77–99.

Nieto Hernandez, M. P. (1993). “Heracles and Pindar”, *Metis* 8: 75–102.

Nikolaidou–Arabatzi, S. (2014). “Maiden Choruses in the Epinician Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides: Poet’s Choral ‘I’”, *QUCC*, n.s., 106.1: 33–50.

Nünlist, R. (2007). “Choral Lyric: Pindar and Bacchylides”, in de Jong, I J.F. and R. Nünlist, eds., *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, vol. 2. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 291. Leiden: 233–251.

Ogden, D. (1997). *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece*. London.

O’Higgins, D.M. (1997). “Medea as Muse: Pindar’s *Pythian* 4”, in Clauss and Johnston (1997): 103–126.

Olivieri, O. (2004). “*L'inno ad Apollo Ptoios* di Pindaro ("Hymn." frr. 51A-D Maehl).” *QUCC* n.s., 76.1: 55–69.

—— . (2007). “Il fr. 198b Maehl. di Pindaro e la morte di Tiresia.” *QUCC*, n.s., 85.1: 65–71.

—— . (2011a). *Miti e Culti tebani nella poesia di Pindaro*. Filologia e critica 89. Pisa.

—— . (2011b). “Dioniso e sua madre Semele nelle tradizioni tebane e nella poesia di Pindaro”, in Aloni, A. And M. Ornaghi, eds., *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali*: nuovi contributi. Orione 4. Messina: 177–200.

Olsen, S. (2020). “Pindar, *Paean* 6: Genre as Embodied Cultural Knowledge”, in Foster, Kurke and Weiss (2020): 325–346.

Osborne, R. (1998). “Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West”, in Fisher, N. and W. van Wees, eds., *Archaic Greece*: *New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: 251–270.

—— . (2009). *Greece in the Making*: *1200–497 BCE*. Routledge History of the Ancient World. 2nd edn. New York.

—— . (2012). “Archaic Greek History”, in de Jong, I.J.F. and H. van Wees, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: 497–520.

Pappas, Z. (2018). *Genealogy and Identity*: *The Genealogical Evidence for the Appropriation of Early East Greek Mythology by the Mainland City-States in the Archaic Period*. Ph.D. Diss. Columbia University.

Papazarkadas, N., ed. (2014). *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia*: *New Finds, New Prospects*. Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy. Leiden.

Parker, R. (1989). “Spartan Religion”, in Powell, A., ed. *Classical Sparta*: *Techniques Behind Her Success*. New York: 142–172.

Patterson, L.E. (2010). *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin.

Pavese, C.O. (1968). “Semantematica della poesia corale greca.” *Belfagor* 23.4: 389–430.

Pavlides, N.A. (2010). “Worshipping Heroes: Civic Identity and the Veneration of the Communal Dead in Archaic Sparta”, in Cavanagh, H., W. Cavanagh, and J. Roy, eds., *Honouring the Dead in the Peloponnese*: proceedings of the conference held at Sparta 23-25 April 2009. CSPS Online Publication 2: 551-576. <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/csps/resources/open-access/hounouring-the-dead.aspx>.

—— . (2011). *Hero-Cult in Archaic and Classical Sparta*: *A Study of Local Religion*. *Pindar and the Poetics of Autonomy*: *Authorial Agency in Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Edinburgh: < http://hdl.handle.net/1842/14212>.

Pavlou, H. (2012). "Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past", in Marincola, J., et al., eds., *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras*: *History without Historians*. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6. Edinburgh: 95–112.

Peirano, I. (2013). "'Sealing' the book: the *sphragis* as paratext." In Jansen, L., ed., *The Roman Paratext*: *Frame, Texts, Readers*. Cambridge: 225 –242.

Pelliccia, H. (2009). "Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides", in Budelmann (2009): 240–262.

Petropoulou, A. (2011–2012). "Hyakinthos and Apollo of Amyklai: Identities and Cults. A Reconsideration of the Written Evidence," *Mouseio Benaki* 11–12: 153–161.

Pettersson, M. (1992). *Cults of Apollo at Sparta*: *The Hyakinthia, the Gymnopaidiai, and the Karneia*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 12. Stockholm.

Pfeijffer, I.L. (2004). "Pindar and Bacchylides", in Nünlist, R., et al., eds., *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, vol. 1. Leiden: 213–232.

Phillips, T. (2016). *Pindar's Library*: *Performance Poetry and Material Texts*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford.

—— . (2018). "Words and the Musician: Pindar's Dactylo-Epitrites", in Phillips, T. and A. D'Angour, eds., *Music, Text, and Culture in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: 73–98.

Poerio, R.L. (2017). *La storiografia tebana di età ellenistica: Testo, traduzione e commento dei frammenti su Tebe di Timagora, Lico, Aristodemo di Tebe e Lisimaco di Alessandria*.

Ph.D. Diss. University of Naples Federico II: <http://www.fedoa.unina.it/11838/1/poerio_rosa%20leandra_29.pdf>.

Potamiti, A. (2015). "The Theme of Hospitality in Pindar's Fourth *Pythian*." *G&R* 62.1: 1–11.

Powell, A. (2018). *A Companion to Sparta*. 2 vols. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA.

Pratt, L.H. (1993). *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar*: *Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*. Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity. Ann Arbor.

Prodi, E.E. (2017). "Text as paratext: Pindar, Sappho, and Alexandrian Editions." *GRBS* 57.3: 547–582.

Race, W.H. (2012). *Pindar I*: *Olympian Odes*. *Pythian Odes*. LCL 56. Cambridge, MA.

Rawles, R. (2018). *Simonides the Poet*: *Intertextuality and Reception*. Cambridge.

Rawlings, H.R. (1975). *A Semantic Study of "Prophasis to 400 B.C.* Hermes Einzelschriften 33. Wiesbaden.

Richer, N. (2004). "The Hyakinthia of Sparta", in Figueira (2004): 77–102.

Robbins, E. (1997). "Pindar", in Gerber, D., ed., *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden: 253–277.

——— . (2013a). *Thalia Delighting in Song*: *Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry*. B. MacLachlan, ed. Toronto.

——— . (2013b). "Jason and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar's Fourth *Pythian*", in Robbins (2013): 192–201.

——— . (2013c). "Cyrene and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar's Ninth *Pythian*", in Robbins (2013): 202–216.

Robert C. (1915). *Oidipus*: *Geshichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum*. Berlin.

Robinson, E.W. (2011). *Democracy Beyond Athens*: *Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*. Cambridge.

Rockwell, N. (2017). *Thebes*: *A History*. Cities of the Ancient World. New York.

Rutherford, I. (1997). "Odes and Ends: Closure in Greek Lyric", in Roberts, D.H., et al., eds. *Classical Closure*: *Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton: 43–61.

——— . (2001). "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary", in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 33–55.

——— . (2014)." Singing Myth: Pindar", in Dowden, K. and N. Livingstone, eds., A *Companion to Greek Mythology*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell: 109–123.

Sakellariou, M.B. (1990). *Between Memory and Oblivion*: *The Transmission of Early Greek Historical Traditions*. Athens.

Sanders, K.A. (2018). *Pindar and the Enigmatic Tradition*. Ph.D thesis. University of Texas at Austin: <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/65647>.

Schachter, A. (1967). "The Theban Wars." *Phoenix* 21.1: 1 –10.

——— . (1979). "The Boiotian Herakles", in Fossey and Schachter (1979): 37 –43.

——— . (1981–1994). *Cults of Boiotia*. 4 vols. = *BICS Supplement* 38. London.

——— . (2014). "Creating a Legend: the war between Thebes and Orchomenos." *QUCC* n.s., 106.1: 65–88.

——— . (2016a). *Boiotia in Antiquity*: *Selected Papers*. Cambridge.

——— (2016b). "Politics and personalities in Classical Thebes", in Schachter (2016a): 66–79.

——— . (2019). "The Boiotians: Between *ethnos* and *koinon*. In Beck, Buraselis and McAuley (2019): 65–82.

Schaus, G. (1985). “The Evidence for Laconians in Cyrenaica in the Archaic Period”, in Barker, Lloyd, and Reynolds (1985): 395–403.

Schmid, M.J. (1996). *Speech and Speaker in Pindar*. Ph.D. Diss. Stanford University.

—— . (1998a). “Speaking ‘Personae’ in Pindar’s Epinicia”, *CFC* 8: 147–184.

Schironi, F. (2019). “The Speaking Persona: Ancient Commentators on Choral Performance”, in Foster, Kurke and Weiss (2019): 109–132.

Scirpo, P.D. (2017). “About the Boeotian Origin of the Emmenidai’s Genos: An Indication from Gela”, in Bierl (2017): 217–228.

Scodel, R.D. (2001). “Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar”, in Watson (2001): 109–137

Segal, C. (1986). *Pindar’s Mythmaking*: *The Fourth Pythian Ode*. Princeton.

—— . (1998a). *Aglaia*: *The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*. Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Lanham, MD.

—— . (1998b). “Naming, Truth, and Creation in the Poetics of Pindar”, in Segal (1998): 105–132.

—— . (1998c). “Messages to the Underworld: An Aspect of Poetic Immortalization in Pindar”, in Segal (1998a): 133–148.

Sevieri, R. (2000). “ Cantare la città: tempo mitico e spazio urbano nell’ *Istmica* 7 di Pindaro per Strepsiade di Tebe”, in Angeli Bernardini (2000): 179–192.

Sicka, D.M.J. (2015). *A Commentary on Pindar’s Emmenid Odes*: *O.2, O.3, P.6, I.*2. Ph.D. Diss. University of Oxford: <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4a36d011-96df-4a6f-b89a-88fd5c18628e>.

Sider, D. (2001). “Fragments 1–22 W^2: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation”, in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 13–29.

A Commentary on Pindar’s Emmenid Odes: *O.2, O.3, P.6, I.2*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Oxford: <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4a36d011-96df-4a6f-b89a-88fd5c18628e>.

Sigelman, A.C. (2016). *Pindar’s Poetics of Immortality.* Cambridge.

Silk, M. (2012). “Reading Pindar”, in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012): 347–364.

Slater, N.W., ed. (2017). *Voice and Voices in Antiquity*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, vol. 11. Mnemosyne Supplements vol. 396. Leiden.

Slater, W.J., ed. (1969). *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.

—— . (1979a). “Pindar’s Myths: Two Pragmatic Explanations”, in Bowerstock, G.W., et al., eds., *Arktouros*: *Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Berlin: 63–70.

—— . (1979b). “Pindar and Hypothekai”, in Fossey and Schachter (1979): 79–82.

—— . (1983). “Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle.” *ClAnt* 2.1: 117–132.

Snell, B. (1982). *Griechische Metrik*. Göttingen.

Snell, B. and Maehler, H., eds. (1987). *Pindarus*. *Pars I*: *Epinicia*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana (repr. 2008). Leipzig.

Spelman, H. (2018). *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford.

Stamatopoulou, Z. (2017). *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry*: *Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge.

Stephens, S. (2011). “Remapping the Mediterranean: The Argo Adventure in Apollonius and Callimachus”, in Obbink, D. and R. Rutherford, eds., *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*. Oxford: 188–207.

Studnizcka, F. (1890). *Kyrēnē*: *Eine altgrieschische Göttin*: *Archäologische und Mythologische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.

Suárez de la Torre, E. (2006). “Les mentions généalogiques chez Pindare.” *Kernos* 19: 97–11. <https://doi.org/: 10.4000/kernos.435>.

—— . (2015). “The Apollonian Features of Pindar’s *Pythian* Odes”, in Pena, A.N., et al., eds., *Revisitar o Mito* (=*Myths Revisited*). Ribeirao: 11–30.

Sulimani, I. (2017). “Imaginary Islands in the Hellenistic Era: Utopia on the Geographical Map”, in Hawes (2017): 221–242.

Symeonoglou, S. (1985). *The Topography of Thebes*: *From the Bronze Age to Modern Times*. Princeton.

Thomas, R. (2012). “Pindar’s ‘difficulty’ and the performance of epinikian poetry: some suggestions from ethnography”, in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012): 224–245.

—— . (2019). *Polis Histories*, *Collective Memories and the Greek World.* Oxford.

Thummer, E. (1968-1969). *Pindar. Die Isthmischen Gedichte*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Tibiletti, A. (2018). “Commenting on Pindar, *Olympian* 2: The Emmenid Genealogies.” *CCJ* 64: 166 –177.

Tsagalis, C. (2015). “*Telegony*”, in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015): 380–401.

Tufano, S. (2019). *Boiotia from Within*: *The Beginnings of Boiotian Historiography*. *TSO* 2: <https://doi.org/10.17879/tso-2019-vol2>.

Uhlig, A. (2016). “A poetic possession: Pindar’s *Lives* of the poets”, in Fletcher, R. and J. Hanink, eds., *Creative Lives in Classical Antiquity*: *Poet’s, Artists, and Biography*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: *Theatrical Reenactment in Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: 103–128.

—— . (2019). *Theatrical Reenactment in Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge.

Vannicelli, P. (1992). “Gli Egidi e le relazioni tra Sparta e Cirene in età arcaica.” *QUCC* n.s., 41.2: 55–73.

—— . (1993). *Erodoto e la storia dell’Alto Arcaismo (Sparta—Tessaglia—Cirene)*. Rome.

Vian, F. (1963). *Les Origines de Thèbes*: *Cadmos et les Spartes*. Études et commentaires 48. Paris.

Vlachou, V. (2018). “Feasting at the Sanctuary of Apollo Hyakinthos at Amykles: The Evidence from the Early Iron Age”, in van den Eijnde, F., J. Blok, and R. Strootman, eds., *Feasting and Polis Institutions*. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 414. Leiden: 93–124.

Waldo, C.J. (2019). *Emergent Genre*: *Innovation and Experimentation in the Victory Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides*. Ph.D. diss. University of California, Berkeley. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2r83836k>.

Walker, J. (2000). *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford.

Watson, J., ed. (2001). *Speaking Volumes*: *Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 218. Leiden.

West, M.L., ed. (1966). *Theogony*. Oxford.

—— . (1973). “Greek Poetry 2000–700 B.C.” *CQ* 23.2: 179–`192.

—— . (1974). *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.

——— . (1982). *Greek Metre*. Oxford.

——— . (1985). *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*: *Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford.

——— . (1987). *Introduction to Greek Metre*. Oxford.

——— . (1989-92). *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. 2 vols. Oxford.

Willcock, M.M., ed. (1995). *Pindar*. *Victory Odes*: *Olympians 2, 7, and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, and 7*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1922). *Pindaros*. Berlin.

Wilhelm, M. P. (1973). *Pindar*: *A Literary Study of Pythians 4 and 5*. Ph.D. Diss. Ohio State University: < http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=*osu1226068113* >.

Williams, F. (1978). *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo*. Oxford.

Woodard, R. D., ed. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*. Cambridge Companions to Literature and Classics. Cambridge.

Wülfing-v. Martitz, P. (1960). "Ιερός bei Homer." *Glotta* 38.3–4: 272–307.

Young, D.C. (1973). *Pindar, Isthmian 7*: *Myth and Exempla*. Mnemosyne Supplements, vol. 15. Leiden.

Young, D.C. (1983). "Pindar *Pythians 2 and 3*: *Inscriptional* ποτέ and the "Poetic Epistle", *HSPh* 87: 31–48.

Zali, V. (2018). "Herodotus Mapping out his Genre: The Interaction of Myth and Geography in the Libyan *Logos*", in Bowie, E. ed., *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Trends in Classics; supplementary vol. 59. Berlin: 125–138.