

## PINDAR'S *PYTHIAN* 4: INTERPRETING HISTORY IN SONG\*

Peter Agócs

*Abstract:* This chapter comprises a narratological analysis of Pindar's longest victory-ode, *Pythian* 4, composed to celebrate a chariot victory at Delphi of Arcesilas IV, the Battiad king of Cyrene. Through a close reading of the ode as a colonisation-story, and through comparison with the traditions set out by Herodotus in his Libyan *logos*, it examines Pindar's handling of oral and poetic tradition, and the connection between poetic form and political/social ideology.

*Keywords:* Pindar, *Pythian* 4, collective/social memory, ideological meaning of poetry, time and narrative, Cyrene, Herodotus

### 1. Introduction

In the late summer or early autumn of 462 BCE, Arcesilas IV, the eighth Battiad king of Cyrene in line from the Founder Battos I, won the chariot-race at the Pythian Games. His victory was celebrated by Pindar in two epinician odes (*Pythians* 4 and 5). Together with *Pythian* 9, composed twelve years earlier for the victory of Telesicrates in the Delphic race in armour, and the Libyan *logos* that Herodotus composed a few decades later, these songs form our largest textual dossier on how the

---

\* I wish to thank the editors, as well as Jessica Lightfoot, Alan Griffiths, Zsigmond Ritoók, Samu Gábor, Felix Budelmann, Chris Carey and Simon Hornblower, all of whom read drafts of this piece and suggested changes. I thank Raymond Geuss and Chris Kassam, Asya Sigelman and her class at Bryn Mawr College, and certain colleagues in the Cambridge Classics faculty, for reading the ode with me. Pietro Vannicelli recommended important reading. A version of this text was presented to the Reading Classics Seminar (November 2016). Pindar's text follows the edition of Snell and Maehler (1997); Herodotus' from that of Wilson (2015). The Pindar scholia are cited from the edition of Drachmann (1910) = 'Dr.' The Pindar-translations were checked against Race's Loeb (1997) and Braswell (1988). I should have made earlier use of Isobel Longley-Cook's (1989) excellent St. Andrews PhD thesis, now available online. Similarities between her analysis and mine were arrived at independently. Pindar's epinicians are cited simply by book and line-number.

Hellenes of North Africa understood their early history, particularly with respect to the foundation (*ktisis*) of Cyrene.<sup>1</sup>

Each of these sources enacts a unique ‘set’ on that tale of origins. *Pythian* 9 concentrates on the Thessalian nymph Cyrene’s abduction by Apollo.<sup>2</sup> This myth, primordial, symbolic, and enjoying a certain Panhellenic reach because of its inclusion in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* tradition,<sup>3</sup> remained the dominant charter-myth of Hellenic Libya down to Roman times. *Pythians* 4 and 5 each focus in different ways on the human *ktisis*, which happened on the initiative of the Delphic god Apollo (identified at Cyrene with ‘Dorian’ Apollo Carneios), and involved the arrival of Dorian-speaking settlers from Thera (Santorini) led by Battos (also known as Aristoteles),<sup>4</sup> Arcesilas’ ancestor. The fifth *Pythian* concentrates on Battos himself, whose myth—as a charter for the city’s relationship with Apollo, for the Cyrenaeans’ possession of the land, and for the parasitical symbiosis of ruling family and people—survives as a ‘sacred identity’ conveyed not only through oral tradition and in performed and written song, but also through ritual practices (the Carneia-festival, ancestor-worship and the oikist cult) and even the physical fabric of the city itself.<sup>5</sup> *Pythian* 4, with its thirteen triads and intricate narrative structure that culminates in its central Argonautic myth is the longest extant nondramatic Greek choral ode.<sup>6</sup> It weaves two stories—the god’s apparently random selection of Battos as king, and the tale of how Battos’ distant ancestor Euphemus the Argonaut happened to receive a

---

<sup>1</sup> For historical surveys of the *poleis* of Greek Cyrenaica, see Austin in Hansen and Nielsen (2004) 1233–7, 1240–7 (Cyrene and Apollonia: no. 1028; Barke-Ptolemais: no. 1025; Euhesperides-Berenike: no. 1026; Taucheira-Arsinoe: no. 1029; see also Reger on Thera: no. 527); also Chamoux (1953) and Mitchell (2000). I cannot here present an overview of the theory of collective or social memory: for useful introductions see Giangliulio (2010) 13–43, Assmann (2011) 15–141 and Fentress and Wickham (1992).

<sup>2</sup> See Dougherty (1993) 136–56.

<sup>3</sup> For the Cyrene-*ehoie*: [Hes.] fr. 215–17 **M-W** = 101–2 Hirschberger (2004) with Giangliulio (2001) 122. D’Alessio (2005a) 206–7 ascribes the passage tentatively to *Megalai Ehoiai*; West (1985) 85–9 firmly to the *Catalogue of Women*.

<sup>4</sup> On Battos’ two names (‘Stutterer’ vs. ‘Aristoteles’) see Corcella (2007) 681–2; Vannicelli (1993) 137–8 and Braswell (1988) 147–8. Sources: Pind. *P.* 5.87 (with  $\Sigma$  *P.* 5, 117, ii: 187 Dr.), *P.* 4.59–63 (on which see pp. 33–35 below) and Acesander *FGrHist* 469 F5a. Herodotus 4.155.2–3, though apparently unaware of ‘Aristoteles’, believed ‘Battos’ was the Libyan for ‘king’ (*contra* see e.g. Masson 1976), and was not, therefore, the Founder’s original name.

<sup>5</sup> For ‘sacred identity’ (in the context of Herodotus’ *logoi*) see Giangliulio (2001) 116–20 esp. 118 n. 9–10; on ritual and the built environment as ‘carriers’ of social memory, see Assmann (2011) 23–8 and 34–50. *P.* 5 has been intensely studied from the point of view of social memory: Krummen (2014) 117–18; Lefkowitz (1991) 169–90; Dougherty (1993) 103–19; Calame (2003) 79–86; Currie (2005) 226–57; and the indices in Chamoux (1953) and Malkin (1994).

<sup>6</sup> Stesichorus’s songs were longer: his influence may make itself felt particularly in elements in *P.* 4’s myth of Jason, which this essay treats as ‘epic’ (see pp. 000–000 below).

clod of earth from a stranger on the shores of Lake Triton—into a legitimation of the Battiads’ predestined right to rule. In an example of what Assmann has called the ‘alliance between power and memory’, Pindar’s odes for Arcesilas thus place history and myth, and a particular idea of a divinely predestined Cyrenaean *mission civilisatrice*, at the service of Battiad hegemony.<sup>7</sup>

Pindar’s odes cannot, however, be properly understood without Herodotus. In his Libyan *logos* (4.145–205, the subject of Emily Baragwanath’s chapter in this volume), the ‘father of history’ presents an account of this same *ktisis* story (145–58) more circumstantial than Pindar’s. Drawing, as he claims, on local traditions of Lacedaimon, Thera, and Cyrene, he traces a chain of interrelated migrations beginning with those Minyans, descendants of Jason’s Argonauts, who, after settling at Sparta following their expulsion from Lemnos, accompanied Theras (a descendant of Polynices and Cadmus and the ancestor, through his son Oiolykos, of the Spartan Aegeidae)<sup>8</sup> to the island that would bear his name (4.145–9). In the following chapters (150–8), as he narrates the *ktisis* of Cyrene under Battos eight generations after Theras, Herodotus first gives a ‘Theraean’ account of Battos’ origins and the islanders’ decision to colonise Libya (150–3), before reverting back to a second, Cyrenaean version of the same events which he follows up to the point (roughly the Theraean colonists’ definitive arrival in their Libyan home) where his two epichoric traditions coalesce into a single *logos*.<sup>9</sup> The Theraeans camp first on a coastal island called Plataea; then, after some Delphic prompting, they settle the mainland at a place called Aziris before moving finally to Cyrene (153, 156–9.1).

Herodotus is important for understanding Pindar’s odes for Arcesilas, not least because his account arguably reflects the changed political conditions of Cyrene after the collapse (c. 440 BCE) of the Battiad monarchy and the establishment of a limited democracy. Pindar’s odes, on the other hand, composed two decades earlier, are best read as expressions of monarchical ideology. Together these Cyrenaean stories thus provide, as Maurizio Giangliulo (2001) writes, a test-case for examining Greek social memory traditions in a ‘colonial’ context: how foundation-traditions were creatively

---

<sup>7</sup> Assmann (2011) 53–4.

<sup>8</sup> See Baragwanath (in this volume) 3–7 on the wider connections of this Phoenician motif in the *logos* and the *Histories*. On the Aegeidae and Sparta, see p. 27 below.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Hdt. 4.154.1, where Herodotus seems to say that the Theraeans’ story joins the Cyrenaean’s either with the sailing of the settlers or their arrival at Plataea. On the question where the ‘Cyrenaean’ version ends, which has bothered commentators since at least Jacoby, see Corcella (2007) 669–70 and Giangliulo (2001) 117 n. 4 (with further references); cf. Malkin (2003) 157–9.

adapted, ‘reinvented’, or adjusted to reflect constant changes of socio-political context, or, alternatively, allowed to persist as markers of a shared past.<sup>10</sup> Giangiulio has unpicked the likely very complicated mixture of poetic, oral and written sources, as well as local and ‘Panhellenic’ story-variants, which fed into the traditions mined by Pindar and Herodotus.

Here I am less concerned with these probable sources (although, continuing earlier precedents, I will have some suggestions to make about them). Rather, what concerns me most are the patterns of structure and signification created by Pindar’s organisation of his story into poetic narrative. The interpretation that follows, which is strongly indebted to other historical and literary readings of Pindar’s text, will proceed through the ode in a linear fashion from beginning to end, making constant comparative digressions into Herodotean territory. Such comparisons, whether to Herodotus, to other pre- and post-Pindaric sources, or to modern anthropological work on oral traditions, enable one to consider questions of contextualisation that are often taken for granted by ancient historians, and even more so in Pindaric criticism as it exists today—questions implicit in any attempt to make literature, as a form or ‘figure’ of a given society’s engagement with its past,<sup>11</sup> fit into the wider culture of memory and commemoration (that diverse, endlessly creative web of interacting ‘social frames of memory’) that creates and sustains it: how poetry reflects political reality, and if it does, what ‘reality’ it reflects.

The chapter is thus an essay in what has been called ‘the politics of form’. It uses a close formal reading (in this case: a narratological analysis built mostly around concepts pioneered by Gérard Genette)<sup>12</sup> of a poetic structure to reveal the deeper ideological construction of political and historical meaning, and finally of mythical and historical time, that underlies and determines the form. *Pythian 4*, my focus of attention here, is a text that, through the poet’s handling of time in narrative, performs a certain ‘intentional’ interpretation of history focused on group identity and institutions.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> I use ‘colonial’ euphemistically, aware of the difficulties surrounding the concept (see esp. Osborne 1998).

<sup>11</sup> See **n. 16 below**.

<sup>12</sup> Genette (1980); Ricoeur (1984–1988) is another important, if here largely unacknowledged influence.

<sup>13</sup> On ‘intentional history’, see Giangiulio (2001) 116–20; Gehrke (1994) and (2001), and the articles in Foxhall, Luraghi and Gehrke (2010). Grethlein (2010) presents a different, less satisfactory Greek historical consciousness’ development from Pindar to Herodotus and beyond. On time in Greek

After an introductory paragraph on the relation of ‘myth’ to ‘frame’ in Pindar, I will begin my reading of *Pythian* 4, analysing its formal and temporal structure, but digressing to consider particular themes that emerge in the course of reading.<sup>14</sup> The ode, I will argue, enacts in its form certain styles of temporality typical of Greek oral traditions. I will examine its use of temporal themes and narrative effects— anachrony, chronology, genealogy, counterfactual memory, tradition and so on—to understand the way in which its concrete literary form enacts a certain ideological perspective. I will also examine how Pindar integrates multiple traditional tales into a single poetic structure. Having reached the ode’s concluding triad (the ‘coda’), the argument takes a methodological and theoretical turn, to consider first the general problem of contextualising myth in our readings of Greek poetic texts, and then Pindar’s own vision of history. On its most general level—that is to say, the level on which the ode’s historical present relates to a paradigmatic time of origins—we find that the poet’s chosen form pulls the disparate mythistorical strata of his song together into a single hegemonic pattern from which the divine intention that underlies the whole development of Cyrene’s history springs suddenly into view: a historical vision, I will argue, that shows some affinities to the concept of ‘typology’ familiar from biblical hermeneutics. This theoretical turn is not intended as a key to unlock Pindar’s narrative; rather, it is a suggestion that you can take or leave. Whatever view you take of it, the chapter will, I hope, make clear that *Pythian* 4, as a commemorative song within a wider Cyrenaean and Panhellenic ‘culture of memory’, performs ideology through its form, inferring from society’s beginnings a vision of the stability of its divinely-ordained and supposedly eternal institutions.

## 2. Myth as a Problem of Epinician Form

Our journey through Pindar’s ode begins by invoking the general question of how ‘present’ and ‘past’, ‘frame’ and ‘myth’, relate in epinician. Pindar locates his victory odes in the dominant Homeric tradition of *kleos*-song. Both he and his older contemporary Simonides were conscious of the variety of cultural technologies, genres, or ‘figures’ of social memory available in their culture: ways—from song to inscribed epigram, folktale, ritual or commemorative statue—of giving meaningful

---

historiography, see also the relevant contributions in Grethlein and Krebs (2012), especially those by Boedeker and Baragwanath.

<sup>14</sup> My approach has affinities with Most’s (1985) 42 notion of ‘compositional form’.

concrete form to the present's engagement with the past. They assert song's privileged place, in competition with these other genres, within what we might call the larger Greek 'culture of memory'.<sup>15</sup>

The relationship of 'present' to 'past' is indeed central to epinician. Apart from a few that are too short to accommodate a narrative, these odes are almost always built around a shift from 'occasion' or 'frame' to 'myth',<sup>16</sup> 'praise' to 'narrative' and back again. *Pythian* 4 comprises two such mythical digressions, one of which (the Jason story) is by far the longest such inset-narrative in extant Pindar. But this movement from praise to myth, although a fundamental formal structure of the genre, has all too often been regarded as problematic. Beginning with the *scholia vetera*, critics have treated epinician myths—much like Herodotus' stories within stories—as unmotivated 'digressions'.<sup>17</sup> The roots of this attitude can be traced back to the language employed by Pindar's own lyric voice in the so-called 'break-offs' (*Abbruchsformeln*) or 'returns' with which he often ends his myths. In these, he tends to claim that he is straying from his real subject of praise.<sup>18</sup> Break-offs help to maintain an illusion of spontaneity in a poetic form whose success depends greatly on immediacy, sincerity and presence. But when the lyric voice claims to be wandering from his contracted purpose, it is hardly surprising that epinician myths have long been read as arbitrary digressions. Perhaps the earliest extant Greek reflection on this problem outside the odes themselves is the familiar (perhaps fourth-century?) tale of Simonides' invention of the *ars memoriae* (Cic. *De orat.* 2.86).<sup>19</sup> Here, the punishment of Simonides' patron Scopas by the gods for his refusal to pay the poet his full fee for a song that had praised the Dioscuri equally to himself evokes the relative priority of 'myth' (divinity and the collective) over 'praise' (and the

---

<sup>15</sup> On 'figures' and 'sites' of social/collective memory, see Assmann (2011) 23–8, whose discussion is strongly dependent on Halbwachs (1925) (1941), and (1950). For analysis of the fifth-century Greek culture of memory and epinician's place within it, see Agócs (2009) and Thomas (2007).

<sup>16</sup> In Pindaric scholarship, 'the myth' refers to an ode's central narrative: I also use it loosely in the sense of a traditional tale. The bibliography on the relevance (or irrelevance) of myth to frame in Pindar is overwhelming: for a few stages in that ongoing debate, see Young (1968) and (1970); Köhnken (1971); Most (1985); Segal (1986); Pfeijffer (2004); Burnett (2005); Nünlist (2007); Krummen (2014); Morgan (2015); Sigelman (2016). On Pindar's use of time in narrative, see Hurst (1985) and – with the most recent bibliography -- Sigelman (2016).

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Σ inscr. a, ii: 92 Dr., which describes the myth of *P.* 4 as a *ἱστορικὴ παρέκβασις* (= 'historical digression').

<sup>18</sup> On break-offs (for an example, see pp. 33-5; 41-3 below), see Schadewaldt (1928); Race (1989) 189–209; and Fuhrer (1988).

<sup>19</sup> Simonides fr. 510 *PMG* = T80 Poltera; Yates (1966) 1–4; Rawles (2018) 191–3.

individual *laudandus*) in epinician. As Lowrie writes: ‘One could argue that society produces victors in order to get the national myth told’.<sup>20</sup>

### 3. Poetic form, time and geography in *Pythian* 4 proem

By its very form, epinician song thus connects an individual’s athletic triumph to tradition—in Arcesilas’ case, to the collective history of society. This (and the genre’s consequent power to ‘integrate’ individual achievement into shared cultural *kleos*)<sup>21</sup> helps to explain its outstanding success—at least in the conditions of the early fifth century BCE—as a technology of social memory. But it also turns each ode into an ideological statement packaged as a hermeneutic enigma, since the connection between victory and ‘myth’ is never very explicit.

The victory fixes the song in historical time, logging a ‘debt’ the *laudator* must requite.<sup>22</sup> But Pindar’s epinicians almost always inhabit a present time of celebration posterior to the victory.<sup>23</sup> This is the ‘epinician moment’: the ode’s discursive frame, from which it digresses into ‘myth’. As a movement *away* from this ‘epinician moment’, myth takes shape in relation to the ‘now’ and ‘here’ of praise. As the ode moves into its myth, the lyric voice becomes a narrator, and the deictic cues which constitute the frame are erased.<sup>24</sup> The *Fourth Pythian*’s proem shows how this works (1–13):

#### triad 1, strophe 1

*Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ’ ἀνδρὶ φίλω  
στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆϊ Κυράνας,  
ὄφρα κομάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλῃ,  
Μοῖσα, Λατοΐδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυ-  
θῶνι τ’ αὐξῆς οὔρον ὕμνων,  
ἔνθα ποτὲ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος  
οὐκ ἀποδάμουσιν Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἰέρεια  
χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττων*

5

<sup>20</sup> Lowrie (1997) 34–5.

<sup>21</sup> For the idea of epinician as (re)integrating individual aristocratic achievement into the collective culture, see Kurke (1991) 1–11 and (1993).

<sup>22</sup> On this ‘*chreos*’ motif, see e.g. Schadewaldt (1928) 278 n. 1 and Kurke (1991) index.

<sup>23</sup> In *Pythians* 4 and 5, a celebration in the victor’s home city: on a song’s ‘descriptive context’ in relation to the ‘original’ context of performance, see Yatromanolakis (2004).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Calame (2003) esp. 35–60; on ‘shifting-in’ and ‘shifting out’, Calame (1996) esp. 20–4; also Felson (1999).

καρποφόρου Λιβύας, ἱεράν  
νᾶσον ὡς ἤδη λιπὼν κτίσσειεν εὐάρματον  
πόλιν ἐν ἀργεννόεντι μαστῶ,

tr. 1, antistrophe 1

καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι  
ἐβδόμα καὶ σὺν δεκάτα γενεᾷ Θή-  
ραιον, Αἰήτα **τό ποτε** ζαμενής  
παῖς ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, δέξ-  
ποινα Κόλχων. εἶπε δ' οὕτως  
ἡμιθέοισιν Ἰάσονος αἰχματᾶο ναύταις·  
'Κέκλυτε, παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν·  
[...]

10

**Today**, my Muse, you must stand by a friend, the King of horse-famed Cyrene, so that, joining Arcesilas' *komos*, you may bring increase to the sailing-wind of songs we owe to Leto's children and to Pytho, **where once upon a time** the priestess who sits beside Zeus' golden eagles, at a time when Apollo was not away in another country, prophesied Battos to be the founder of harvest-rich Libya, and that he should immediately leave the holy island and found a city of fine chariots on the silvery-white breast [of a hill], and [thereby] bring home the Theraean word of Medea in the seventeenth generation, **which once** the great-minded child of Aietes breathed from an immortal mouth, the Lady of the Colchians. And she spoke thus to the demigods, the sailors of Jason Spearman: 'Hark, you children of valiant humans and of gods...!'

The ode opens in the midst of a victory-*komos*: a traditional term for epinician celebration that covers a complex range of social behaviours.<sup>25</sup> Its first word is 'today': a moment in time (a 'now') that rapidly becomes a setting (a 'here') with multiple figures—speaker, Muse and Arcesilas (the object of celebration)—who stand in various relations to one another. As almost always in Pindar's victory odes, there is

<sup>25</sup> On *komos*-terminology as a genre-marker in epinician song, and a way of describing the epinician occasion, see e.g. Harvey (1955) 163–4; Heath (1988); Morgan (1993); Eckerman (2010); Agócs (2012); and Maslov (2015) 279–94.

no sign of an audience. Arcesilas is leading his own *komos*; ‘I’ (the speaker’s position is marked only by reference to his addressee) am in Cyrene; ‘you’, the Muse (the addressee), are to come ‘here’ and join ‘us’ (Arcesilas and ‘me’). Who is this ‘I’: this ‘lyric speaker’, ‘lyric voice’ or *laudator*?<sup>26</sup> Clearly, he too is somehow a *kōmastēs*: a description equally relevant to the composing poet and the performing chorus. Speaker, Muse and Arcesilas all have parts to play in the komastic moment established as the ‘frame’ or occasion of the ode.<sup>27</sup> Arcesilas, since he himself is performing the *komos* rather than receiving it in august detachment as royal *laudandi* sometimes do in Pindar,<sup>28</sup> is brought closer to the singer in a relationship defined by the bonds of *philia* (‘friendship’, or at least loyalty). The speaker’s *μὲν* ‘solitarium’ (1) opens a frame of utterance<sup>29</sup> which he later describes (3) as a ‘propitious sailing-wind of songs’ (*οὐρος ὕμνων*). This ‘wind’, he adds, is ‘owed’ to Apollo, Artemis and Delphi: the Muse must make it grow. The metaphor has been explained as an allusion to *Pythian* 4’s supplementary role in a panegyric program inaugurated by the fifth.<sup>30</sup> But ‘song as journey’ is a well-attested Greek poetic motif, particularly in reference to the idea of a ‘song-path’ (an *οἴμη*).<sup>31</sup> Drawing on the image of the ‘ship of state’, it can also describe historical contingency.<sup>32</sup> The *laudandus*’ ‘voyage out’ to Delphi, returning with glory that will increase the fame of his city and house (a quasi-narrative structure described by Kurke as the ‘*nostos* loop’), can also be understood as a quest.<sup>33</sup> Sailing and the quest-metaphor are thus a *leitmotiv* relevant on several levels of Pindar’s text (myth, song and frame alike), whose meanings are enriched as we travel through it.

Barely is this ‘epinician moment’ sketched out when the myth takes over (l. 4). Through a relative clause (*ἐνθα*, ‘where’) dependent on its antecedent (‘Pytho/Delphi’), the speaker glides back to when the Pythia appointed Battos founder of Cyrene. Such almost unmarked transitions to narrative are typically Pindaric.<sup>34</sup> At

<sup>26</sup> On the ambiguity of the epinician ‘I’, see D’Alessio (1994); Felson (1999) 9-13 and Currie (2013).

<sup>27</sup> On occasion and frame, see Agócs (2012) 193–4, 218–21.

<sup>28</sup> Arcesilas ‘receives’ the *komos* at *P.* 5.20–3; cf. e.g. *P.* 2.67–72.

<sup>29</sup> Braswell (1988) *ad loc.* and Denniston (1954) 382–4.

<sup>30</sup> Giannini (1995) 104 n. 2, cf. *ad loc.*; Giannini (1979). Wilamowitz (1922) 376 suggested the Carneia festival of 461 BCE as the likeliest context for the first performance of both odes.

<sup>31</sup> See on the theme of ‘song as journey’ Sigelman (2016) esp. 53–5 and 111ff; on *oimai*, see n. 186, n. 188 below. On the motif in *P.* 4 esp. Felson (1999).

<sup>32</sup> For a Pindaric example, see *P.* 8.98–100; cf. Alc. fr. 6, 73, 208, 249 Campbell with Gentili (1988) 197–215.

<sup>33</sup> Kurke (1991) 15–34.

<sup>34</sup> See Pfeijffer (2004) 214–16, Nünlist (2007) 233–4 and Sigelman (2016) 26–8, 117–18.

this point, the myth is still only an overextended ornamental epithet qualifying ‘Delphi’; the temporal shift is registered, however, with *ποτέ* (‘once upon a time’).<sup>35</sup> With this, we have arrived at what the Pythia said to Battos. The deictic markers of the initial komastic context are withdrawn, and the *laudator* becomes a more neutral *narrator*. The next stop on this journey is Medea: mention of whom (again in a relative clause) introduces a third, still-earlier temporal stratum nested inside the second.<sup>36</sup>

Pindar’s shift from his ‘occasion’ to his ‘myth’ thus unfolds over multiple temporal and narrative horizons embedded one inside the other: from the ‘now’ of the ode to Battos’ experiences in Delphi, and onward to the ‘Theraean word’ of Medea. This complex structure demands from the reader (and presumably from the original audience too) an ability to divine the meaning of its implicit temporal order. To paraphrase Gérard Genette’s fundamental study *Narrative Discourse* (1980), time manifests itself in narrative under three main aspects: *order*, *frequency* and *duration*.<sup>37</sup> *Order* involves studying how narrative (as a realised utterance or artistic object) rearranges the putative syntagmatic order of an underlying chronology of events (the *story*).<sup>38</sup> Pindar’s myth-opening permits a simple analysis of this kind. In the poem’s myth-historical time, Battos follows Medea, just as Arcesilas is descended from Battos: here, their positions are reversed. This is *retrograde narration*.<sup>39</sup> Pindar’s opening sentence incorporates two such retrospective movements (one nested within the other, each introduced by a relative clause and each marked by *ποτέ*). This retrogressive drift is familiar from epic ‘dispatching narratives’ like the proems of Homer’s *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, where the narrator progresses backwards through the story until he reaches a chosen (perhaps quite arbitrary) starting-point. The narrative

---

<sup>35</sup> *ποτέ*, which signals ‘time of the narrative’ (Calame (1996) 37) as opposed to ‘epinician moment’, normally marks analepsis in Pindar; for a proleptic use see l. 14 (discussed p. 16 below).

<sup>36</sup> See the analysis of Calame (2003) 43–8 and Sigelman (2016) 113–20.

<sup>37</sup> Effects of *frequency* (an event can take place once or many times) play almost no role in the *P.* 4. myth, which concentrates on analogies between historical singularities: cf. Nünlist (2007) 245–6. *Duration* dominates my analysis of the central myth (see pp. 33–41 below).

<sup>38</sup> cf. Genette (1980) 35–47, where ‘story’ translates *histoire*, and ‘narrative’ translates *récit* in the original French (cf. *fabula* vs. *sjuzhet* in Russian formalist theory).

<sup>39</sup> Genette (1980) calls any modification of the ‘natural’ order of the *story* ‘anachrony’. Backward narration is ‘retrospection’ or *analepsis* (a term used by Genette in reference to flashbacks achieved against the background of a generally progressive narrative, rather than of a narrative that, as here, unrolls itself *backwards* from effects to causes). Movement forward in the timeline (‘anticipation’) is *prolepsis*. cf. Nünlist (2007) 240–3.

then begins to move progressively.<sup>40</sup> In Pindar’s song, this point is Medea’s ‘Theraean word’ (ἔπος ... Θήραιον, 9–10). The song-wind’s projected votive journey as a gift or dedication from Arcesilas to Apollo is thus reconfigured as time-travel. The narrator thus moves through two tableaux, each involving a prophecy. The Pythia addresses Battos; Medea speaks to the Argonauts.

The Pythia’s words are presented in *oratio obliqua*. She enjoined Battos to leave the ‘sacred island’.<sup>41</sup> Her impatient ἤδη (‘already’, 7) implies the existence of a providential plan, since it takes Battos’ foundation of the city in Libya for granted.<sup>42</sup> The *ktisis* is also defined, by *hendiadys*, as a ‘bringing home’ or a ‘redeeming’ (ἀνακομίζειν)<sup>43</sup> of an utterance or ‘word’ (ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι ... τό ποτε ...: the *ipsissima verba*!) spoken by Medea while the Argonauts were at Thera.<sup>44</sup> The *hendiadys* thus expresses both a programme of action for Battos and a hidden meaning unknown either to him or the Pythia, whose oracle happily coincided with the content of a prophecy Medea had made sixteen generations earlier. By this point, the myth has almost pulled away from its frame: what follows are Medea’s own words, distinguished from the narrator’s by an epic-style speech formula (εἶπε δ’ οὐτως, 11).

Pindar’s opening thus sets out a chronological framework for the ode,<sup>45</sup> each of whose strata stand at an almost unimaginable temporal distance, in human terms, from one another. (At this juncture it is not yet clear that Battos and his settlers were themselves descended, as Minyans, from the Argonauts who listened to Medea’s speech).<sup>46</sup> The strata do, however, share a common geography. The nested episodes unfold into one another on a mental map that takes Apollo’s oracle as its centre. Arcesilas’ horses travel to Delphi, confirming the favour the god has always shown the Battiads.<sup>47</sup> Battos goes there to receive the prophecy that sends him and his Theraeans to Libya. Later, it will become apparent that Jason’s quest, too (the subject

<sup>40</sup> E.g. the *Iliad* proem (ll. 8–12) cf. Hurst (1983) 160 n. 13 and Genette (1980) 45–6. Such movement is also generally typical of Homeric embedded narratives, and has an important role to play in lyric narrative forms: p. 17 below.

<sup>41</sup> See Braswell (1988) 66 *ad* l. 5(a). Apollo’s presence (or rather non-absence) marks the fact that it is his *thought* (if not his words) the Pythia speaks.

<sup>42</sup> Braswell (1988) 70 *ad* 7(c). ἤδη can be taken as an instance of ‘free indirect speech’ or ‘hybrid discourse’.

<sup>43</sup> Braswell (1988) 73 *ad* ll. 9–10.

<sup>44</sup> In Apollonius’ later version of the myth (pp. 21–22) the Argonauts do not stop at Thera, and it is unclear if Pindar imagines them there or at sea—but Medea’s *epos* is *Theraion* in a deeper sense in any case.

<sup>45</sup> Calame (2003) 45–8 and Segal (1986) 182–3.

<sup>46</sup> See *P.* 4.43–56 and 251–62 (pp. 22–4, 41–3 below).

<sup>47</sup> The victory itself receives more attention in the sister-ode *P.* 5.

of the ode's great central myth), was motivated by a Delphic oracle.<sup>48</sup> Pindar recognises the centrality of the oracular sanctuary not just in the ode, but in the cosmos: his narrator later (*P.* 4.74) calls it 'the central navel (*omphalos*) of the tree-rich mother [Earth]'. On each of its temporal strata (Arcesilas', Battos' and Medea's), the ode thus describes a circular, quest-like movement centred on, or even emanating from, Delphi. Connections between them are reinforced by similar situations and motifs, and by the poet's diction.<sup>49</sup> Delphi, with its oracle as a spatial centre (and, in Halbwachs' terms, a *lieu de mémoire*: a place where tradition finds a fixed form in a spatial setting with its monuments and rituals)<sup>50</sup> corresponds, on the temporal plane, to the divine perspective that pulls the disparate events of history into a single meaningful narrative: a foundational memory aligned with the interests of power.

#### 4. Pindar, Oral Tradition and Genealogy

This movement from 'present' to 'deep time' enacted in epinician form is not a rhetorical device: rather, it reflects certain aspects of temporality in an oral culture. The first is 'telescoping' or the 'hourglass effect'. Oral traditions tend to 'telescope' recent events, and the living 'communicative memory' of families and communities, into the time of mythical origins or heroic/divine ancestry ('cultural memory'): the two are distinguished by a horizon of forgetting that moves 'forward', as it were, with each passing generation.<sup>51</sup> The results of this process are visible, if differently so, in Hesiod, Homer, and Herodotus; Thomas speaks of the way Pindar's odes move 'effortlessly' from praise to 'a mythical origin, or heroic ancestor'.<sup>52</sup> The 'telescoping' is not, of course, evident from inside the tradition, but only to an outsider who is able (like Hecataeus, Pherecydes or indeed Herodotus) to compare multiple and often inconsistent oral traditions, or like a modern anthropologist or

---

<sup>48</sup> See Calame (1990) 298–300, who notes this quest theme applies also to Damophilus (see p. 45 below) and Sigelman (2016) 113.

<sup>49</sup> Segal (1986) 180–1. On Apollo: Athanassaki (2009) 436–9; on Delphi, Eckerman (2014); on 'foundational memory': Assmann (2011) 62–9. On the ode's multiple, Delphi-centred 'cycles', see Sigelman (2016) 113–28.

<sup>50</sup> On the idea of a *lieu de mémoire* (*Erinnerungsort*; 'memory-site') see Assmann (2011) 24–5, 44–5; Nora (1997); Halbwachs (1941); Hölkeskamp and Stein-Hölkeskamp (2011), which explains the rationale behind Hölkeskamp and Stein-Hölkeskamp (2006) and (2010).

<sup>51</sup> On 'telescoping' (i.e. the 'hourglass effect'/'floating gap'): see Vansina (1985) esp. 23–4; Thomas (2001); Cobet (2002) 405–11. For 'communicative' vs. 'cultural memory': Assmann (2011) 34–41.

<sup>52</sup> Thomas (2001) 199.

historian who can impose her own abstract universal time-scheme on the living temporality of an oral tradition.<sup>53</sup>

Normally, epinician specifies no exact time-duration between ‘present’ and ‘past’.<sup>54</sup> In Homeric and Hesiodic *epos*, the break between ‘then’ and ‘now’ basically corresponded to the end of the ‘heroic age’. Pindar alludes to this in his narrative, when he describes the Argonauts as ‘demi-gods’ or ‘heroes’. This boundary, for him, is not however impermeable. Rather, the ‘heroic’ age stands in fruitful contact with the present, mediated not least by continuity of inheritance.<sup>55</sup> Whatever is great or powerful is so by virtue of its ties to the famous figures of the past. This aetiological drive will prove important in our ode as well. But *Pythian* 4 does something unusual in epinician: it defines precise chronologies through genealogical means. ‘In the seventeenth generation’ (*ἐβδόμη καὶ σὸν δεκάτῃ γενεῇ*, 10) hints at a linear continuity through descent, which theme will become progressively more emphatic as Medea’s ‘word’ unfolds: sixteen generations from Medea and the Argonauts to Battos, and eight from Battos the founder to Arcesilas IV, for a total of twenty-four.<sup>56</sup>

Fifth-century Greeks possessed no universal chronology. *Chronos* was not an abstract, divisible duration so much as a personification of memory enduring beyond the limits of a mortal life.<sup>57</sup> Time-reckoning systems (month-names and calendars, lists of kings, magistrates or priestesses) reflected different communal or institutional frameworks.<sup>58</sup> Generational time measured as distance from a given present was perhaps the most generally applicable reckoning available,<sup>59</sup> and it is unsurprising that Panhellenic mythical time was understood mostly in genealogical terms. In Herodotus, generational computation is most at home the further he gets from the present, where it provides the only temporal ordering principle at the historian’s disposal.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, his use of genealogical time-reckoning has at least a superficial similarity to Pindar’s here.

---

<sup>53</sup> Thomas (1989) 183, 203–5 and (2001), with important bibliography.

<sup>54</sup> See Pavlou (2012) 97–8 for an excellent discussion of Pindar’s methods and the uniqueness of *P.* 4.

<sup>55</sup> *P.* 4.12, 13, 57–8. Cf. Thomas (2001) 206–7, on Homer with Cobet (2002) 387–90 and Thomas (2001) 200–10 on Herodotus (she shows that it corresponds—if somewhat imperfectly—to the distinction in modern historiography between *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum*). On the age of heroes as real, see Calame (2003) 1–34.

<sup>56</sup> *P.* 4.9–10 and 64–7 and Pavlou (2012) 98–101.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Cobet (2002) 395–6 n. 20; Hurst (1983) 166 on *chronos* in Pindar; also Segal (1986) 188–93 and *passim*.

<sup>58</sup> Cobet (2002) 402–5.

<sup>59</sup> Cobet (2002) 397–8.

<sup>60</sup> Calame (2003) 96.

The precision of Pindar’s count of generations contrasts sharply and rhetorically with his simple method (*ποτέ*) of marking the relative earliness or lateness of his story-strata. It certainly reads like an authority-claim. Does it imply a claim about how the poem’s sense of genealogical continuity can be translated into chronological time? Pavlou has shown that the sixteen generations from Euphemus to Battos (and the four from Euphemus to the Return of the Heraclidae)<sup>61</sup> can be made to cohere disconcertingly with the pseudohistorical synchronies established by Herodotus and later authors for events like the Trojan War. But there is little evidence that even Herodotus used genealogical dead-reckoning to reconcile the dates of mythical events into a coherent Panhellenic chronology; while the once-influential idea that his predecessor Hecataeus developed a universal myth-chronology based on the Spartan king-lists is largely discredited.<sup>62</sup> Claims of descent from a god or hero were a trope of aristocratic and royal self-fashioning in Pindar’s lifetime and after, but where any genealogical evidence is presented, they tend to telescope the generations closer to the present, with greater detail in the legendary part.<sup>63</sup>

Certainly, Hecataeus’ genealogical methods (whatever they were) were for Herodotus a constant subject of interest and invective, most famously in that paradigmatic scene set in Egyptian Thebes (2.143–6), where the Milesian, in an allegory of the fragility of the Hellenes’ grip on their own past, proudly recites his ‘full’ genealogy of ancestors (16, in fact, back to a god), only to find himself confronted with the vastly superior genealogical and chronological knowledge of the local priests.<sup>64</sup> At the very least, the episode brings out just how conscious Herodotus is of the existence of a Greek cultural obsession with genealogy as a means of organising the past.<sup>65</sup> Although ‘full’ genealogies (complete lists of names extending

---

<sup>61</sup> Pavlou (2012) 100–1. On the ‘four generations’, see *P.* 4.43–9.

<sup>62</sup> Cobet (2002) 390–4, 410–11 and Varto (2015). On the impossibility of bringing local ‘heroic’ genealogies into a unified order: Thomas (1989) 184, 186. On Hecataeus and genealogical chronology: Mitchel (1956), Bertelli (2001) esp. 89–94 (who notes that Hecataeus constructed at least one ‘full’ genealogy: his own), and Vannicelli (2001). On dating the Trojan War: Giovannini (1995) and Burkert (1995). Mitchel (1956) 61 notes the discontinuity of Herodotus’ genealogical testimonials and the fact they rarely seem to cohere, if at all: ‘Herodotus seems to have recorded the chronology of each story just as it came to him as an integral part of the story itself’. This certainly seems to be the case in his Theran/Cyrenaean traditions.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas (1989) 157–8.

<sup>64</sup> Genealogy, and methods of creating and interpreting genealogies, play a key (and still quite poorly understood) role in Herodotus’ relationship of ‘agonistic intertextuality’ with his influential Milesian predecessor: see Bertelli (2001), Moyer (2013) and Condilo (2017) esp. 258–73. Thanks to Jess Lightfoot for help with this.

<sup>65</sup> See Moyer (2013) 313–19.

back to a heroic ancestor) are rare even in the fifth century, some, still, are attested.<sup>66</sup> Pindar himself in *Olympian 2* implies the existence of just such a document for the tyrant Theron of Acragas, who traced his ancestry back eight generations to Thersander, the son of Polyneices son of Oedipus, and so on back to Cadmus. In fact, Pindar is supposed in one of his lost *Encomia* to have traced Theron's descent also to Polyneices' estranged brother Eteocles!<sup>67</sup> The scholiasts present two complete lists gleaned perhaps from an early Hellenistic source. Who, however, would have concocted such lists after the fall of the Acragantine tyranny? As Schneider (2000) has demonstrated, the upper 'heroic' sections of these genealogies rely on well-established Panhellenic lore, while the more recent parts that relate the movements of Theron's historical ancestors between Greece and Sicily show the 'telescoping' one would expect in an oral tradition.

Pindar's implication that a 'full' genealogy from Euphemus to Battos I existed is thus *prima facie* possible: it could have been produced by an intellectual based at the Battiad court, or possibly a prose genealogist like Hecataeus.<sup>68</sup> But the mere claim of such continuity was as useful as a fully-realised genealogy. Since it extended beyond the scope of verifiable memory, such a claim could not be falsified. If such a list ever existed, it had lost its interest by Herodotus' time, since he shows no knowledge of it.<sup>69</sup> What Arcesilas hoped to gain from such a genealogical claim is obvious. More than a way to order time, Greek genealogy was a charter for social relationships in the present. Once attached to a skeleton narrative of significant events and embedded in a Hellenic discourse of kinship relations, 'heroic' genealogies, constantly reworked in the light of present needs, sustained relationships, obligations, alliances and even enmities, including between states.<sup>70</sup> Such effects can be suspected for Pindar's spuriously precise Euphemid genealogy. Combined with *Pythian 5*'s claim (in lines 63–88) that Cyrene belongs to a community of Dorian peoples who

---

<sup>66</sup> See Thomas (1989) 157, to whom the term 'full genealogy' (i.e. in writing; as opposed to a family oral genealogy) can be ascribed; also Wade-Gery (1952).

<sup>67</sup> Theron's ancestors, like Theras' in Herodotus 4.147, on which see Malkin (1994) 89–111, Vannicelli (1993) 126–31 and Mitchel (1956) 58–61, were Kadmeians: Σ 16c, ii: 64 Dr. (citing Menecrates, a Homeric critic active probably in the second half of the 2nd c. BCE). For Polyneices see *O.* 2.41–7 with Σ 82d, ii: 81–2 Dr.; for Eteokles, Pind. fr. 118 ΣM and Σ 70b, ii: 78: also Schneider (2000).

<sup>68</sup> On these writers, see Thomas (1989) esp. 173–95, and Wade-Gery (1952) 90–1. Giangiulio (2001) 124–5 (with useful bibliography) considers such a written genealogy (or at least a similar tradition) possible, excluding however a common source for Herodotus and Pindar's variant genealogies.

<sup>69</sup> See p. 53 n. 240 below.

<sup>70</sup> Thomas (1989) 173–9 and Varto (2015); also Gould (1989) 46–7.

derive their customs and political order from Sparta and the will of Apollo Carneios, it becomes a statement of Panhellenic political, cultural and religious affiliation.<sup>71</sup>

So much, then, for Medea's 'sixteen generations'. The Battiad royal genealogy, eight generations long, is another matter. Battos I himself was too ancient to be an object of communicative memory. Eight generations is too long for an oral genealogy to survive without any interpolation or change, and as Herodotus and Pindar present it, the Cyrenaean tradition, with its stuttering, marginalised hero (who in Herodotus' version suffers also from illegitimacy), shows extensive signs of folkloric reshaping.<sup>72</sup> But royal genealogies are special. In Cyrene, whose political institutions and cults drew their legitimacy from the heroized founder, and where the Battiad genealogy's centrality was surely reinforced by the closed society of the court and its household traditions, time itself, measured from the foundation and linked to the biological rhythms of the ruling house, with each of four Battoi succeeded by an Arcesilas, must have helped to stabilise the monarchy. This tendency may have been heightened by contact with the older states of the Near East and especially Egypt, the stability of whose royal genealogies, supported by an accretion of writing associated with governance, repression and propaganda, plays an important role in the Herodotean system of synchronicities that helps the historian partly to overcome the otherwise unfathomable chronological plurality of Greek oral and poetic tradition.<sup>73</sup> There is evidence for the importance of the Battiad genealogy as a temporal framework for early Cyrenaean history centuries after the monarchy's collapse.<sup>74</sup> With such a framework in place, Cyrenean memory had a framework different from that of mainland states dependent on archon-lists or registers of priestesses. At the very least, monarchical reigns provided a structure of longer temporal articulations (the alternation of 'good' and 'bad', successful and unsuccessful kings in Herodotus' post-settlement narrative [4.159–67] proves this). But for Pindar, as for both of Herodotus' sources, Battos' genealogy can be traced only as far as his father

---

<sup>71</sup> On Cyrene and Sparta, see pp. 26-27 below.

<sup>72</sup> Giangiulio (2001) 121 n. 15. Physical disability and illegitimacy (cf. Herodotus' 'Cyrenaean' tale, 4.154–6) are frequent markers of chosenness in *ktisis*-traditions—see Giangiulio (1981), Calame (2003) 59–60, 94–5 and 98, and Malkin (1994) 115–42—as they are in stories of tyranny: Vernant (1982).

<sup>73</sup> Cobet (2002) 399–401; Vannicelli (1993) 14–15; Thomas (1989) 103–28. On Egyptian king-lists in the Saïte period and later, see Moyer (2013) 300–1.

<sup>74</sup> The genealogy of Clearchus of Cyrene (*SGDI* 4859, 1st-2nd c. AD) goes back eight generations to a 'Battos': Thomas (1989) 159 n. 9; Hornblower and Morgan (2007) 13–17. Callimachus, too, seems to have claimed Battiad descent: see Call. epigr. 35.

Polymnestus. For Cyrenaeans, history stopped in the generation before the conquest. The figure of the Founder marked a watershed between the ‘before’ and the ‘now’ of their existence as a people.<sup>75</sup>

### 5. Medea’s ‘Theraean Word’: Euphemus at Lake Triton

Let us return to Pindar’s *Fourth Pythian*, and the ‘Theraean ἔπος’ (13–56) of Medea. Her speech is both a prophecy and a narrative. The first section (13–20) is cryptic and prophetic in tone; the second clearer. ‘Hear me, O sons of valiant heroes and of gods! For I affirm that out of this sea-pounded land the daughter of Epaphos, a root of cities famous among mortals, will one day (ποτέ) be planted amid the foundations (θέμεθλα) of Zeus Ammon (13–16)’. This ‘daughter of Epaphos’ is Libya. The Theraeans, in a metaphor (‘a root of cities’) that reverses the relationship of settler to land in a way that recalls the perennial colonist’s discourse of ‘virgin soil’, will fill her with settlements. The planting metaphor, whose connotations of agricultural fertility, sexual reproduction and the fixation of territory are felt through the whole myth, is a recurrent trope in Greek colonial discourse.<sup>76</sup> Medea’s language also hints at a manifest destiny. Cyrene’s god-given borders, coterminous with the sacred ‘precinct of Zeus Ammon’ (Διὸς ἐν Ἀμμωνος θεμέθλοις, 16) defined at its furthest extent by that god’s sanctuary at Siwa oasis 500 kilometres from the city, extend far beyond the Greek zone of settlement in coastal Cyrenaica.<sup>77</sup> The Theraeans will ‘swap swift horses for short-winged dolphins, and steer reins and storm-footed chariots instead of oars’ (17–18).<sup>78</sup> Thera’s emergence as a metropolis of great cities will be ‘brought to pass’ by an ‘augury’ or omen ‘once’ (ποτέ) received in the shallows of Lake Tritonis (19–20) by Euphemus, who leapt from *Argo*’s stern to meet a mysterious ‘god disguised as a man who was trying to give them earth (or “the land”) as a guest-

---

<sup>75</sup> Malkin (2003) 158–9.

<sup>76</sup> Calame (2003) esp. 52–5 and Nicholson (2001) 191–2; Dougherty (1993) 62–76; Sigelman (2016) 121. For parallels see Braswell (1988) 155; in Herodotus, **Baragwanath (in this chapter) 26**. On vegetal growth (the ‘family tree’) as a symbol for the survival, prosperity and ‘inherited excellence’ or *physis* of a house across generations, see Rose (1992) 161.

<sup>77</sup> See Malkin (1994) 158–68 and also 169–74: ἐν θεμέθλοις could refer to a ‘dwelling place’, but clearly extends to the furthest borders of Libya (Africa west of the Nile: cf. *P.* 4.56, *P.* 9.6–8, 51–8). On Zeus Ammon at Cyrene: Chamoux (1953) 320–39; Austin (2008) 213–14 (Pindar is associated with Ammon’s cult at Thebes and composed a hymn to that god for the Cyrenaeans: Paus. 9.16.1, cf. *Vit. Amb.* i: 2.18–21 Dr.). Calame (1990) 282 notes that Libya, first a mythical person, becomes a place by the end of Medea’s monologue.

<sup>78</sup> Segal (1986) 81 and Sigelman (2016) 114–16 note a pervasive pattern of ‘interchange between land and sea’.

present' (*θεῶ ἀνέρι εἰδομένῳ γαίαν δίδοντι | ξείνια ... Εὐφάμος καταβαίς δέξατ[ο]*, 21–3). He was rewarded with a thunderclap from Father Zeus (23) that assigned his action the status of a portent.<sup>79</sup>

Medea thus prophesies Battos' foundation of Cyrene (from her perspective a giant step into the future), before expounding the sign that foretold it (a brief *analepsis* into the Argonauts' own past). Her narrative of events at Lake Tritonis duplicates, from an inverted historical perspective, the structure of its own frame. Bypassing the moment of Euphemus' leap, Medea explains its precedents in two further steps (24–8). The first of these is descriptive ('when he [the god] chanced upon us hanging the bronze-cheeked anchor, swift *Argo*'s curb, from the ship', 24–5),<sup>80</sup> and the second another *analepsis* ('for we had been bearing the seafaring wood [= *Argo*] on our backs for twelve days previous over the land's desert back from Okeanos, having beached her in accordance with my wise plans', 25–7). Medea's narrative thus regresses until she reaches its point of departure: the Argonauts' arrival, on their return from Colchis, at the rim of Ocean. From here, she recapitulates Euphemus' dive, this time as progressive narrative (ll. 28–37). Then, in a series of *δέ-*clauses, each of which enacts a step forward in the story, she continues *past* the initial tableau, explaining its consequences (ll. 38–56). This chiasmic narrative form (Slater has called it 'lyric narrative'), in which the story, first condensed into a single tableau-like moment, is developed once as retrograde movement and then reiterated, often with different emphasis and somewhat greater circumstantial detail as progressive narrative, is familiar from other Pindaric and Bacchylidean myths and also from Homer's 'inset-stories' (reminiscences or moral exempla embedded in character-speech or narrative). It is a structure that suits the oral storyteller, since it clarifies the order of events in the story, allowing her to end her digression where it began.<sup>81</sup> Often, the closing part of such a narrative adopts a rapid summary form which, especially in tales of heroic action, can in its abbreviation and compression resemble the 'kill-catalogues' of Homeric epic.<sup>82</sup> Medea's monologue, however, differs from other such embedded narratives in its length and complexity. It is also one of the longest episodes of direct speech in extant Pindar.

---

<sup>79</sup> Malkin (1994) 163–4. Zeus here is also Zeus Ammon.

<sup>80</sup> *άνις* ... *έπέτοσσε*, another relative clause.

<sup>81</sup> See Illig (1932); Slater (1983); Pfeijffer (2004); Sigelman (2016) 23–45.

<sup>82</sup> Young (1968) 4 and Slater (1983) with Sigelman (2016) 31, call these closing summaries 'terminal exploits': see e.g. *P.* 4.249–54 (pp. 41–42 below).

After twelve days' desert march,<sup>83</sup> the Argonauts arrived at Lake Tritonis: a strange mythical lagoon half-way between earth and sea, which is sacred to Poseidon, Triton and Athene.<sup>84</sup> 'It was *then* (τουτάκι δέ, 28) that the solitary god (οἰοπόλος δαίμων) approached us, donning the bright visage of a reverential man':

tr. 2 str. 6

... φιλίων δ' ἐπέων  
 ἄρχετο, ζείνοις ἅ τ' ἐλθόντεσσιν εὐεργέται 30  
 δεῖπν' ἐπαγγέλλοντι πρῶτον.

tr. 2 ant. 1

ἀλλὰ γὰρ νόστου πρόφασις γλυκεροῦ  
 κώλυεν μεῖναι. φάτο δ' Εὐρύπυλος Γαι-  
 αόχου παῖς ἀφθίτου Ἐννοσίδα  
 ἔμμεναι· γίνωσκε δ' ἐπειγομένους· ἄν  
 δ' εὐθὺς ἀρπάξαις ἀρούρας  
 δεξιτερᾷ προτυχὸν ζένιον μάστευσε δοῦναι. 35  
 οὐδ' ἀπίθησέ νιν, ἀλλ' ἦρωσ ἐπ' ἀκταῖσιν θορών,  
 χειρὶ οἱ χεῖρ' ἀντερείσαις  
 δέξατο βόλακα δαιμονίαν. 37

He began with friendly words—[those] with which givers of kindness first offer a meal to strangers arriving from afar. But the excuse of a sweet homecoming kept [us] from staying. He said he was Eurypylos, the son of immortal [Poseidon] Gaiaochos Ennosida; he saw that [we] were hurrying; and immediately he, seizing some with his right hand, tried to give it as the first guest-gift to hand. And he [the god] did not fail to persuade him [Euphemus], but the hero, having leapt into the surf and fixed hand mutually in hand, accepted the divine clod.

This bizarre scene, rich in the language of Homeric *xenia* ('guest-friendship') and gift-giving,<sup>85</sup> leaves much unexplained. It involves three conspicuous failures. The

<sup>83</sup> As Ian Rutherford commented to me, Pindar's geography throughout Medea's narrative is preposterous and contradicts knowledge available at the time.

<sup>84</sup> Calame (2003) 55–6.

<sup>85</sup> On *xenia* here, compare Potamiti (2015); Gottesman (2010) 297; and Malkin (1994) 177. Athanassaki (1997) presents a more optimistic reading of the motif (noting that Pindar represents his ties to his *laudandi* in *xenia* terms).

first is a failure of hospitality; then there is a deception; finally, there is an apparently valueless ‘gift’ (ζένοιον, 35). The mysterious ‘god in the form of a man’ behaves as an epic host should. His guests, however, choose *not* to accept his offer of hospitality, citing their *nostos* as an excuse. The ‘god’ then lies about his name. Cognate later versions identify him as Triton: here, however, he claims to be Eurypylus (‘he of the wide gates’; ‘the Welcomer’).<sup>86</sup> Pindar does not explain the name, but Eurypylus was later identified by Acesander (a local historian of Cyrene)<sup>87</sup> with a human ‘brother’ of Triton who ruled Libya when Apollo abducted Cyrene, the Thessalian girl hunter. In the variant of Cyrene’s story told in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* (90–2),<sup>88</sup> it is Eurypylos who grants the Thessalian maiden title to the land in exchange for killing a lion which was ravaging the Libyans’ herds. If the mystery-god were in fact Eurypylus, he and Euphemus (as sons of Poseidon) would not be *xenoi* at all, but half-brothers!<sup>89</sup> But this is all a ruse: this trickster-host never betrays his real identity, thus preventing a lasting *xenia*-relationship from forming between himself and the Greek stranger. ‘Eurypylus’ nevertheless gives Euphemus what Medea defines, again in paradoxical terms, as a *random* guest-gift (προτυχὸν ζένοιον, ‘the first thing to hand’). The ‘divine clod’ is not a *κειμήλιον* to be treasured over generations—it is a lump of earth.<sup>90</sup>

The clod-motif has affinities to other mythical situations in which a gift (often unintended) of earth produces, as a symbolic synecdoche, a lasting charter to an entire territory. These stories always combine the clod-motif with elements of prophecy, misjudgement and deception.<sup>91</sup> The ‘clod’ also recalls the ‘earth and water’ motif

<sup>86</sup> Σ 42ab, ii: 102–3 Dr. names the god as Triton, as does A.R. 4.1554–61.

<sup>87</sup> Possibly fourth–second c. BCE: see Σ 57, ii: 105 Dr. = *FGrHist* 469 F1, F3 and F4. Note that Phylarchus (3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE: *FGrHist* 81 F15) apparently called the king ‘Eurytus’, a variant Braswell (1988) 110 implies may be older than Pindar’s; Malten (1911) 115 n. 1 calls it a ‘wertlose Variant’.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Σ ad Call. *Hy.* 2.90–2 and see Stephens (2011) 194–5.

<sup>89</sup> Pindar’s (*P.* 4.45–6) version of Euphemus’ parentage differs from that attested for the *Megalai Ehoiai* (fr. 253 M–W) and in Σ Lycophr. 886, but Poseidon is always the father.

<sup>90</sup> Malkin (1994) 179–80; Athanassaki (1997) esp. 211–16; cf. also Currie (2012) 293–4.

<sup>91</sup> The closest parallels seem to be Aletes at Corinth, on whom see Σ Pind. *N.* 7.155a, iii, 137–8 Dr), and the story of Temon (Plut. *QG* no. 13, 293f–294c), a man of the Ainianes who is given a clod of earth in insult that becomes a claim to the territory his people will settle (cf. the very similar *QG* no. 22, 296d–e). Both involve a conscious deception inspired by an oracle (the divine sanction is therefore provided in advance rather than retroactively, as in Euphemus’ tale, which is unique among these myths for the way it emphasises a lack of conscious agency on the part of the ‘gift’s’ recipient). Cf. also 1) Ne(i)leus son of Kodros, the founder of Miletus—Hornblower (2015) *ad* Lycophr. *Alex.* 1380–1 (citing Σ. Lycophr. 1379, ii: 382 Scheer); 2) Cresphontes in Messene (Paus. 4.3.3–8 and Luraghi (2008) 46–67); and 3) Perdicas of Macedon at Hdt. 8.137 (similar in its structure, even if the ‘payment’ involves a symbolic appropriation of sunlight = royal power). For detailed discussion, see

familiar from Herodotus' accounts of the decades before 480/479 BCE.<sup>92</sup> Its frequency attests an obvious cultural context for Pindar's story. It also helps us to clarify a difference between the synchronic and paradigmatic levels of the narrative—that is to say, between the characters' understanding of themselves and the subsequent significance of their actions when viewed within a wider historical frame. On the synchronic level, Euphemus' dive is tragicomedy; on the paradigmatic, it symbolizes things to come. His acceptance of the 'gift' inadvertently constitutes a portent recognised in the thunderclap. By playing along and accepting the clod *as though* it were a gift, Euphemus creates a bond not between himself and the disguised god, but rather with the land itself. The clod's transfer turns 'stranger' into 'native'. It symbolises a relation to the land that reflects simultaneous displacement and belonging: a central paradox of settler identity.<sup>93</sup> The logic is the same as the charter that drives the Dorians' 'Return of the Heraclidae': the Theraean settlers were always already autochthonous Libyans.<sup>94</sup> It is important that neither the divine imposter nor the Libyan indigènes gain anything from this pact: no cult is established, no human relationship founded, nor is there any demand of reciprocal service.<sup>95</sup> Nor does Euphemus gain anything, at least not personally. His descendants' good fortune is also undeserved and therefore all the more miraculous.<sup>96</sup> Battos, as we shall learn below (*P.* 4.59–63), went to Delphi not to ask about founding a colony, but rather to ask the god to cure his stutter. The Pythia did not answer his original question, instead proclaiming him three times 'Cyrene's destined king'.

The bond that Euphemus inadvertently creates between himself and the land of Libya must wait for several generations before reasserting itself. How is this to be achieved? The following verses (38–43) again begin with total failure. Near Thera, the clod was inadvertently lost at sea:

**tr. 2, ant. 7**

*πέυθομαι δ' αὐτὰν κατακλυσθεῖσαν ἐκ δούρατος*

**38**

---

esp. Gottesman (2010) and S. West (2011), with Malkin (1994) 174–81. I thank Alan Griffiths for help with this motif.

<sup>92</sup> Herodotus (for a list, see Powell [1938] 67 sv. γῆ, 2) mentions Persian demands for gifts from Greek states of 'earth and water' (a motif often explained as Zoroastrian in origin, but present in Greek tradition: see e.g. Neileus and Cresphontes, previous n.). Cf. Kuhrt (1988) and Gottesman (2010) 294 with S. West (2011).

<sup>93</sup> Athanassaki (2003).

<sup>94</sup> See Vannicelli (1992) 67–8: '... *un ritorno dei Eufemidi*'; Calame (2003) 57–9.

<sup>95</sup> Other variants enact less one-sided 'exchanges': **p. 31 below**.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. e.g. Σ 36c, ii: 61.

ἐναλίαν βᾶμεν σὺν ἄλμα

tr. 2. epode 1

ἐσπέρας ὕγρῳ πελάγει σπομέναν. ἧ

40

μάν νιν ὄτρυνον θαμά

λυσιπόνοις θεραπόντεσ-

σιν φυλάττει· τῶν δ' ἐλάθοντο φρένες

καί νυν ἐν τᾷδ' ἄφθιτον νάσῳ κέχεται Λιβύας

εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα πρὶν ὄρας.

43

But I hear that it [the clod] has been washed from the ship in to the sea at evening and goes with the salt wave, following the watery deep. Oh yes, how I warned him to guard it safe with his labour-saving servants! But their minds forgot, and now the deathless seed of broad Libya is poured out on this island *before its time*'.

Medea warned him, but Euphemus' men have lost the dubious heirloom, which is dissolved in the alien element. Medea herself seems to feel some uncertainty about how it was lost or where it went.<sup>97</sup> In the next clause, however, the clod, now described as 'the seed of *Libya* of the broad dancing floor', is said to have been poured out prematurely over the soil of Thera.<sup>98</sup> Pindar's version, which emphasises human failure and frailty, differs from what we find in the corresponding passage of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (4.1731–64). There, Euphemus, on Jason's advice, deliberately throws Triton's gift overboard, in response to a dream in which he had sex with the clod, which had metamorphosed into a nubile girl.<sup>99</sup> Overcome with shame as though he has raped his own daughter, he is comforted by the clod-woman,

---

<sup>97</sup> *πέυθομαι* (like the in the context of a *pentekonter*, somewhat absurd reference to the 'labour-saving servants') reinforces the sense that no one was in control or watching the clod; it absolves Euphemus partially, and Medea totally, of blame for the disaster. Jess Lightfoot points out to me the close similarity of the loss-episode to certain adventures in Odysseus' *Apologoi*, especially the 'Aeolus' tale (Hom. *Od.* 10.1–79) where Odysseus' achievement of an easy *nostos* is thwarted by the 'madness' (*βουλή ... κακή*, 46) of his crewmen. There is indeed much work to be done on Pindar's reception of the *Odyssey* in this ode.

<sup>98</sup> On *eurychoros* and its commemorative power, see Fragoulaki (in this volume). The 'slipperiness' of the clod, and its ability to create different realities through its presence or absence, can be taken as a symbol of the power of contingency in Pindar's historical scheme: one splash, and you're in an alternative reality (thanks to Jess Lightfoot).

<sup>99</sup> Calame (2003) 61–2; Vian (1981) 144 n. 5 comments that this type of dream is recognised in later *oneirokritika* as implying some future profit.

who says that she is Triton's child and Libya's. If he entrusts her to the sea off Anaphe, she will lie there in readiness for his future offspring. Thrown into the sea, she rises again as an island (4.1757–64), known first as Kalliste ('Fairest'), and then as Thera.<sup>100</sup> Although Medea's version lacks this cosmogonic birth of Thera from the waves, her language likewise locates the relationship between Euphemus and Libya in the nexus of agricultural wealth, sexual reproduction and territorial claim laid out in her earlier planting-metaphor.<sup>101</sup> The two things coalesce, for this 'seed of Libya' planted on Thera will in turn cause Libya to be planted as a 'root of cities' by the Theraeans—a 'root' destined to flourish both as a realm of cities and a line of kings. There thus remains a sense of cosmogonic potentiality in the subtext.<sup>102</sup> In calling the clod 'the seed of Libya of the broad dancing-floor', Medea again demonstrates the coloniser's sense of place. For her, Libya is not primarily a nymph, a geographical designation, nor the kingdom of Eurypylus mentioned by Callimachus: she is an emptiness, a *potential* territory.<sup>103</sup> Wherever it lands, the synecdochic clod transforms that place into a promise of abundant wealth and populous cities. Battos will receive the task of bringing this divine promise home to Libya from Thera.

What brings all this to fruition is not human action but the will of an unknown providence able to link the actions of ignorant people far-removed in time from one another into a single story. The myth's devious failure marks the creation of a land-charter under which the supposed giver's people will be displaced by the recipient's descendants, who must become Euphemids, Minyans and Theraeans before they become Cyrenaeans.<sup>104</sup> The failure is 'devious', because, in a logic reminiscent of Adam's *felix culpa*, Euphemus must fail if the providential plan is to succeed.<sup>105</sup> He provides a pretext for divine redemption: 'O goodness infinite ... that all this good of evil shall produce'.<sup>106</sup> Episodes of disaster, hard luck, loss, personal failure or crime

---

<sup>100</sup> Apollonius' myth is in a sense much more literal as a charter (clod creates land). His paradoxical failure to mention Cyrene is thus surprising: it is sometimes explained as 'intentional history'—a rejection, by the Ptolemies, of a potential Battiad claim: see however Hunter (1993) 153 n. 7, (2015) 312–13; Stephens (2008) 98–103, 111–13 and (2011), esp. 196–8.

<sup>101</sup> In assuming that Pindar's sources may have been closer to Apollonius I follow Schroeder (1922) 37–8; cf. Braswell (1988) 121. On 'land' vs. 'territory' see Malkin (1994) 6–7.

<sup>102</sup> These themes are corroborated in the lyric speaker's words in the third epode (64ff.) after the break-off that ends Medea's speech. See also Athanassaki (1997).

<sup>103</sup> Malkin (1994) 174–5.

<sup>104</sup> Malkin (1994) 178; on autochthony, Calame (1990) 281–90 and 2003; also Athanassaki (1997).

<sup>105</sup> Segal (1986) 150–2. On a similar motif in *O.* 7.30–53, where the primitive Rhodians, the sons of Helios, fail to perform a proper foundational sacrifice to Athena, see Athanassaki (2009) 432–6.

<sup>106</sup> Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 12.469–70.

followed by incomprehensible blessings and success are a trope of colonial settlement narratives and also tales of mythical founders.<sup>107</sup> What marks this episode, however, is the way it pits human weakness and incomprehension against an inscrutable providence. The Pythia sends Battos to ‘redeem’ (*ἀνακομίζειν*) Medea’s ‘word’ (a kind of promissory note?) which is also the story of Euphemus’ failure. Euphemus may have spilt Libya’s metonymic seed too soon, but it has not fallen on barren ground. Why ‘too soon’? (*P.* 4.43–56)

<b>tr. 2, ep. 4</b>	<p>‘... <i>πρὶν ὥρας</i>, εἰ γὰρ οἴ-  <i>κοι νιν βάλε παρ χθόνιον</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>43</b></span>  <i>Αἶδα στόμα, Ταίναρον εἰς ἱερὰν Εὐφάμος ἐλθὼν,</i>  <i>υἱὸς ἱππάρχου Ποσειδάωνος ἄναξ,</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>45</b></span>  <i>τόν ποτ’ Εὐρώπα Τιτυοῦ θυγάτηρ</i>  <i>τίκτε Καφισοῦ παρ’ ὄχθαις,</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>46</b></span></p>
<b>tr. 3, str. 1</b>	<p><i>τετράτων παίδων κ’ ἐπιγεινομένων</i>  <i>αἰμά οἱ κείναν λάβε [sc. ἄν] σὺν Δαναοῖς εὐ-</i>  <i>ρεΐαν ἄπειρον. τότε γὰρ μεγάλας</i>  <i>ἐξανίστανται Λακεδαιμόνος Ἀργεί-</i>  <i>ου τε κόλπου καὶ Μυκηναῖν.</i>  <i>νῦν γε μὲν ἄλλοδαπᾶν κριτὸν εὐρήσει</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>50</b></span>  <i>ἐν λέχεσιν γένος, οἷ κεν τάνδε σὺν τιμᾷ θεῶν</i>  <i>νᾶσον ἐλθόντες τέκωνται</i>  <i>φῶτα κελαINEφέων πεδίων</i>  <i>δεσπόταν· τὸν μὲν πολυχρύσῳ ποτ’ ἐν δώματι</i>  <i>Φοῖβος ἀμνάσει θέμισσιν</i></p>
<b>tr. 3, ant. 1</b>	<p><i>Πύθιον ναὸν καταβάντα χρόνῳ</i> <span style="float: right;"><b>55</b></span>  <i>ὕστερῳ, νάεσσι πολεῖς ἀγαγὲν Νεί-</i>  <i>λοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα.’</i></p>

<sup>107</sup> On ‘crisis’ in colonisation-narratives: Dougherty (1993) 16–17, 31–44.

‘... **before its time**. For if he (Euphamus, horse-commanding Poseidon’s son, whom Europa daughter of Tityos bore by the banks of Kaphisos) had come to holy Tainaros and, at home, had thrown it [the clod of earth] down near the chthonic mouth of Hades, then, **when the fourth generation of his offspring had come to be, his blood would have seized that wide continent with the Danaans. For then** they are [i.e. ‘will be’] **driven out of** great Lacedaemon and the Argive gulf and Mycenae. **But now the situation is that** he will find a **chosen lineage** in the beds of foreign women, which, when they have come to this island with the favour of the gods, **will beget a man to be master over raincloud-blackened plains**: him will Phoebus in the gold-rich house **remind with prophecies**, when **in later days** he has entered the Pythian temple, to lead many [men] in ships to the **rich precinct** of the son of Cronus by the Nile’.

In one of the ode’s most extraordinary moments, as her prophecy, inadvertently retracing the steps of its own framing discourse, brushes past the moment of its own enunciation to connect with Battos’ foundation sixteen generations in the future, Medea defines two possible outcomes of Euphemus’ guardianship of the clod, which are also mutually exclusive colonisation scenarios for Cyrene.

If Euphemus, the son of Poseidon who has his sanctuary at Cape Tainaron, had managed to bring the clod back there and deposit it next to the mouth of Hades, thus consecrating it to the powers of death and the earth in a gesture reminiscent of the fertility-sacrifices at the Thesmophoria,<sup>108</sup> then his descendants, four generations later, would invade Libya with the remnants of the Achaeans who will (the ‘prophetic’ present tense of *ἐξανάστανται* leaves little doubt)<sup>109</sup> be driven from their homes by the invading Dorians and Heraclidae. The deposition of the clod thus marks the start-line for a *reconquista* of Libya by Euphemus’ immediate descendants. But his failure in this mission changes everything. The clod has been scattered in the sea off Thera: its magical fertility will realise itself from there. Euphemus will meet the women of Lemnos and beget a line of offspring who in time will settle the island. From these men will rise eventually a man destined to rule Libya. He will visit Delphi, and Phoebus will ‘remind him’ to lead the Theraean people to the ‘rich

<sup>108</sup> See Calame (2003) 56–7. On cults at Tainaron, see Giannini (1995) 440–1.

<sup>109</sup> Braswell (1988) 129 on line 49 (a), with Giannini (1995) 442.

precinct of Zeus by the Nile'.<sup>110</sup> 'Remind' is a strong word, since Battos was no more aware of Medea's 'Theraean word' than Euphemus was of the meaning of his own actions. This too is an aspect of the *felix culpa* motif that governs Medea's prophetic tale. All the human protagonists act in a fog of ignorance. Only a god can make something viable from humanity's crooked timber.

## 6. Pindar's two foundations of Cyrene

What are we to make of Medea's counterfactual history? There was much confusion in the later, post-Herodotean literary tradition about when Cyrene was founded. St. Jerome's translation of Eusebius' *Chronological Canons* gives three dates (1336, 761 and 631 BCE). The last, though perhaps a bit low, seems to fit archaeological material dating the Greeks' arrival more or less to the third quarter of the sixth century.<sup>111</sup>

While the main early Panhellenic literary tradition about the colony established in Pindar and Herodotus ascribes the first Greek settlement in Libya to Battos' Theraeans, the story of an earlier sojourn at or near the site of Cyrene by the Trojan sons of Antenor was known already to the Theban poet (*P.* 5.77–88). They arrived, he says, with Menelaus and Helen on their *nostos* after the destruction of their homeland: they, the 'horse-driving men' of Troy, are 'welcomed' and 'approached' (in the cultic sense), presumably as epichoric heroes, with sacrifices and gifts by the men of Cyrene, 'whom Aristoteles (Battos) brought in swift ships when he opened a deep path through the salt sea' (τὸ δ' ἐλάσιππον ἔθνος ἐνδυκέως | δέκονται θυσίαισιν ἄνδρες οἰχνεόντες σφε δωροφόροι | τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλης ἄγαγε ναυσὶ θααῖς | ἀλὸς βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων, *P.* 5.85–8), during the Carneia festival.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>110</sup> Reference to Zeus Ammon's precinct (cf. n. 78 above) is implied however we translate the double genitive. On the translation of *Νεῖλοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα*, compare Braswell (1988) 137–8 and Giannini (1995) 125, 443–4.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Chamoux (1953) 70–1, 120–3, who notes that 761 appears to be an earlier traditional date for Battos' foundation, and Malkin (1994) 66. The archaeology seems to indicate Greek settlement at a site identified with Herodotus' Aziris after 650 BCE (the earliest occupation of Cyrene, Taucheira and Barke seems to date to perhaps 620: for recent views of the chronology, see n. 131 below).

<sup>112</sup> Homer's Trojans, like Pindar's Cyrenaean, are horsemen: see Giannini (1995) 534 *ad loc.* Σ *P.* 5.113a–c (ii: 186–7 Dr.) applies τὸ ἐλάσιππον ἔθνος to the Cyrenaean. Krummen (2014) 146 suggests a possible connection to Libyan horsemanship. On the passage and its difficulties, see Defradas (1952); Giannini (1990) 84–7; Calame (2003) 79–86; Krummen (2014) 138–53; Brillante (1989); and Malkin (1987) 209–12 and (1994) 52–6, 64–6. A 'Hill of the Antenoridae between Cyrene and the sea' is mentioned by Σ *P.* 5.110 (ii: 186 Dr.), which cites the Hellenistic mythographer Lysimachus (*FGrHist* 382 F 6 with nn. 43–51: *Nostoi?* perhaps late 2<sup>nd</sup>–early 1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE? see *NP sv.* and *RE xiv* (1928) sv. 'Lysimachus [20]', col. 32–9 with Krummen (2014) 139. Lysimachus also links the Antenoridae to Amnax, a Libyan king. Braccisi (1987) claims the myth emerged in connection with Athenian interests around the time of the Inaros revolt in Egypt (c. 460 BCE). In fact, as Pindar attests, it is likely older and Cyrenaean. Krummen (2014) 142–6 plausibly envisages a ritual of theoxenic/heroxenic type.

On the assumption that Eusebius' earliest foundation-date of 1336 must reflect a grain of historical truth, modern scholars, many active before or just around the beginning of serious archaeological exploration in Libya towards the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, understood Medea's counterfactual narrative, along with Pindar's traditions about the Antenoridae and the 'harbour of Menelaus' mentioned in Herodotus,<sup>113</sup> as implying a historical settlement from the Peloponnese by pre-Dorian 'Danaans' at the close of the 'heroic age'—or at least Pindar's knowledge of some such oral tradition.<sup>114</sup> Both interpretations have been defended recently,<sup>115</sup> despite Chamoux's refutation of the first,<sup>116</sup> and the inherent implausibility of the second. It has been argued that Medea's narrative engages with two distinct myth-variants, one 'pro-' (the colonisation after sixteen generations), and the other (the four generations) 'anti-Battiad', with the latter possibly rooted in an early sixth-century conflict (during the reign of Battos III 'the Lamé', the fifth king of his line) attested in Herodotus between the descendants of the Theraean settlers and more recent immigrants from the Peloponnese that led to a temporary redrawing of Cyrene's political institutions and some reduction of royal prerogatives.<sup>117</sup>

Pindar, it is argued, alludes to this 'anti-Battiad' tradition in a way that implies its rejection (as a-historical) in favour of the other Euphemid/Battiad account. But the weak retentive capability of oral traditions unreinforced by writing, and their tendency to reconstruct the past to suit present interests, combined with a lack in Cyrenaica of archaeological material from the early Greek Iron Age that could indicate an earlier and lasting phase of Greek settlement before the arrival of the Therans,<sup>118</sup> clearly place Medea's double-settlement story in the realm of myth. The presence in Cyrene of mythical precedents like the sojourn of Menelaus and the Antenoridae is likewise

---

<sup>113</sup> Hdt. 4.169 (Harbour of Menelaus): see Malkin (1994) 48–57; Boardman (1966) 150–1.

<sup>114</sup> Malten (1911) argued for late Bronze- or early Iron-Age colonisation from Lakonia; Gercke (1906) and Studniczka (1890) 60–1, followed by Pasquali (1986), from Thessaly. The Lindian Chronicle (*FGrHist* 532 F17 and Chamoux (1953) 72–3) may reflect a variant that dates Battos' arrival to the aftermath of the Trojan War; Silius Italicus (8.57–8, cf. Chamoux (1949) 73 n. 1) makes him a contemporary of Aeneas. These variants, as Malkin (1994) 66 shows, are irrelevant to Pindar.

<sup>115</sup> See Corcella (2007) 671, citing Stucchi (1967) and (1976), and Marinatos (1974) 54–7, who argue that the Pindaric and Herodotean myths contain a folk-memory of settlement from Minoan Thera and Crete; *contra*, see e.g. Boardman (1968).

<sup>116</sup> Chamoux (1953) 69–91.

<sup>117</sup> Hdt. 4.159–61, with Studniczka (1890) 108–9; Chamoux (1953) 86–91; Huxley (1975) 37–8; Giannini (1990) 75–7; Mitchell (2000) 86–9; Hornblower (2004) 113. Malten (1911) 109–10 argued that the Euphemus legend, which applied originally to pre-Dorian settlers (see n. 115 below), was appropriated by Pindar for the Battiads.

<sup>118</sup> A small amount of Minoan and Mycenaean material has been explained as the residue of trade: see Corcella (2007) 671 and n. 131 below.

easily paralleled in Western Greek colonial traditions, where settlers traced their land-charters back to an earlier visit by Heracles, Odysseus or another Trojan-war *nostos*-hero, and where even the Antenoridae and other Trojans (not least Aeneas) play a role in such pre-settlement traditions.<sup>119</sup> Nor, as Malkin has shown, is there any strong reason to identify strongly ‘pro-’ and ‘anti-Battiad’ biases even within the Herodotean material, let alone in Pindar; or to assume that traditional stories of the first settlement changed so rapidly to reflect political developments.<sup>120</sup>

To understand the double colonisation, we do not, therefore, need to posit conflicting, politically-charged variants. The motif fits the logic of Pindar’s Euphemid account too well: I believe he must have invented it. Medea’s reference to the mythical Dorian conquest of the Peloponnese—the ‘Return of the Heraclidae’—pins the earlier, abortive Euphemid colonisation of Libya to the phase of disruption and population-movements that for Thucydides (1.12.3–4) followed on the upheavals caused by the Trojan War. The ‘Return’ marked the end of the ‘heroic age’, and the beginning of a different sort of time-reckoning in which he dates events relative to one another in increments of decades.<sup>121</sup> As the *Fifth Pythian* (60–81) shows, the ‘Return’ had by Pindar’s time become central to the way at least some Cyrenaicans (and surely the régime itself) defined their political and cultural identity, as well as their political and religious institutions (e.g. the monarchy and the Carneia), through the links of both to Sparta; Pindar’s reference to it thus grounds Medea’s counterfactual story in what, for him, was authentic history, alluding to the position of Euphemus’ line, and the Cyrenaicans more generally, within a larger community of ‘Dorian’ peoples who—so the story went—had derived a decisive part of their culture and their *nomima* from Sparta.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> For *nostoi* (Menelaos) in the West: Malkin (1994) 57–64; Hornblower (2015) 327–35. On the lost tragedy of Sophocles that sent the Antenoridae to the Veneto (Strab. 13.1.53), see Malkin (1998) 198–9, Krummen (2014) 139 and Braccisi (1987) who argues—like Brillante (1989)—that they were seen as ancestors of the Libyans (the Elymians of Sicily, and the Choni near Siris in Italy, were also remembered as of Trojan origin). At Siris Trojans appear again together with a Greek *nostos*-hero (Philoctetes): see Malkin (1998) 226–31. For the Antenoridae as symbolic mediators between settlers and ‘Libyan’ *Ureinwohner*, see Krummen (2014) 149–53.

<sup>120</sup> Malkin (2003). On the circumstances in which the ‘anti-Battiad’ narrative is supposed to have become dominant by Herodotus’ time, pp. 47–48 below.

<sup>121</sup> See Gomme (1945) 116–20, and Hornblower (1991) 37–41 and (2011) 120–1.

<sup>122</sup> How old or generalised this tradition was in Pindar’s time cannot be discussed here. The interpretation of this lengthy passage of *P. 5* which links Apollo and the Carneia to the foundation-narrative of Cyrene, is especially vexed: for bibliography, see n. 000 below. This sense of a wider ‘Spartan Mediterranean’, explored by Malkin (1994) and so strongly present to Pindar, was not so evident to Thucydides—on which problem see Fragoulaki (forthcoming).

Herodotus seems to refer to similar traditions and cultural links, at least when, in the first part of his Cyrenaean *logos*, he explains the ties of blood and custom, including a monarchical system, that bind the Therans to Sparta. If we accept, with all modern editors, the conjecture at 4.150.2 that makes Battos a ‘Euphemid’ (and not, as in all the manuscripts, a ‘Euthymid’), the Euphemid *genos* (if they existed) belonged (at least for Herodotus’ ‘Theran’ source) among the Minyans who participated with Theras in the colonisation of Thera, and then (in Battos’ person) of Cyrene.<sup>123</sup> Through his son Oiolykus (who remained behind in Lacedaemon), Theras became the ancestor of the Spartan Aegeidae: a famous clan with deep links to traditions of the Return and early Sparta.<sup>124</sup> Pindar, speaking most likely in the voice of the Cyrenaean chorus, describes the Aegeidae as ‘my fathers’ in *Pythian* 5.<sup>125</sup> Pindar draws even the Cyrenaean cult of the Antenoridae into his broader Dorian discourse, since it is during the Carneia that Battos’ people receive the heroes with offerings.<sup>126</sup> The Trojan heroes’ ‘arrival’, in the recurring, cyclical time of the yearly ritual, seems to presage that of the Cyrenaeans themselves in their new (now old) homeland. But there is no trace, either here or in *Pythian* 4, of any earlier colonisation. If it had existed, Pindar surely would have polished such an explicit and recognised Peloponnesian connection into an exemplary myth, but it was not possible in the traditions at his disposal. Indeed, the very Dorian emphasis of his discourse logically requires the sequence of unrelated migrations that he paints.

Pindar’s counterfactual history is thus probably a recent invention (perhaps even his own) designed to call attention to the workings of providence in history. Here too, the *felix culpa* motif structures the argument. The fact that the earlier colonisation after four generations did not happen is not in the end a problem. The god, it seems, had envisaged long before Battos a relationship between Cyrene and the Peloponnesians: the aborted Peloponnesian line of Medea’s narrative thus duplicates

---

<sup>123</sup> See Corcella (2007) 677; Chamoux (1953) 83–91.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Hdt. 4.147 and 149.

<sup>125</sup> *P.* 5.72–6: one of the most notorious *crucis* in Pindar. On the passage, see Lefkowitz (1991) 179–82 (it refers to Pindar’s Aegeid ancestry and to the relationship, through Sparta, between Cyrene and Thebes); cf. Krummen (2014) 153–66 (ascribed to the Cyrenaean chorus); D’Alessio (1994) 122–4, Giannini (1995) 532 (the same); and finally Currie (2005) 227–8 (with extensive earlier bibliography). On the Aegeidae here and in Herodotus: Malkin (1994) 98–106; Nafissi (1985), Giannini (1990) 81–4; Vannicelli (1992) and (1993).

<sup>126</sup> Calame (2003) 79–86; Dougherty (1993) 103–19. ‘Return of Heraclidae’ as a charter-myth: Malkin (1994) 33–43 and (1998); Carneia: *ibid.* 143–58. Vannicelli (1992) and De Vido (1998) on the importance of Sparta for Cyrenaean royal ideology.

the ‘historical’ Theraean one. The founding voyage *must* happen: fortuitous failure and sixteen generations were, however, needed to transform Minyan Argonauts, through multiple expulsions and misfortunes, into proper Dorians: men who, as we learn from *Pythian 5*, acquired their institutions and culture through their ties to Sparta, and whose claim to the Libyan land is buttressed not only by Euphemus’ claim, but by the conquering energies of the ‘Return’.<sup>127</sup> Although human beings’ lamentable freedom to fail explains history’s surface contingencies, it is the god who patiently determines their general direction of movement.<sup>128</sup> In this way, little Thera, as Cyrene’s metropolis, mediates between the powerful kingdom of the Hellenes in Libya and the hegemonic state of the Dorian Peloponnese, and Battos’ settlement becomes in turn a ‘Return of the Euphemidai’.<sup>129</sup>

The early Greek archaeology of Cyrenaica seems to point to a first settler population and a network of sites more diverse than the places mentioned in the early literary tradition: Platea, Aziris and Cyrene. The Battiadai and Theraeans clearly established their hegemonic narrative of the settlement period, including a claim to metropolitan hegemony over the other cities of Greek Libya (Taucheira, Barke, Euhesperides), early in the colony’s history. The ‘single ship’ (or the case of Cyrene, ‘two fifty-oared ships’) narrative, like the American myth of the *Mayflower*, probably obscured a more complicated and pluralistic process of settlement and exploitation.<sup>130</sup> But even this tradition (or set of traditions) must have comprised many local variants overlooked in Pindar’s framing of his narrative.

We can begin to imagine these by comparing his odes with the double tradition of Herodotus’ Libyan *logos*. The historiographer entirely excludes, perhaps as too primordial and legendary, the tale of Cyrene and Apollo familiar from *Pythian 9*.<sup>131</sup> Also neglected (perhaps as an uninteresting cultic *aetion*) are the Antenorids

---

<sup>127</sup> Vannicelli (1992) 56; Giannini (1995) 107 n. 3; Malkin (1994) 179.

<sup>128</sup> Giannini (1995) 105 n. 3. Baragwanath (in this volume) discusses the same theme in reference to Herodotean modes of historical explanation.

<sup>129</sup> Vannicelli (1993) 128–9. Arcesilas can thus ‘have it both ways’: it is a striking example of Pindar’s ability to force multiple, often somewhat conflictual thematic strands into a single authoritative discourse.

<sup>130</sup> Boardman (1999) 153–9 and (1994) 142–7, and Gill (2006) demonstrate that other Greek settlements were founded almost simultaneously with Cyrene; for a more radically pluralistic interpretation see Osborne (1996) 15–17 (and 1998) and Austin (2008) esp. 192–4, with the reflections on ‘mixed colonial realities’ in Hornblower (2004) 119–23. The ‘two pentekonters’ motif is present in both of Herodotus’ ‘traditions’: cf. 4.153 (‘Theran’) and 156.2 (apparently ‘Cyrenaean’). For a defence of the literary evidence, see Malkin (2003), to whom I owe the *Mayflower* analogy.

<sup>131</sup> Unless the oracle at 4.157.2 alludes ironically to Apollo’s having been to Libya before, perhaps in the Hesiod *Catalogue* (see Hirschberger (2004) 389; Giangliulo (2001) 122–4) with the nymph Cyrene.

(although, as we have seen, he does mention a ‘Harbour of Menelaus’). Herodotus’ *logos* begins with the misrule of the sixth Battiad king Arcesilas III, whose reign coincided with Cambyses’ conquest of Egypt, and whose murder provoked the Persian invasion of Libya that is the historian’s point of connection to his wider narrative of Achaemenid expansion; it ends with the revenge of Pheretime, Arcesilas’ mother, on her son’s Barcaean foes.<sup>132</sup> He says nothing about the tyrant’s successors Battos III and Arcesilas IV. Herodotus’ first ‘Spartan and Theraean’ variant of the Battos-story narrates the Minyans’ move from Lemnos to Sparta and their role in the colonisation of Thera. It then skips forward to Battos’ generation. Minyans, Dorians and others coalesce into a new people on Thera.<sup>133</sup> While the text with emendation can be made to support the claim that Battos was both a Minyan of Thera and a Euphemid, it does not corroborate a ‘full’ Battiad genealogy. Indeed, Herodotus never explains the significance of the connection between Euphemus and Battos.<sup>134</sup> Likewise, the ‘Cyrenaean’ version he presents of Battos’ origins makes him the son of Theran Polymnestus and Phronime, a princess from Axos on Crete (4.154–5), but does not mention the Euphemids at all.<sup>135</sup> The next section will show that Argonauts’ visit to Libya has a different function in Herodotus’ narrative.

With respect to the colonisation itself, Herodotus’ ‘Theraean’ version emphasises the planned constitutionality of the enterprise, and thus the links between metropolis and colony; while the Cyrenaean’s focuses more on the experience of rupture and the colonists’ rejection by Thera.<sup>136</sup> The ‘Cyrenaean’ version certainly emphasises the fact that Battos was divinely chosen; it is also closer to Pindar’s tale in its details, particularly in the section that narrates the first of Battos’ two visits to the Delphic oracle (*P.* 4.59–63).<sup>137</sup> Herodotus’ Battos-narratives are distinguished from

<sup>132</sup> Hdt. 4.145.1; 162–7; 200–5 with Mitchell (2000) 89–93; see also Baragwanath (in this volume) 7–8, 10–22.

<sup>133</sup> Calame (1990) 313–14 n. 98.

<sup>134</sup> See Vannicelli (1992) 69–73 on the silence about Euphemus in Herodotus and the narrative of Jason’s sojourn in Libya (on which see the next section). Later historians of Cyrene (Acesander, *FGrHist* 469F 5, cf. Theochrestos, *FGrHist* 761 F 1a) mention a certain Samos as the link between Euphemus and Battos, who Σ 88b, ii: 109–10 Dr. says accompanied Theras to the island. cf. Malkin (1994) 100 n. 155.

<sup>135</sup> Perhaps the historian’s description of Battos as ὁ Πολυμνήστων, ἐὼν γένος Εὐφημίδης τῶν Μινυέων (‘the son of Polymnestus, being with respect to his lineage a Euphemid of the Minyans’) at 4.150.2 (see n. 000 above) is meant to apply here as well. But the ‘Cyrenaean’ version, while over-emphasising Battos’ Cretan connections, ignores his family links to the ‘Minyans’.

<sup>136</sup> Osborne (1996) 12–13; Giangiulio (2001) esp. 134–6.

<sup>137</sup> Giangiulio (2001) 125–7 speculates interestingly on the possibility that Herodotus may have used a collection of colonisation-oracles—perhaps Pindar as well? For comparison of Pindar with Herodotus,

Pindar's by their wealth of circumstantial detail and by their rationalising, demystifying tendency; unlike Pindar, he fills the space between Battos and the story of Arcesilas III, his mother and the Persians with a history of personalities and events. Both, however, share a perception, familiar from other colonial traditions, that both the settlement and subsequent events were the work of providence in the form of the Delphic oracle.<sup>138</sup> Greek 'colonisation' traditions constantly emphasise the importance of the oracle, and through it the city's special relationship with the god; but Pindar's story does something more.

### 7. Herodotus on the Argonauts in Libya

Perhaps the most striking difference between Herodotus' colonisation account and Pindar's lies in the historian's handling (4.179) of the events at Lake Triton that form the narrative kernel of Medea's 'Theraean word'. Something similar takes place in Herodotus, but both the story's details and its meaning are transformed. Herodotus' version, clearly marked as a dubious oral tradition (*ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὄδε λόγος λεγόμενος*, 179.1; *λόγος ἔστι*, 179.2), is buried as a digression in the historian's survey of the Lotophagoi and the Machlyes, Libyan tribes who live around Lake Tritonis. Before her Colchian adventure, he says, *Argo* set sail from Iolcus to Delphi with a hecatomb and a bronze tripod for Apollo as cargo. Blown off course at Cape Malea, she finds herself trapped in the sandbanks of the Tritonian Lake (localised here not in Cyrenaica, but in the shallows of the Lesser Syrtis). Triton appears and promises help in exchange for the tripod. He puts it in his own temple, but before the Argonauts depart, he sits on it like the Pythia and prophesies to them, saying that if any descendant of *Argo*'s crew returns to Libya and reclaims (*κομίσσεται*, 4.179.3) the tripod, a hundred Greek cities will sprout on the shores of Lake Tritonis. 'Hearing this, the native Libyans of the country hid the tripod'. Jason sails away: the Argonauts and their descendants play no part in Libya's history. Euphemus goes unmentioned, and there no connection is made to the Battiads or to Cyrene.

The similarities and differences are stark. Both tales are clearly charter-myths. Beyond that, Pindar's narrative treats Lake Tritonis as part of the Battiads' Libyan

---

with emphasis on his monarchical links, see his pp. 134–7 (cf. Athanassaki (2009) 436–9; for the 'Theraean' version of Battos' Delphic scene, [see n. 153 below](#)).

<sup>138</sup> See Calame (1996) 36 and (2003) 95–6. The central role of Apollo and Delphi in Cyrenaean institutions and ideology persisted into the fourth century, as is attested on the so-called 'Founders' agreement ([see n. 153 below](#)) and a sacred law cited by Malkin (2003) 169.

realm; Herodotus places it further west towards Carthage, beyond the conventional western border of the ‘precinct of Ammonian Zeus’ at the Arae Philaenorum. Herodotus brings the Argonauts to Libya before they go to Colchis; Pindar, like Apollonius after him, brings them there on the return. In Pindar’s version, Eurypylos/Triton does not prophesy and there is no tripod. Instead of a gift from Greeks to Libyans (the tripod being both a symbol of victory and a votive dedication in cult) which remains in Libya as a marker or ‘symbol of possession’ after the Argonauts depart, there is the clod and the gift of Libya to the Theraeans. For Pindar, the prophecy of Medea is fulfilled and exhausted by the Theraean settlement under Battos; in Herodotus’ version, Triton’s prophecy remains an unfulfilled potential charter for aggressive Greek expansion.<sup>139</sup> Still later, Apollonius Rhodius synthesises the two versions into a single story ending in a swap: Euphemus gets the clod, and Triton takes the tripod.<sup>140</sup>

As Corcella notes, it is difficult to pinpoint a date for Herodotus’ story. Is it earlier or later than Pindar’s? If it is later, does it consciously rework the poet’s tale of Euphemus and the clod in an ‘anti-Battiad’ mode?<sup>141</sup> An earlier (perhaps even an earlier Cyrenaean) epic version of the Lake Tritonis story may have existed on which both accounts were separately based. The Hesiodic *Megalai Ehoiai* is reported to have brought the *Argo* to Libya via Oceanus on her return voyage, but the context of this fact, its place in the larger Argonautic story, and the part played by Euphemus remain unclear, as does the possible role of Cyrenaean local tradition, and even poetic tradition, in generating it.<sup>142</sup> Malkin provides the likeliest solution to the problem,

---

<sup>139</sup> Loss or concealment plays a role in both stories, but the tripod, as trophy, is very concrete and spatially fixed, while the clod more malleable, able to diffuse itself despite loss, and to change state (it shifts from metonymy for the land to one for the people in their connection to the land) in order to make its effects felt. Paradoxically, however, the claim articulated through the clod is fixed (since realised in generations of Cyrenaean) while the tripod’s claim is open-ended and projected into the future. The one explains a finished process, the other, on the model of apocalyptic predictions put forward by Kermodé (2000) must potentially explain successive failures to realise the prophecy. (One can imagine people saying, for example, that Dorieus—see p. 32 below—must have failed to locate the tripod!) As a motif, the clod also implies that whatever happened to Thera and the Euphemids has necessarily happened to Libya as well: it is a source of growth and human as well as chthonic fertility. There is thus no intrinsic pro- or anti-Battiad content in either myth: the two stories simply use similar tropes to accomplish very different things. Cf. Currie (2012) 293–4.

<sup>140</sup> A.R. 4.1537–619. See Corcella (2007) 701–2 (‘symbol’) and Hunter (2015) 8–9, 290. See also Lycophron 885–96, with S. West (2007b) 208 and Hornblower (2015) 337–40, in which the tripod becomes a ‘golden *krater*’.

<sup>141</sup> Huxley (1969) 80–1 has ascribed it (groundlessly) to Epimenides of Crete; cf. also Jackson (1987).

<sup>142</sup> The Argonauts’ *nostos* through Libya was apparently described (fr. 241 M-W) in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*; Euphemus (fr. 253 M-W) figured in the *Megalai Ehoiai*: D’Alessio (2005a) 196–9 and (2005b) 232; cf. Braswell (1988) 8–10. M. L. West (1985) 87–8, following Malten (1911) 158,

finding a *terminus ante quem* for the Herodotean tradition about fifty years before Pindar (ca. 513 BCE), in the mission of the Spartan Dorieus (with Theraean but no Cyrenaean help) to colonise Kinyps, ‘the most beautiful place in Libya next to a river’,<sup>143</sup> on the coast of the Greater Syrtis far to the west of the Cyrenaean border at Euhesperides.<sup>144</sup> The collapse of this expedition due to resistance from the Makai, Libyans and Carthaginians prompted an even more disastrous venture at Eryx in Sicily, where Dorieus’ men were wiped out by the Segestans and their Carthaginian allies.<sup>145</sup> The Sicilian expedition of Dorieus, a Spartan Agiad and a Heraclid, and brother of the Leonidas who fell at Thermopylae, was justified by appeal to a ‘Heraclid charter’:<sup>146</sup> an oracle of Laius which claimed that Heracles had acquired the land of Eryx for the Heraclidae in perpetuity. Throughout his narrative of Dorieus’ Sicilian career, Herodotus highlights the Spartan’s reliance on dodgy oracle collections, implying that his failure to consult the Pythia or ‘to do any of the prescribed actions’ (*νομιζόμενα*, 5.42.2), explains the disaster. Dorieus may have chosen his Libyan settlement-site on a similar basis.

Immediately before his narrative of Jason, Triton and the tripod, Herodotus (4.178) mentions a tradition in Libya that claimed the Spartans were fated to found a colony on the island of Phla near Lake Tritonis (actually well to the west of Dorieus’ failed colony at Kinyps).<sup>147</sup> For Dorieus, then, the myth of the Argonauts at Lake Tritonis may have served as an ‘open’ charter (a claim of expansion) for land west of Cyrenaica proper, just as Euphemus’ clod, in Pindar, explains the Battiads’ ownership of the ‘precinct of Ammonian Zeus’. Diodorus (4.56.6), probably following Timaeus of Tauromenium (c. 350–260 BCE = *FGrHist* 566), says that the tripod Jason left, ‘inscribed with ancient characters’, was displayed ‘until rather recent times’ in

---

suggests that it may have reached the Hesiodic corpus from the 6<sup>th</sup>-century epic poets around Eugammon (the supposed author of the *Telegony* and contemporary of Arcesilas II, c. 565–550), on whom see also Giangiulio (2001) 123–4 nn. 21–3 (with bibliography). Lasserre (1976) 122–3 argued that Eugammon may have been the common source for the *ktisis* story and prophecies in Pindar and Herodotus as well.

<sup>143</sup> Hdt. 5.41–2.

<sup>144</sup> Malkin (1994) 192–218.

<sup>145</sup> Hdt. 5.39–48 (and Asheri in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> iv 751–3). Affinities between the Dorieus story and that of Theras are also illuminating: Baragwanath (2008) 165–7.

<sup>146</sup> See Hornblower (2013) 155–6 and Malkin (1994) 203–18.

<sup>147</sup> For Malten (1911) 132 n. 2 this is grounds for rejecting the connection, proposed before Malkin by Niese (1907), between Dorieus and Herodotus’ Jason-narrative: cf. Hornblower (2013) 148. Hornblower ((2004) 107–13) argues that Pindar’s clod-myth (specifically the counter-factual ‘four generations’ discussed above) has Dorieus in mind, and that this element of his narrative was known already to the Spartan. On how Herodotus’ proem (1.2.2) integrates the Argonaut-myth into his wider tale of East-West conflict, see Baragwanath (in this volume) 5.

Euhesperides. When we turn in the following pages to examine the historical context of Pindar's ode, we will find that there is a tradition, well-attested in the scholia, that Arcesilas IV chose Euhesperides as the place at which he would establish a new colony of his own, a military settlement intended to serve as a private power-base and refuge from the political struggles of Cyrene.<sup>148</sup> This may imply that a version of the same tripod story, in Arcesilas' time or later, provided a 'closed' charter (or mythical border-claim) for the western frontier of Cyrenaica; where Pindar, or at least his later readers, may have imagined the transfer of the clod.

If Malkin's contextualisation of the story is correct, then the Herodotean variant of the Lake Tritonis tale is older by a half-century than Pindar's. While it is possible that Pindar based his account on a lost older tradition, and perhaps even on the *Megalai Ehoiai*, it is equally likely that he and Arcesilas IV hijacked whatever original Argonautic myth existed to their private ends. The persistence in Apollonius of elements such as Triton and the tripod may point to the pre-Pindaric, epic version of the story being much closer to Herodotus than to Pindar. There is in any case no *prima facie* reason to assume that Herodotus relates an anti-Battiad tradition that developed after the fall of the monarchy, or that his version is in any way connected to Pindar's. It seems that the motif of Euphemus and the clod, which forms the centrepiece of Pindar's account of Cyrenaean history, may represent the poet's creative adaptation of a story known, possibly in several variant forms, in both Cyrene and Hellas, one that provoked Dorieus to attempt his own *κτίσις* at Kinyps—a revision of tradition, then, that is hardly out of step with other changes Pindar makes to the Argonaut story in the following part of his poem.

### **8. Summary and Scene: The Contest of Lyric and Epic Form in the Argonaut Myth (ll. 57-246)**

Let us return, then, to Pindar's text. Medea's 'word' has retraced its steps, inadvertently sanctioning its own framing narrative. The rest of the journey—the transition from Battos to the present, or from 'myth' to 'frame', 'narrative' to 'celebration'—is left to the lyric voice, who in a 'break-off' or 'return' reframes Medea's speech as part of his own discourse:

---

<sup>148</sup> See p. 46-48 below.

tr. 3, ant. 3

ἦ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες. ἔπτα-

ξαν δ' ἀκίνητοι σιωπᾶ

57

ἦροες ἀντίθεοι πυκινὰν μῆτιν κλύοντες.

So spoke Medea's serried ranks of words, and they, the demigod heroes, shrank down unmoving, as they heard her astute counsel.

The following lines (58–69) re-introduce the contextual cues (the deictic markers of 'here', 'now', 'I' and 'you') lost when the narrator turned from celebration to myth and invoked Medea's 'Theraean word' some fifty lines before.<sup>149</sup> The speaker addresses the long-dead founder Battos.<sup>150</sup>

tr. 3, ant. 5

ὦ μάκαρ υἱὲ Πολυμνάστου, σὲ δ' ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ

χρησμὸς ὄρθωσεν μελίσσας

Δελφίδος αὐτομάτῳ κελάδῳ·

60

ἃ σε χαίρειν ἐστρίς ἀυδάσαισα πεπρωμένον

βασιλέ' ἄμφανεν Κυράνα,

tr. 3, ep. 1

δυσθρόου φωνᾶς ἀνακρινόμενον ποι-

νὰ τίς ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν.

63

O blessed son of Polymnastus, [it was] you in that speech whom the prophetic voice of the Delphic bee set upright<sup>151</sup> with **spontaneous shout** (60); [she] who crying "Hail!" three times revealed you to be the destined king of Cyrene, when you were coming to ask what requital there might be from the gods for your ill-sounding voice.

This refers back to ll. 4–6, recapitulating the 'Battos in Delphi' story for the third time and adding further motifs—Battos' stammer and the Pythia's spontaneous salutation of him as 'King'—which feature also in Herodotus' (4.155) 'Cyrenaean' variant of

<sup>149</sup> On 'shifting in' and 'shifting out' see p. 000 above, and also Felson (1999) 18–20.

<sup>150</sup> On heroisation in *P.* 5, see p. 2 n. 6 below, and p. 35 n. 55 above.

<sup>151</sup> The verb ὀρθόω often implies a change from misfortune to happiness; as Giannini (1995) 445 notes, to 'lie on the ground' is to remain in unhappiness and obscurity.

the same scene.<sup>152</sup> The temporal viewpoint is the lyric speaker's, but the irony of unintended consequences applies here as well. The Pythia's words created a political reality that persists to the present day: her words' intention (the god's, not the Pythia's) thus coincided with the promise of Medea's 'Theraean word', which Battos 'brought home' (cf. *ἀγκόμισαι*, 9):

tr. 3. ep. 2	<p><i>ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν,</i>  <i>ὥτε φοινικανθέμον ἦρος ἀκμῶ,</i>  <i>παισὶ τούτοις ὄγδοον θάλλει μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας·</i>  <i>τῷ μὲν Ἀπόλλων ἄ τε Πυθῶ κῆδος ἐξ</i>  <i>ἀμφικτιόνων ἔπορεν</i>  <i>ἵπποδρομίας.[...]</i></p>	64  65  67
--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

'As at the height of spring with its brilliant flowers, so Arcesilas, as the eighth part of Battos' descendants **even now** in this later time flourishes and blooms, to whom Apollo and Pytho granted from the Amphictyons glorious victory in the chariot-race'.

The preposterous particle-collocation *ἦ μάλα δὴ μετὰ καὶ νῦν* ('yes—really!—so—later—even now/still'), with its combination of clarification, asseveration and shift from past to present, avers that Cyrene's 'now' is a consequence of Battos' 'then', heightening the continuity between myth and frame. Pindar thus glides easily back to the ode's opening situation and to Arcesilas' epinician *komos*.<sup>153</sup> The essential political point is that Cyrene has been a divinely-ordained polity since the foundation: her monarchical order is stable; divine favour in the present re-energizes a history of providential will that legitimates and sanctions hegemony.<sup>154</sup> The city's success is a

<sup>152</sup> On a possible reference to the tradition that Battos = 'king' in Libyan, see [n. 4 above](#). The motif of oracular spontaneity, differently attested in Herodotus' 'Theran' version (4.150.3) as an unintended *kledon* by the Theran king Grinnos, recurs in the Cyrenaean 'Agreement of the Founders' inscription (*SEG IX 3.24–7*): *ἐπεὶ Ἀπόλλων αὐτομάτιζεν Β[άτ]τω | καὶ Θηραίοις ἀποι[κί]ζαι Κυράναν*. See Giannini (1979) 42 n. 36; for extreme positions in the debate surrounding the authenticity of this document, see e.g. Osborne (1996) 13–15 and Malkin (2003) 166–7; for bibliography and discussion Ager (2008).

<sup>153</sup> Cf. vv. 1–3, and [pp. 7–11 above](#).

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Segal (1986) 160. *Pythian 5* approaches the same themes through its invocation of Apollo's Carneia-festival and Spartan/Doric tradition, as well as by defining the song itself (94–103) as a libation offered by Arcesilas to his heroized royal ancestors: the long-dead 'sacred kings' whose presence near the city ensures its continued prosperity. On *ἄτερθε δὲ πρὸ δώματων*, *P.* 5.96, I follow Σ *P.* 5.129, ii: 189 Dr. and Giannini (1995) 536–7 *ad loc.*: for discussion and full bibliography see Currie

kind of genetic inheritance in the male line of the ruling house.<sup>155</sup> The epinician programme of the ode is also complete: Arcesilas has been named and his victory proclaimed. There is little to add: many of Pindar's finest epinicians are shorter than this three-triad composition.<sup>156</sup>

What follows is therefore one of the most deviously-constructed examples of false closure in pre-tragic Greek literature. At triad-end, instead of ending the song, the lyric voice makes two additional statements that set another, longer narrative in train. 'I will' he says, 'render him [Arcesilas] up to the Muses, and the all-golden fleece of the ram (... ἀπὸ δ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ Μοῖσαισι δώσω | καὶ τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ): for when they, the Minyans, sailed in search of it, divinely-sent honours were planted for them (θεόπομποί σφισιν τιμαὶ φύτευθεν, 67–9)'. Here for the first time, the lyric speaker approximates a 'poet's voice': the verbal expression of a mind preoccupied with formal, aesthetic or thematic choices.<sup>157</sup> The Muses here stand for the tradition of *kleos*-song. Pindar's speaker suggests that making Arcesilas a theme for song is somehow the same as remembering the Golden Fleece. This is because 'heaven-sent honour' was 'planted' for the Minyans as a consequence of their quest. The 'planting' metaphor shifts the ruling metaphor of Medea's prophecy and the poet's praise of the Battiads to the sphere of evergreen fame.

The lyric voice thus sets out a programme for an Argonautic narrative, demoting Medea's 'Theraean word', which until now seemed to occupy the centre of a complete ode, to the status of a prologue (*Vormythos*) to something much larger.<sup>158</sup> But how are we to interpret the connection he establishes between Arcesilas and the Argonauts?<sup>159</sup> Two solutions present themselves. First, Jason sailed to Colchis at the prompting of the Delphic oracle; so too did Apollo prompt Battos' voyage from Thera to Cyrene, and Arcesilas' *theoria* to Delphi. Like the Argonauts, these two, ancestor and descendant, have both earned 'god-sent honours'. Second, Medea's *Vormythos*

---

(2005) 241–4. On the importance of oikist cult, see Dougherty (1993) 24–7, Malkin (1994) 127–33 and Currie (2005) 226–57.

<sup>155</sup> Herodotus by contrast emphasises an 'ancestral predisposition' in the Battiads towards violence and ill-rule: see Baragwanath (in this chapter) 16. On vegetal imagery and 'inherited excellence', see n. 77 above.

<sup>156</sup> Sigelman (2016) 120.

<sup>157</sup> On metapoetic 'pseudo-spontaneity' and invocations (with bibliography), see Morrison (2007) 67–90.

<sup>158</sup> See Carey (1980a) 143; Wüst (1967); Longley-Cook (1989); Sigelman (2016) 113–21.

<sup>159</sup> Gildersleeve (1885) *ad loc.* tried to get around the obvious problem of relevance by making Euphemus the subject of *αὐτόν*; Σ 119, ii: 115 argues for reference to Arcesilas.

has already demonstrated the importance of this myth for the Cyrenaean, since their history is a bastard child of Jason’s quest. As Euphemids, the Battiadai are also Minyans in a sense, and they thus get their share of Argonautic *kleos*.<sup>160</sup> If the first of these strikes one as superficial, and the second too diffuse to justify the scale of the impending narrative, such uncertainty about motivation is not uncommon in Pindar.<sup>161</sup> As the coming sections of this chapter will show, however hard one looks for a symbolic or exemplary connection between Arcesilas and the Argonauts, the two themes float largely free of one another, even as they are linked by the loose metonymy implied in the *parataxis*.<sup>162</sup> The transition from Arcesilas to Jason thus poses questions of relevance and meaning that the audience (or reader) struggles to answer. But once the new theme is introduced, the ode is committed to what will be Pindar’s most extensive and ‘epic’ epinician myth.<sup>163</sup>

The shift of topic has implications for genre and style. At the start of the fourth strophe, the ode makes a new beginning with a ‘proem in the middle’.<sup>164</sup> The lyric voice ducks behind his Muse. This is the most traditionally ‘epic’ invocation in Pindar:<sup>165</sup>

tr. 4. str. 1

τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας,  
τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος  
δῆσεν ἄλλοις; [...]

70

What beginning, then, of ship-journeying received [them]? What danger was it that bound them with mighty nails of adamant?

The Muse is not named, but she is the obvious recipient of the speaker’s questions. The apostrophe, the introductory/explanatory *γάρ*, and the emphasis on

<sup>160</sup> See Σ 119 and 123, ii: 115, 116 Dr., with the former bringing out the genealogical tie and the latter the ambiguity in *σφισίν* (‘for them’), which could mean either the Minyans or their Theraean descendants.

<sup>161</sup> Pfeijffer (2004) 223–6; Sigelman (2016) 123–9.

<sup>162</sup> For a similar instance of vague linking of victor with mythical precedents, see *Isth.* 1.13–16 with Bundy (1986) 46.

<sup>163</sup> The ‘epic’ quality of Pindar’s narrative is noted particularly by Pinsent (1985), Braswell (1988) 26, and Sigelman (2016).

<sup>164</sup> Conte (1992). It is perhaps worthwhile noting that Conte regards the device as pre-eminently Hellenistic: on ways in which Pindar and other ‘archaic’ singers ‘anticipate’ the self-consciousness of later poets, see Morrison (2007).

<sup>165</sup> cf. Σ 124ab, ii: 116 Dr. for the Muse-address and the Homeric imitation, and Giannini (1995) 448.

*Themenstellung* (the ἀρχή from which the sea-journey began; the demand for a cause), all point to another epic-style ‘dispatching narrative’.<sup>166</sup> The lyric voice has again become a narrator: the occasion of celebration again vanishes from view. The myth opens with another prophecy. Pelias received an oracle from Delphi that the Aiolidai were fated to kill him: he should avoid the ‘one-sandaled man ... whenever he should come down out of the mountains to the sunlit lowlands of famous Iolcus, whether [he be] a stranger or a citizen. And so in time he came ...’ The ‘man’ is Jason: his arrival in Iolcus initiates the narrative’s forward movement. The mention of Delphi is the first of several connections established between myth and frame.<sup>167</sup>

This ode’s engagement with epic is intense: reflected in diction, themes, plotting, characterisation, and use of formal devices. It is especially evident in the overall structure of the Jason myth (70–246). If Pindar’s epinician myths usually generate effects of temporal order like the ones we saw in the Medea passage above, here the story’s events are presented in linear progression, but with radical changes in narrative pace or rhythm (Genette’s ‘duration’): that is to say, the relative balance of *summary* and *scene*.<sup>168</sup> In its most ‘epic’, initial sections, anachrony is limited to places where characters reminisce. The myth falls into three sections, each of which adopts a different approach to the problem of pace. The first and longest runs from Jason’s arrival in Iolcus to the beginning of the quest for the Golden Fleece (78–167): it consists of two confrontations between Jason and Pelias (78–120: 42 verses; 138–67: 29 verses) ending with Jason’s agreement to undertake the quest (again motivated by a Delphic oracle: 163–4). Excepting the epic-style speech-formulae and the narrator-summary (120–38) that links the two confrontations, most of this part consists of direct speech, and conforms to epic rather than lyric expectations about rhythm of summary and scene.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>166</sup> See p. 9 above.

<sup>167</sup> Note e.g. the use of the verb κομίζω in the sense ‘reclaim’ or ‘bring home’ of Jason’s restoration (106) of the usurped kingdom of Aeson and his repatriation (159) of Phrixus’ ghost and the Fleece, and the use of the epithet βωλακία (228) with γᾶ, ‘earth’, which recalls the βόλαξ of Lake Tritonis. For other connections, see p. 38 n.172 and p. 40 below.

<sup>168</sup> Genette (1980) 86–112 defines a ‘scene’ as a moment in a narrative in which the internal time of the evolving story coincides exactly with the external time of the narration; in a ‘summary’, narrative time abbreviates *story*-time. Cf. also Nünlist (2007) 234–9 on changes of pace in epinician narrative.

<sup>169</sup> From the prophecy to the agreement of Jason and Pelias (73–168) we have 95 verses, about 32% of the ode. Of this, 58 (61%) are direct character speech, and 37 (39%) are narrator description, summary, and formulae introducing or concluding speech. There is nothing like this anywhere else in Pindar.

The myth's second section (168–211) begins after Jason undertakes the quest. It shifts from a rhythm of direct-speech exchanges interspersed with narrator's commentary to a narrator-driven style of story-presentation that arbitrarily expands some things and abbreviates or excludes others. There is no character-speech here: the rhythm of scene and summary is irregular. It opens with the gathering of the Argonauts, conveyed through the epic device of the catalogue (171–87).<sup>170</sup> After praising the heroism of these youths and the lust for glory inspired in them by Hera—which it transpires, is the dire necessity that drove them to seek danger mentioned in the 'second proem' (70–1)—the narrative jumps forward to *Argo's* departure (188–201). This is richly described in a scene that (both in its diction and situation) recalls Medea's narrative of the events at Lake Tritonis.<sup>171</sup> After *Argo's* sailing, the myth is increasingly attenuated, with summary replacing detailed scenes although the story's events are still presented in linear, progressive style without anachronies. To compare relative scales, the first confrontation between Jason and Pelias filled forty-two verses and *Argo's* departure nineteen (183–202), while the entire journey to Colchis fills eight (203–11). *Ellipsis* becomes an important structuring principle here,<sup>172</sup> as the narrator relies on audience knowledge (any version of the myth will do) to complete omissions made in the narrative. Familiar episodes like the Lemnian Women, the Argonauts' tragic battle at Cyzicus, Hylas, the boxer-king Amycus, or Phineas and the Harpies are all missing.<sup>173</sup> Only the episode of the Clashing Rocks is mentioned (208–11). The Argonauts build an altar to Poseidon at the mouth of the 'Inhospitable' (Black) sea and pray to pass the Rocks in safety. From here, they arrive at the river Phasis 'in less than a sentence'.<sup>174</sup>

With *Argo's* arrival in Colchis, the narrative enters a third phase (211–45, thirty-five verses) marked by a sudden efflorescence of overtly poetic imagery, surprising diction, and even wilder oscillations of tone and tempo. Here diction and

---

<sup>170</sup> The heroes' names are arranged according to the precedence of their divine fathers in the pantheon: Euphemus (his only mention in the myth) is named as one of two sons of Poseidon.

<sup>171</sup> One thinks particularly of the portentous thunderclap of Zeus that sends the heroes on their way (lines 197–200); the heroes' response to which (199–200) contrasts with their reaction to Medea's 'Theraean word' (57–8).

<sup>172</sup> Genette (1980) 43, 106–9: by ellipsis I mean simple omission of an episode of the traditional story. Cf. Nünlist (2007) 245–6.

<sup>173</sup> Braswell (1988) 16–19 shows that these episodes are also attested for Pherecydes' prose narrative of the Argonauts (which should probably be dated closer to 480/470 than to 450): Pindar was certainly aware of them.

<sup>174</sup> Braswell (1988) 293: it takes Apollonius (2.619–1261) 642 hexameters to cover the same ground.

form become a stylistic enactment of genre, as the poet prepares for his shift back from epic to lyric, and from the Jason myth to the stanzas about Arcesilas and Cyrene which close the ode. The *Argo* lands, and her crew seem to fight a battle (or perhaps engage in athletic contests?) against the black-skinned Colchians ‘in Aietes’ presence’ (211–13). The seduction of Medea (213–23) follows immediately. The story is presented almost impersonally, through the goddess Aphrodite’s intention to suborn Medea by the dark power of erotic Persuasion (*Peitho*). The diction evokes the sadistic imagery of love-spells.<sup>175</sup> In speaking of the desire for Hellas that strips Medea of her social standing and filial respect (218–19), the narrator, beyond his bland assertion of Hellenic superiority, alludes to a part of the story (Medea’s life in Greece) outside his myth’s temporal ambit. Whether we import the eventual destruction of this love-bond into Pindar’s narrative is a matter of temperament and our knowledge of extra-Pindaric variants.<sup>176</sup> Medea gives Jason the antidote he needs to survive his impending contest with Aietes, and they agree to sleep together in a ‘sweet marriage of mutual consent’ (*κοινὸς γάμος γλυκύς*, 221–3).

Here too, it is the audience’s knowledge of the story that sustains comprehension, since in Pindar’s narrative Aietes has not challenged Jason to a test. The ploughing-contest (224–43), in a formal recapitulation of the first section’s extended scenes, is again more circumstantial and shows certain epic devices: direct speech, focalisation and simile. But the language and imagery are markedly heightened in comparison with the corresponding scenes between Pelias and Jason.<sup>177</sup> When Jason performs the whole trial without flinching (232–7), Aietes makes a silent inward cry of jealous rage (*ἴβξεν δ’ ἀφωνήτω περ ἔμπαζ ἄχει | δύνασιν Αἰήτας ἀγασθείς*, 237–8). This description of the secret thoughts of a character as speech reads quite Homericly, despite the elaborate strangeness of the diction.<sup>178</sup> Jason’s accomplishment of his deadly task moves us, however, out of epic and into epinician

<sup>175</sup> See Faraone (1993) and (1999).

<sup>176</sup> Despite debate about whether the story of Medea’s revenge on Jason existed in pre-Euripidean tradition (see Gantz (1993) 365–73 and Mastronarde (2002) 44–64), there is no reason to assume their love will end happily: see Iles Johnston (1997). *P.* 4.250 hints at Medea’s murder of Pelias.

<sup>177</sup> Segal (1986) 39–40 brings out the difference between the language used by Pelias (156b–167) and the heightened diction of Aietes in his short speech inviting Jason to the contest (229–31), the final instance of direct character-speech in the ode. This is true, however of the entire third section of the myth.

<sup>178</sup> Focalisation, on which see Genette (1980) 189–98 and de Jong (2004) with Genette (1988) 72–8, is common in Homer but exceptionally rare in epinician narrative: perhaps the only other instance is *N* 1.56–9. An example of deviant focalisation in Homer is *Il.* 22.465 *ἀκηδέστως*; de Jong (2004) ch. 4.

territory again. The Argonauts' reaction to their leader's success ('and they stretched out their dear hands to the mighty man ...': *πρὸς δ' ἑταῖροι καρτερὸν ἄνδρα φίλας | ὄρεγον χεῖρας*, 239–40) creates another link to the ode's opening *komos* (*σάμερον μὲν χρὴ σε παρ' ἄνδρὶ φίλω*, 1).

The embraces, the *phyllobolia* and *stephanēphoria* (*στέφανοισι τέ νιν ποίας ἔρεπτον*), the 'welcoming with gentle words' (*μειλιχίσις τε λόγοις | ἀγαπάζοντ'*, 240–1) are all tropes of victory-celebration in the epinicians.<sup>179</sup> Jason's *komos* thus becomes a primordial model for Arcesilas'. From here, we cut to the hero's confrontation with the Fleece's guardian serpent (241–6). Aietes tells him where the treasure lies: the description of the serpent, 'which surpassed in breadth and length a ship of fifty oars, which strokes of iron have built', is again focalised through the Colchian king, who is confident Jason will not return alive. The little simile (similes are rare in epinician narrative)<sup>180</sup> is Pindar's final 'epic' touch in his myth. The actual winning of the Fleece is then forgotten, as the narrator rushes into the break-off (see the next section).<sup>181</sup>

This narrative scheme based on the manipulation of tempo and pace along an extended storyline differs from Pindar's anachronic narrative of events at Lake Tritonis. From the invocation that defines it as 'epic' utterance, Jason's myth proceeds from a rhythm of dialogue-scenes interspersed with narrator-summary (the closest imitation of epic style in Pindar) through catalogue to pure summary and *ellipsis*, until, just before the break-off, poetic devices like focalisation and simile help to re-establish a hint of 'epic' tone even as narrative breaks down, diction is radically heightened and defamiliarised, and thematic allusions to epinician multiply.<sup>182</sup> **The form of Pindar's longest myth** thus enacts a formal struggle between two related forms of Panhellenic poetic memory: hexameter epic and Pindaric commemorative 'lyric', when ends in the victory of 'lyric'.

<sup>179</sup> See Braswell (1988) 327–8 for the practice of *phyllobolia* (cf. Σ 427b, ii: 156 Dr., with *P.* 9.121–5, Bacch. 11.17–21 and *P.* 8.56–7).

<sup>180</sup> Segal (1986) 7 n. 7 notes the allusion here to Hom. *Od.* 9.319–24 (cf. esp. *P.* 4.245 *πάχει μάκει τε* with *Od.* 9.324, where the stick used to put out Polyphemus' eye *τόσσον ἔην μήκος, τόσσον πάχος ἔσοράσθαι*, and now cf. the dedicatory inscription CEG 394 = Colvin (2007) no. 62, from Sybaris [Francavilla Maritima, late 6<sup>th</sup> c.], which compares the size of the Olympic victor's statue to the man's: 1.2 *μᾶκός τε πάχος τε*). For the association of 'blows' (*πλαγαί*, 246) and killing: Silk (1974) 156.

<sup>181</sup> Nünlist (2007) 246.

<sup>182</sup> On 'epic' vs. 'lyric' in the Jason-myth, see Sigelman (2016) 112, 124–8, 133–6; see also Nünlist (2007) 245–7.

### 9. The Return, the ‘Riddle of Oedipus’, and Damophilus (lines 247–99)

As Jason prepares to undergo his final trial, the epinician speaker reasserts himself in a break-off (or ‘return’) that abrogates the myth in a ‘lyric’ summary style, re-establishing for a final time the ode’s connection with Cyrene, Arcesilas and the moment of celebration:

<b>tr. 11, ep. 1</b>	<i>μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ’ ἀμαξιτόν· ὦρα γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν· πολ- λοῖσι δ’ ἄγῃμαι σοφίας ἐτέροις. κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν, ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐ- τᾷ, τὰν <i>Πελιαόφρονον</i>.</i>	<b>247</b>     <b>250</b>
<b>ep. 5</b>	<i>ἔν τ’ Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ’ ἐρυθρῶ Λαμνιᾶν τ’ ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων· ἔνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοις ἐπεδεί- ξαντο κρίσιν ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς,</i>	
<b>tr. 12, str. 1</b>	<i>καὶ συνεύνασθεν. καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς σπέρμ’ ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀ- κτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες· τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφά- μου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν αἰεὶ τέλλετο· καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μυχθέντες ἀνδρῶν</i>	<b>255</b>
<b>str. 5</b>	<i>ἦθεσιν ἐν ποτε Καλλίσταν ἀπόκησαν χρόνῳ ναῶσον· ἔνθεν δ’ ὕμμι Λατοί- δας ἔπορεν Λιβύας πεδίον σὺν θεῶν τιμαῖς ὀφέλλειν, ἄστν χρυσοθρόνου διανέμειν θεῖον Κυράνας</i>	<b>260</b>
<b>ant. 1</b>	<i>ὀρθόβουλον μῆτιν ἐφευρομένοις.</i>	

But it is too far for me to return home on the broad highway: because the hour is pressing and I know a short-cut, and I lead the way for many others in wise skill. He slew with cunning plans the grey-eyed snake with dappled back, O Arcesilas, and on her initiative abducted Medea, the Pelias-Slayer: and in the broad seas of Oceanus they were mixed and with the (250) Red Sea and the race of man-slaying Lemnian women; where they also performed the strength of their limbs in games for the sake of a cloak, and they slept with the women. Then it was, in those outland furrows, that the destined days or nights received the seed of your (pl.) happiness'/wealth's splendour, for there the race of Euphemus was planted and rose for ever after (255): and after mixing with the ways/dwelling-places of Lacedaemonian men,<sup>183</sup> they settled in time (*ποτε ... χρόνω*) the island of Kallista [= Thera]; whence (*ἔνθεν*) the Son of Leto gave you [pl.] the plain of Libya to foster with the favours of the gods, and the godly city of gold-throned Cyrene to govern (260–1) as you have devised right-counselling wisdom.

Disrupting the climax of Jason's tale, this break-off resolves the tension between narrative ('epic') and praise ('lyric') in favour of praise. Jason's story is now a digression that must be abbreviated and ended. Pindar's language here (*νεῖσθαι*, 247) evokes a *nostos*. The 'cart-road'—a path of storytelling used by many<sup>184</sup>—and the 'shortcut' (*οἶμος βραχύς*) of artful abbreviation,<sup>185</sup> which only the speaker in his incomparable poetic craft can use, stand for different types of sung narrative (epic is slow and straight; praise-poetry can compress its material or flit between themes and times),<sup>186</sup> and also for different 'paths' through the topography of tradition.<sup>187</sup> The speaker addresses Arcesilas (*ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα*, 250), anchoring his closing summary in a

<sup>183</sup> On *ἦθεσιν* here, cf. Braswell (1988) 355 and Giannini (1995) 500 *ad* 257–9, with Slater (1969) and Race's Loeb translation.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. *Pae.* 7b (fr. 52h SM = C2 Rutherford), 11–12 with Rutherford (2001) 246–9.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. *O.* 9.47. *οἶμος* seems to allude to a false but living etymological connection with *οἶμη*, a rare Homeric word that seems to designate the narrative element in song (what Lord (1960) 68–98 calls a 'theme': see Hom. *Od.* 8.73ff, 481 with Hainsworth (1988) 351 and Ford (1992) 42–3, 112–13).

<sup>186</sup> Cf. e.g. *P.* 9.76–9, *P.* 10.51–4.

<sup>187</sup> See Ford (1992) 44 on what he, after Ong (1977) 224, calls the 'topical poetic' of hexameter song.

deictic *hic et nunc*.<sup>188</sup> From this point, the Cyrenaean perspective and the corresponding time of celebration (the occasional ‘here and now’) dominate.

This is rapid elliptical summary. Jason kills the snake ‘cunningly’<sup>189</sup> and abducts (with her own help) Medea, ‘the slayer of Pelias’;<sup>190</sup> the Argonauts come to Oceanus and the Red Sea, brushing past Medea’s ‘Theraean word’ before reaching Lemnos, where they participate in the games of Hypsipyle and sleep with the ‘race of husband-slaying women’. The Fleece, the original target of Jason’s mission, is replaced by Medea, who in the structure of the ode has already played a crucial role in elucidating the consequences of Euphemus’ actions at Lake Triton. This, as Köhnken comments, is a ‘remarkable change of direction’.<sup>191</sup> Pindar’s ‘shortcut’ requires a literal change of direction in the story itself. All other *Argonauticas* place the Lemnian episode on the outward voyage: Pindar, implausibly, moves it to the *nostos*,<sup>192</sup> since this alone can create a straight line from the Argonauts to Arcesilas. The ode’s narrative drive, blown off-course into epic like Odysseus’ fleet was at Cape Malea (Hom. *Od.* 9.80), is now restored in the achievement of the poet’s planned *nostos*. The entire richness of the Jason-myth is itself forcibly diverted into an *aition* for the Battiads.<sup>193</sup> The seed of their *olbos* was ‘planted’, as Medea predicted, on Lemnos. This ‘seed’, the Minyan *genos* of Euphemus (the other Argonauts go unmentioned here) came first to Sparta and then to Thera, where they received Apollo’s gift of Libya, which they (now addressed collectively as ‘you’) rule.

With narrative closure achieved, the ode has returned to its beginning, and to the plot of its *Vormythos* (the Cyrenaean colonisation-narrative), retracing the timeline from Euphemus to Battos and Arcesilas to plant itself one final time in the

---

<sup>188</sup> Felson (1999) 23–7.

<sup>189</sup> *τέχνας*, perhaps hinting at Medea’s lethal arts: see Braswell (1988), Giannini (1995) *ad loc.*

<sup>190</sup> *τῶν Πελαιοφόνων* again incorporates an event from outside the limits of the narrative.

<sup>191</sup> Köhnken (1993) 32–5.

<sup>192</sup> See Σ 447b and 448, ii: 159 Dr. *οὐκ ἀκολούθως* (Σ 447a adds that Pindar was the first to bring the Argonauts to Oceanus and the Red Sea: cf. n.000 above) with Braswell (1988) 347; Gantz (1993) 345–7. Σ 88, ii: 109–10 gives the familiar account. Pindar’s route is implausible for a voyage from Libya to Greece (Farnell (1932) 165) and also rules out Jason’s romance with Hypsipyle (mentioned already at Hom. *Il.* 7.467–71 and surely known to Pindar). Giannini (1995) 498, following an opinion of Schmidt (1980) and Rizzo-Martelli (1988–9), argues that Pindar’s version pre-existed him. Myrsilos of Lesbos (*FGrHist* 477F1) told of a visit by Medea to Lemnos on the *nostos* voyage, but the reference to her ‘jealousy’ there requires the Hypsipyle-affair. As for the vases brought into the frame by Schmidt (1980) and Rizzo-Martelli (1988–9) – these are the seventh-century Etruscan bucchero olpe Villa Giulia inv. 00825 from Cerveteri, and a late fifth-century Apulian volute krater ascribed to the Gravina Painter: Trendall-Cambitoglou *RVAp* 32, 1 (=1978–1982) i: 30–32, pl. 8, 1–2) – their interpretation is still hardly settled and their connection to Pindar’s myth is still (to my mind) unproven. For other possible reasons for the shift, see Athanassaki (1997) 232.

<sup>193</sup> Stephens (2011) 192–3.

moment of komastic celebration and praise. Now in its closing section (262–99), it embarks on yet another series of surprising thematic turns.<sup>194</sup> It is a kind of coda to the song’s main theme: the continuity of the Battiads’ line and their special relationship with Apollo. The speaker first asks Arcesilas to ‘know the wisdom of Oedipus’ (263). A story follows about a mighty oak tree which, though stripped of its boughs and ruined in its ‘splendid appearance’ (*θαητὸν εἶδος*) can, although it bears no fruit, still give an account of itself, ‘if ever it comes at last to a winter’s fire, or if, supported by upright pillars of a master,<sup>195</sup> it performs a wretched labour within others’ walls, having left its own place desolate’ (263–9). Arcesilas, he adds, is ‘a most suitable healer (*ἰατὴρ ἐπικαιρότατος*)’. ‘Paian’ (= Apollo), he says, ‘honours your saving light’ (270). He continues:

<b>tr. 12, ep. 2</b>	<i>χρῆ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλ-          λοντα τρώμαν ἔλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.          ῥάδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σειῖσαι καὶ ἀφαιροτέροις·          ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ χώρας αὖτις ἔσσαι δυσπαλῆς          δὴ γίνεται, ἐξαπίνας</i>	<b>271</b>
<b>ep. 5</b>	<i>εἰ μὴ θεὸς ἀγεμόνεσσι κυβερνατὴρ γένηται.          τινὲ δὲ τούτων ἐξυφαίνονται χάριτες.          τλᾶθι τᾶς εὐδαίμονος ἀμφὶ Κυρά-          νας θέμεν σπουδὰν ἅπασαν.</i>	<b>275</b>

One must apply a gentle hand to care for the injury of a wound; for it is easy, even for feeble men, to shake a city, but to set it back in its place is a difficult wrestling-match, unless all of a sudden the god becomes a steersman for the leaders. But for you the gifts of such things are being woven through to the end: dare to devote all your serious effort to the cause of happy Cyrene.

<sup>194</sup> On the element of false closure at 260–2: Gildersleeve (1885) 279. In what follows I have relied extensively on Carey (1980b).

<sup>195</sup> For another paraphrase of *δεσποσύναισιν*: Carey (1980b) 145.

Whatever the meaning of the oak story, this at least is reasonably transparent. Cyrene is a sick polity as well as a happy one: her king, as a healer (confident in Apollo's favour expressed in the Delphic victory) must devote himself to fixing it—not, it is implied, through authoritarian violence, but the arts of peace.<sup>196</sup> This voice of a wise counsellor finds clear parallels as a device of understated praise in Pindar's victory odes for Sicilian tyrants.<sup>197</sup> The city, meanwhile, is 'εὐδαίμων Cyrene': a realised state of collective peace and joy. The myth has already inculcated the idea that with the god's help any failure can be redeemed. Those who seek to overthrow the divinely-established order are weaker than those who fight for it.<sup>198</sup>

The next triad (277–99), though addressed to Arcesilas, is not about him. The *laudator* intercedes on behalf of Damophilus, an exile from Cyrene whose virtues and vicissitudes are implicitly connected to the city's sickness.<sup>199</sup> Pindar begins with a *gnome* ascribed to Homer ('an honest messenger brings the greatest honour to every affair'),<sup>200</sup> which he tells Arcesilas to 'understand and heed', adding that 'the Muse, too, gains with accurate reporting' (279): praise-poetry is more powerful for being a true account of the facts.<sup>201</sup> The focus shifts here to the speaker's sincerity: appropriately, considering the delicacy of the moment. Damophilus may be the king's enemy, but 'Cyrene and the most famous house of Battos' have learned to know the justice of his mind. Pindar's praise follows epinician tropes—Damophilus is 'a youth among boys, but in counsels an elder who has attained a life of a hundred years'; he hates slander and has learned to hate violent men (ὄβριζοντα μισεῖν, 284)—before identifying a set of virtues more appropriate to a courtier: he does not struggle 'against the great and good' (ἀντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, 285); he does not delay the accomplishment of anything, 'for opportunity (καιρός) in human affairs has a brief span' (286); 'he waits on it not as a slave, but as a henchman' (θεράπων δὲ οἱ, οὐ δράστας ὀπαδεῖ, 287).<sup>202</sup> In short, Damophilus is someone Arcesilas can use: a man who sticks to the social middle ground and will not challenge his authority.<sup>203</sup> To

<sup>196</sup> See Braswell (1988) 371 and Robbins (1975) 210–13.

<sup>197</sup> Giannini (1995) 109 n. 1 refers to traditions where poets advise kings.

<sup>198</sup> Carey (1980b) 146; on *phthonos*, see Morgan (2008); on Damophilus, see 48–9).

<sup>199</sup> This is the interpretation offered by the scholia, cf. Carey (1980b) 143 n. 3, 151.

<sup>200</sup> A paraphrase of Hom. *Il.* 15.207? See Braswell (1988) 378 and Carey (1980b) 147–8.

<sup>201</sup> So Braswell (1988) 379–80 and Giannini (1995) 505–6 *ad loc.*, cf. Carey (1980b) 147–8 who argues that the 'messenger' is Damophilus himself.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. Braswell (1988) 385–7 and Carey (1980b) 151.

<sup>203</sup> That the best place for a man who lacks the resources of a king or tyrant to be is somewhere 'in the middle'—neither too fortunate or unfortunate—and to keep his aspirations within those limits, is a

know what is right and be forced to abstain from it is, they say, the most painful thing of all (287–9). Damophilus, like Atlas, wrestles with the weight of the sky ‘away from his home (*πατρώας* ... *γάς*, 290) and his possessions’,<sup>204</sup> but he does not lose hope. Zeus released even the Titans from Tartaros (291);<sup>205</sup> when the wind dies, we change the sails (291–3). The exile prays that ‘having drained his accursed disease to the end, he may someday see his home’, joining the symposia at Apollo’s fountain in Cyrene.<sup>206</sup> Here, giving himself up to joy and taking up the lyre to sing among his own cultured (*σοφοί*) citizens, he will ‘attain peace’ (*ἡσυχία θιγέμεν*), harming nobody and suffering nothing from his townsmen (293–7). This musical setting for an image of concord (*hesychia*) among the élite of a city evokes powerful utopian cultural associations.<sup>207</sup> ‘Then, Arcesilas, might he tell you of the spring of ambrosial utterance he found when, recently, he was a guest (*ξενωθείς*) at Thebes’ (298–9). *Pythian* 4 ends with a *sphragis* whose real-world verbal performance is set in an indefinite future in the city’s ritual centre, in which the reintegrated exile commemorates the ode itself and the immortality it brought.<sup>208</sup> If the ode in its opening defines itself as a gift to Apollo Pythios, and weaves, in the course of its multiple but interlinked story-arcs a web of historical significance from tales that—in their constant coming-and-going between old Hellas and the wider world—all seem to come together at Delphi, its ending invokes the familiar ambience of the god’s sanctuary at Cyrene: another Apollonian *lieu de mémoire*, but one fixed in the heart of the city—the spring after which, on one account, the place was named. Arcesilas, Battos, Damophilus and Pindar’s narrative itself have all completed their successful real or metaphorical *nostoi* under the watchful, protecting eye of the archegetic god.

## 10. Problems of Contextualisation

---

recurrent sentiment in Pindar: cf. e.g. *P.* 11.52–3 and *I.* 7.39–42, and esp. *P.* 2.88–96. On Damophilus see Sigelman (2016) 134–6.

<sup>204</sup> Note how, as in the ‘Riddle of Oedipus’ (see pp.48-49 below), the simile’s tenor invades the vehicle.

<sup>205</sup> See Braswell (1988) 390–1; Gantz (1993) 46–8; and Giannini (1995) 109. While the myth to which Pindar refers is unclear, it hints at Damophilus’ guilt and Arcesilas’ magnanimity.

<sup>206</sup> See Σ 523, ii: 169 Dr. citing Call. *Hy.* 2.88.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. e.g. *P.* 8.1–2 and esp. Bacch. fr. 22+4 Maehler with Maehler (2004) 225–7.

<sup>208</sup> The *sphragis* not only identifies the ode as Pindar’s work (as always, the poet is described in the third person), but has been read (as e.g. by Σ inscr. ii: 92-3 Dr. and Σ467, ii: 163) as evidence that the ode was commissioned by Damophilus. It also establishes the song’s future survival and the *kleos* it brings. Is this an imagined re-performance of *P.* 4 itself? Felson (1999) 30–1 thinks so.

The ambiguities of the ode's last two and a half triads (lines 247–99) foreground two questions, both of which are about contextualisation. First, while the relevance of the foundation-myth is clear, how does the Argonautic myth relate to the historical circumstances in which the ode was commissioned and performed? Second, what is the coda's relevance to the rest of the poem?

Let us begin with the historical context.<sup>209</sup> Pindar's picture of a society recovering from *stasis* might be confirmed in *Pythian 5*, where Arcesilas' victory brightens his happy hearth like sunshine after a winter tempest (*χειμέριον ὄμβρον*, 10–11).<sup>210</sup> The scholia add that Arcesilas' rule was threatened by rebellion; one note explicitly mentions the *demos*. Damophilus belonged to a group of rebels who found themselves refugees after they failed to 'change the regime'.<sup>211</sup> Quoting from Didymus' citation of 'the first book of the *On Cyrene*' by Theotimus' (*FGrHist* 470 F 1 = *Σ P* 5. 34, ii: 175–76 Dr.), a historian probably of Hellenistic date (2<sup>nd</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> c. BCE?),<sup>212</sup> a scholiast to *Pythian 5* adds that Arcesilas, worried about the stability of his regime, used his successful Pythian *theōria* not only for propaganda,<sup>213</sup> but also to recruit a military force (*στρατιωτικόν*) of settlers (*ἐποίκοι*) who would settle at Euhesperides (modern Benghazi) and establish a base from which to suppress uprisings. While the Theotimus-fragment is open to the objections levelled at all such contextualising material in the Pindar-scholia, the information he gives us about Arcesilas' mission to Delphi seems sound.<sup>214</sup> The king may have been young.<sup>215</sup> His father's death and the weakness of Persia in Egypt possibly multiplied his problems,<sup>216</sup> compounded, perhaps, by absolutist tendencies of his own. His position as a hereditary monarch was almost unique, at least in comparison with the city-states

<sup>209</sup> On Cyrene's politics see Chamoux (1953); Mitchell (2000); de Vido (1998); Vannicelli (1993); Giannini (1990) and (1995); Laronde (1990a) and Hornblower (2004) 243–7.

<sup>210</sup> For a depoliticised reading of these lines, see Lefkowitz (1991) 170–1; for the scholia, see the next n. For 'calm after storm' imagery see e.g. *I.* 4.18a–19, *I.* 7.37–9 with Privitera (1982) *ad loc.*

<sup>211</sup> See *Σ* inscr. a, ii: 92–3 Dr., *Σ* 467, ii: 162–3 (*μεταστῆσαι τῆς ἀρχῆς*) and *Σ P.* 5, 12a (*στάσις γὰρ ἔνεπεσεν αὐτῷ* [sc. Ἀρκεσιλάῳ] *πρὸς τὸν δῆμον*) and c, ii: 173–4 Dr.; also Giannini (1979) 42ff, (1990) 77–8 and (1995). Wilamowitz (1922) 376 argues Damophilus' name may imply democratic sympathies.

<sup>212</sup> See Giannini (1995) 518–19 and Higbie and Horster (2007). Theotimus may have been Rhodian.

<sup>213</sup> Theotimus' text suggests a 'tour' of the major *πανηγύρεις*.

<sup>214</sup> Lefkowitz (1991) 169–90 esp. 175 and 72–88 argued influentially that scholiasts' comments are extrapolations from the text. On a possible contradiction in *Σ P.* 5.34, ii: 175–6 Dr. between Theotimus and Didymus—the former claiming the mission was first led by a certain Euphemus [!], after whose death Carrhotus with Pindar's help took credit for the victory; and Didymus ascribing the latter to Carrhotus alone—see Nicholson (2005) 46–7 and Hornblower (2004) 245–6, who argue for Theotimus' authority.

<sup>215</sup> Chamoux's (1953) 173 arguments based on Pindar's tone of address are hardly decisive.

<sup>216</sup> Mitchell (2000) 93–7.

of the Greek heartland, with the Spartan double monarchy, where the kings were largely reduced to military command, the other main example.<sup>217</sup> Despite the single reference to a democratic revolution in the scholia, his opponents may have included old aristocratic families, and perhaps even Battiads.<sup>218</sup> But Arcesilas' policy seems to have been modelled on the modern, centralised Sicilian autocracies (Acragas and Syracuse) that in 462 BCE had only just collapsed. His entry of chariot teams into the Greek crown games (Arcesilas won a second victory two years later at Olympia),<sup>219</sup> like the epinicians themselves, resembles the tyrants' propagandistic efforts,<sup>220</sup> even as his transformation of Euhesperides into a military camp recalls Hieron's dynastic 'refoundation' of Catane as 'Dorian' Aetna.<sup>221</sup> It is likely, then, that Pindar's intervention on behalf of Damophilus was a political act not unsolicited by Arcesilas himself, and connected to the king's internal safety.<sup>222</sup>

Sometime later (perhaps around 440) Arcesilas was killed and a limited democracy established at Cyrene.<sup>223</sup> This may also have led to changes in how Cyrenaeans interpreted their past.<sup>224</sup> With this hindsight, one might see Pindar's epinicians as desperate moves in the endgame of a doomed regime. Still, in our ignorance of when and how the Battiad *archē* fell, we cannot assume Arcesilas' prospects were bad when *Pythian* 4 was composed. Perhaps Damophilus' return was

<sup>217</sup> Mitchell (2000) 82–3 notes the prevalence of monarchy in 'ethnos states on the fringes of the polis societies of Greece'. This may help to explain the 'Dorian' and Spartan emphasis in *P.* 5.

<sup>218</sup> Σ 467, ii: 163–4 Dr. makes Damophilus Arcesilas' relative (*ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ* [sc. *Ἀρκεσιλάω*] *πρὸς γένους*). But the Battiadae were a *genos* rather than a royal family in the narrow sense (see n.75 above). Chamoux (1953) 195–8 notes 'tyrannical' aspects of Arcesilas' policy, and the probable 'aristocratic' character of the opposition. Cf. also Giannini (1995) 105–6, 108.

<sup>219</sup> Σ inscr. a, ii: 92 Dr.

<sup>220</sup> There is also evidence for a bronze statue-group (Paus. 10.15.6–7) erected by the Cyrenaeans at Delphi, with Battos standing in a chariot driven by Cyrene and crowned by Libya; this, however (*pace* Chamoux (1953) 199–201, followed by *LIMC* sv. 'Kyrene') is unlikely to be Arcesilas', since the active life of its creator Amphion of Knossos (Amorelli sv. in *EAA* i: 325 and Maddoli, Nafissi and Saladino (1999) 188 *ad* Paus. 3.6.5) seems to fall well after 450 BCE. There is no reason why an image of Battos could not have been erected later by 'the Cyrenaeans'. The problem is complicated by the lack of a date for the Battiads' fall (estimates vary from c. 454 to the late 440s). On the bronze head from the Apollo-sanctuary at Cyrene, supposed to be a portrait of Arcesilas IV and perhaps subjected to *damnatio memoriae* after his fall, see Fabbricotti (2003) 123–4.

<sup>221</sup> On Aetna and Gelon's similar forced 'reconstitution' of Syracuse, see Demand (1990) 47–50 and 51–52 with Hdt. 7.156, Diod. Sic. 11.72.3 (Gelon) and Diod. Sic. 11.49 (Hieron).

<sup>222</sup> See Gildersleeve (1885) 144; Wilamowitz (1922) 376–8; Carey (1980b) 148 and Braswell (1988) 5 on the ode as a planned political intervention; Duchemin (1967) 91–2 argues it was unsuccessful.

<sup>223</sup> The only sources (Chamoux (1953) 205–9; Mitchell (2000) 95–6, who dates the collapse to 'before c. 454') are the *ex-eventu* prophecy at Hdt. 4.163 (on which see Baragwanath (in this chapter) 13–16), a brief mention in Σ inscr. b, ii: 93 Dr. (the regime lasted two hundred years), and a passage from Aristotle (fr. 611, 17: p. 375 Rose) which, adding the evil portent of a white raven, says that one Battos (probably Arcesilas' son) was decapitated at Euhesperides and his head thrown into the sea.

<sup>224</sup> The topic is considered especially clearly in Giangiulio (2001) and Malkin (2003).

intended to crown his revived authoritarian government. The Damophilus-coda, at least, imposes a new element of conflict—politics in the real sense—on the slick triumphalism of the Euphemus and Battos narratives.

So much for the historical setting. Our next two questions are the argument of the coda and its connection to the myth. Why, first, does Pindar incite Arcesilas to ‘learn/recognise/take to heart the wisdom/cleverness/art of Oedipus’ (*γνώθι τὰν Οἰδίποδα σοφίαν*, 263)? Is he asking the king to learn: (a) a proverb (a concrete piece of ‘wisdom’ ascribed to the son of Laios, to which the text alludes but does not quote); (b) a moral lesson inferrable from Oedipus’ fate; or (c) is he (since the simile of the oak that follows corresponds to nothing in any extant tradition about the hero) simply pointing to the practical skill needed to solve an *ainos*: a fable with a point to be decoded?<sup>225</sup> Oedipus, after all, was famous for solving riddles, and Pindar has only just referred to the principled cunning (*ὀρθόβουλος μῆτις*, 262) of the Battiads.<sup>226</sup> The speaker thus challenges Arcesilas to use his inherited mental excellence on a story that is less a riddle than an extended simile that is all vehicle and no tenor.<sup>227</sup> With whom are we to identify the oak? The final verses of the passage, which hint at loss of status and economic independence, and the emptiness of an *οἶκος*, can apply only to the exile. The ‘oak’ is Damophilus.<sup>228</sup> If this is true, then we have found a structure very similar to Medea’s ‘Theraean word’. The lyric speaker first presents Damophilus’ riddling claim on Arcesilas: he then suggests, with greater explicitness, that Arcesilas has the power to ‘heal’ both the oak and his city.

The ‘riddle’ enacts the tension, fundamental to all epinician narrative, between symbol and referent, myth and frame. This is also reflected in the Jason myth, whose opening *hendiadys* (67–9) asserts but does not define a correlation between Arcesilas and the Argonauts. All through the myth, symbolic contiguities (metonymies) were hinted at between the story of Jason and the events at Lake Tritonis; or between Jason

---

<sup>225</sup> See, alongside the usual commentaries, the excellent discussion in Geuss (2013). The first solution (Gildersleeve (1885) 301 took the ‘riddle’ in reference to an otherwise unattested ‘parable’ uttered by the exiled Oedipus) is implausible. The second solution to the ‘riddle’ (the moral lesson), like the sphinx’, might be the person of the expounder: Arcesilas should ‘recognise’ in himself the need to repatriate Damophilus. For a fine interpretation that sets Oedipus’ exile, and the plot of Sophocles’ *OC*, in juxtaposition to Damophilus’, see Adorjányi (2015). The third is defended by Σ 467, ii: 162–3 Dr., Braswell (1988) 361–2 and Giannini (1995) 108, as well as many others. Trees can symbolise rootedness, genealogical ties, honours and tradition: all elements important to Pindar’s argument.

<sup>226</sup> Herodotus’ catalogue of Battiad misfortunes might lead us to think differently.

<sup>227</sup> Carey (1980b) 144–5 (on *mētis*) and 145–6 (comparison of Pindar’s *ainos* with Homeric similes).

<sup>228</sup> See Σ 468ab, ii: 163 Dr. and Carey (1980b) 143–6, who emphasises the ‘deliberate ambiguity’ of the riddle-anecdote.

himself and Arcesilas; or Jason's quest and the ode itself as 'journeys'. Precise correlations between the characters of the myth and the real-world people mentioned in the coda have been sought, but none have been found, despite numerous partial similarities.<sup>229</sup> Both the myth (particularly the long scenes between Jason and Pelias) and the coda present variations on the theme of autocracy in crisis.<sup>230</sup> Compromise and civility are needed if the social fabric (in Arcesilas' case, the city; in Jason's the still more exemplary unit of the royal *oikos*) is to survive. Jason and Arcesilas are 'healers'<sup>231</sup> and 'kings':<sup>232</sup> they share traits of courtesy, restraint and willingness to compromise; both also rely on the gods.<sup>233</sup> But any identification of Arcesilas with Jason is undercut by the fact that he is a reigning monarch and thus naturally aligned with Pelias, while Damophilus is the exile.<sup>234</sup> Nor did the conflict of Jason and Pelias end well.<sup>235</sup> Their myth thus stands in an open exemplary relation to Cyrene.<sup>236</sup> One possible reading (in tune with the speaker's persona as 'wise adviser') might say: 'you, my king, must avoid the paranoid crimes of Pelias and realise Jason's conciliatory policy (hopefully, of course, to more salubrious ends)'.<sup>237</sup> A Cyrenaean audience, with its contextual knowledge, may have noticed other possibilities.<sup>238</sup>

This openness of reference is essential to the exemplary function of Pindaric myths within their respective odes. Almost all these myths illustrate certain moral concepts: the interdependency of heroic action, fame, and poetic speech; the destiny or inherited excellence of the *laudandus* or his family or wider community; or the ideals society or its competitor-class hold dear. These links, and the mirroring effects they create, remain, however, unstable and partial. Pindar's use of the Argonaut *mythos* is not allegorical in the sense of a narrative whose every element points to something fixed outside it—a discourse, a moral code, a person or another story.

<sup>229</sup> See e.g. Robbins (1975) 207ff; Carey (1980b) 144–5.

<sup>230</sup> On Herodotus and the inherent weakness of autocracies, see Baragwanath (in this volume) 15–16.

<sup>231</sup> Not least in Arcesilas' identification (270) as an *ιατήρ επικαιρότατος* (see Σ 211a, ii: 127 Dr., which argues that Chiron named Jason after his own medical skill, *παρὸ ἱατρὸς ἦν [Ἰάσων]*). As Braswell (1988) 370–2 notes, the etymology can only be false, but it is fundamental. Cf. also Segal (1986) 18–19 and Nicholson (2000) 197–8; and Sigelman (2016) 128–9, 132 n. 37. For name-etymologies in early song: Braswell (1988) 254.

<sup>232</sup> Nicholson (2000) 197–8. On the pacific, un-epic qualities of Pindar's Jason: Carey (1980b) 146.

<sup>233</sup> Carey (1980b) 147 (citing ll. 272–4, esp. *κυβερνατήρ*).

<sup>234</sup> Hurst (1983) 166 n. 17.

<sup>235</sup> Gildersleeve (1885) 301–2; Robbins (1975) 207. Carey (1980b) 149–50 does not press the potential negative associations of Pelias and his fate for Arcesilas.

<sup>236</sup> Chamoux (1953) 190; Robbins (1975) 208–9; Carey (1980b) 144 n. 9.

<sup>237</sup> Cf. Carey (1980b) 151.

<sup>238</sup> Carey (1980b) 144. On possible self-referential overtones in the oak-passage: Felson (1999) 27–31.

There are no unmistakable correspondences here between frame and myth, but the verbal, formal and thematic repetitions, analogies or echoes they generate force us to reflect on the relation of the ‘parts’ to one another and the whole, within the wider dialogue of two genres (epic and lyric epinician) each of which understands itself as a vehicle of immortal memory (*kleos*).

### 11. Conclusions: The Political Meaning of a Poetic Form

Contemporary Pindaric criticism, saturated perhaps more than at any other time in the history of the field with historicist readings and premisses, is exploring these connections between text and historical reality, sometimes badly and sometimes well.<sup>239</sup> The general lack in Pindar’s epinician myths of strict correspondences between myth and frame means that, when we look for politics in Pindar, we should not look primarily for reflections or allegories of historical situations and events. By establishing a narrative structure that integrates present and past in a particular way, the epinician creates an *emplotment*—a meaningful structure of causality, process, closure and, yes, morality that underlies the story’s raw events and is reflected less in anything explicitly said than implied in the form.<sup>240</sup> In the words of Hayden White, ‘just as there can be no explanation in history without a story, so too there can be no story without a plot to make of it a story of a particular kind’.<sup>241</sup> *Pythian* 4 presents the past of Cyrene through the hegemonic interpretation of the ruling family: a discourse focused above all on ideas of continuity, stability, legitimacy and success. Transforming praise of an individual’s success into aetiology, it envisions the city as an ‘imaginary community’ founded in common origins and a shared destiny.<sup>242</sup> The most powerful tool at the poet’s disposal—bequeathed to him by the collective memories of the cultures, polities, and families for whom he worked—was the political resonance of mythical narrative, with its special power to articulate an ideologically-charged vision of things. Discourses of origins, in a society like

---

<sup>239</sup> Morgan (2015) is to my mind one of the best recent examples.

<sup>240</sup> On narrativization as a feature of any historical explanation, see Danto (1965); the notion of ‘explanation by emplotment’ (‘providing the “meaning” of a story by identifying the *kind of story* that has been told’) as fundamental to much historical narrative and the ideas of explanation and historical development that it enacts, was articulated by Hayden White—see (1973) 5–11 and 7 for the cited passage cited in this note—also (1978) 51–80, 81–100, and (1980) on closure, morality and meaning, and (1987) on tropes; on the connection between endings (closure) and meaning in literature and life, see Kermode (2000).

<sup>241</sup> White (1978) 62.

<sup>242</sup> On ‘imaginary communities’, see Anderson (1991); cf. Agócs (2009) 47.

Pindar's, take on a particular authority and power—even in the contestation of historical truth.<sup>243</sup> This ode shows us a Pindar who was, among other things, a consummate master-craftsman of ideological myth and social memory.

*Pythian* 4 both inherits from collective memory and strives to shape it. In this sense, it is different from Herodotean *logos*, which is mainly concerned with recording, comparing, interpreting and establishing the truth (or at least a plausible construction of the past) in all its complexity. In its use of emplotment to rationalise and conquer historical contingency, and to stabilise a sense of political reality sanctioned by tradition and endorsed by power, Pindar's epinician betrays clear affinities to more familiar forms of Greek memory-politics and 'intentional history'.<sup>244</sup> In fact, it presents us with a poet who, if not engaged in the historiographer's interrogation of causes, has at least, as a historical thinker, something to tell us about the ways in which he and his contemporaries used and understood their collective past.

Our analysis began by arguing that the myth, far from a digression, is in fact the essential feature of the ode. Epinician works by relating individual *kleos* to collective experience and history: the transitions from frame or 'occasion' to myth and back from myth to 'occasion' are thus particularly important and fraught. We saw that the epinician's form resembled certain typical features, claims and forms of thought that characterised the oral (including poetic) traditions on which Pindar, like Herodotus, based his narratives. We also saw that it manipulates those structures and claims to produce certain artistic effects which are themselves implied ideological statements. Through use of space and genealogy Pindar projects what at first glance seems to be essentially a 'local' Cyrenaean story into a Panhellenic field of poetic and other tradition, anchoring both the people and their myth of origins in a wider Greek past.<sup>245</sup> Neither Herodotus nor Pindar give us anything like a truly epichoric Cyrenaean tradition: rather, the epichoric and the Panhellenic are inextricably mixed on the level both of motifs and individual details. Pindar's version of the colonisation-story, even more than Herodotus', focuses on the settlers—it is a Greek story, and there is no room in it for the native Libyans. Even if it creates a charter for the

---

<sup>243</sup> See Baragwanath (in this chapter) 2 n. 8. [Do you need this cross-reference?]

<sup>244</sup> See Grethlein (2010) esp. 19–46; 'intentional history' see n. 14 above.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Baragwanath (in this volume) 7 on Herodotus; on the possibility that Herodotus saw Cyrene as a quasi-orientalised 'other', see p. 8.

Cyrenaeans' possession of the soil, the connections and relationships that it enables pertain exclusively to Greek societies overseas.<sup>246</sup> In this sense, too, *Pythian* 4 is a Panhellenic poem. But it is also rigorously concise in its attitude to its source-traditions. Variants are eliminated, discontinuities rejected, and at least once—the case of Jason's sojourn on Lemnos—the usual order of events is changed to heighten the poem's *post hoc ergo propter hoc* sense of continuity and causation.<sup>247</sup>

Comparing Pindar's account of the Cyrene *ktisis* with Herodotus' not only enables us to perceive significant similarities and differences, and to understand the particular constraints and pressures that helped to structure the poet's response to his material; but also, more generally, to appreciate the importance of contextualisation for understanding these stories. The differences between Pindar's account and Herodotus' are often explained in terms of a shift, with the fall of the monarchical regime, from a 'pro-Battiad' to an 'anti-Battiad' interpretation of the *ktisis* story. While some such effect is perhaps possible, especially in the immediate aftermath of Cyrene's democratic turn, we have shown that it is probably not a major theme, and that there is no compelling reason to interpret the evidence in this way. The differences in the use of certain motifs and themes shared between Pindar and Herodotus' sources can be accounted for entirely by the use, in each particular myth-variant, to which the traditional stories were put. The two differing treatments of the events at Lake Triton provide an especially rich field in which to study the effect of context on the narrative meaning and form of social memory traditions.<sup>248</sup> Where Herodotus' version emphasises an open-ended territorial charter, Pindar's is about revealing the power of origins as they manifest themselves in the present. Herodotus' synthesis, in his colonisation account, of two different, supposedly 'local' variants shares several story-elements and motifs with Pindar's two victory odes; he also narrates variants of stories familiar from Pindar—without once referring to the Theban poet's work.<sup>249</sup> Here too, however, the aims and emplotment of the narrative are different. Pindar's narrative construction of Cyrene's collective past, realised in a

---

<sup>246</sup> On the Libyan element in Cyrene's culture, see esp. Laronde (1987) and (1990b) and Austin (2008) 205–10. Baragwanath's discussion here (esp. 22-26 and 27-28) brings out the ethnographic richness of Herodotus' *logos*.

<sup>247</sup> See p. 43 above on Pindar's transposition of the Lemnian episode from the outward to the return voyage.

<sup>248</sup> See above: 24-33 above. I thank Jess Lightfoot for help with formulating this thought.

<sup>249</sup> West (2007a) 127–8 has argued the opposite. Herodotus (Baragwanath (in this volume) 15-16) shares with Pindar an interest in prophecy and human ignorance.

poetic form that, in its discontinuities, anachronies and poetic allusivity differs radically from the style of Herodotean *logos*, finds paradigmatic symmetries and structures of causation in its source-material to which the Herodotean narrator or his Theraean and Cyrenaean sources remain (perhaps wilfully) blind. It is above all Pindar's integration of the story into a larger (and largely implied) explanatory frame that allowed him to create his own unique Battiad perspective on Cyrenaean tradition.

Much epinician strives to establish exemplary parallels between the past and the present, asserting the continuity of institutions and bloodlines. *Pythian 4*, however, in its teleology, its complex structure composed of distinct but connected temporal strata belonging to the same implied narrative, its use of spatial geography (particularly the twin *lieux de mémoire* of Apollo's temples at Delphi and Cyrene), and in the emphasis it places on those inadvertent, ironical patterns of signification associated particularly with prophecy that it shares (like the *felix culpa* motif in which misfortune and failure is crowned by eventual success) with many Greek 'colonisation' traditions, but which it highlights to excess at almost every point in the narrative, deviates from certain other Pindaric myths in the tight connection it establishes between narrative form and meaning. In Pindar, prophecy, as a plot-element in myths, normally allows the narrator to integrate the future destiny of a hero, or to present an aetiology for some present institution. But in *Pythian 4*, prophecy and history are revealed to be two ways of looking at the same events.<sup>250</sup> Through its use of multiple, overlapping voices and temporal perspectives, the ode welds a series of separate stories into a single account, presenting the resulting story once as prophecy (13–56) and again (1–11; 57–67; 247–62) as historical fact unquestioned in its continuity with (and causal ties to) the present day. In this way, and by *ostinato*-repetition of a few key themes—the notion of 'bringing home' or 'reclaiming' something lost (*κομίζειν/ἀνακομίζειν*); the 'nostos loop' structure; the themes of prophecy, kingship, the conquest or 'planting' of the land—*Pythian 4* creates a hegemonic discourse that construes the relationship of 'past' to 'present' as a single unified intention. From the human viewpoint, the divine plan unfolds in time as a chain of unintended effects whose pattern, invisible to the historical actors themselves, is evident only to an observer positioned at the end of the story, who is

---

<sup>250</sup> Cf. Athanassaki (1997) 232: 'a nontraditional and unique story'.

able to relate it to the *telos* embodied in the society he praises.<sup>251</sup> Whatever the human actors hope to achieve, it is the divine plan that will be fulfilled.<sup>252</sup>

Pindar's achievement in *Pythian* 4 is unique in the corpus of his poetry; nor can I find any real parallels in earlier Greek song. In its insistence on a rational yet elusive meaning that underlies events, his narrative of Euphemus, Battos and Arcesilas resembles most of all a typological interpretation of history. Typology is a concept familiar from Christian biblical exegesis, where an Old Testament person or event is treated as a prefiguration of something in the New, which as its 'antitype' both overwrites the model (the 'type' or 'figure') and preserves it with altered meaning. Isaac and Moses thus each become types of Christ as teacher and as sacrificial lamb of God; Jonah's three days in the belly of the whale become a type of Christ's three days in the tomb. In typological interpretation, the historical distance between events is neutralised by a higher symbolic relevance, motivic parallel or structural regularity revealed through interpretation.<sup>253</sup> In a broader and less theological sense, the term 'typology' might be applied to any reading of history in which the *telos*, since it determines the meaning of the rest, completes and overwrites the events that—from the hegemonic perspective of the end—serve as its prefigurations; in such a sense, it can be applied to any similar understanding of the structural relationships between parts of a work, or a work and its tradition. Nothing like formalised typological exegesis existed in Pindar's culture; it nevertheless shows a certain structural similarity to what he is doing. In Pindar's redemptive emplotment of the city's colonisation tradition, the gift of the clod at Lake Triton prefigures Battos' colonisation of Cyrene, which in turn carries within it the prospect of Arcesilas' rule over a flourishing kingdom. Just so, Medea's 'Theraean word' prefigures the Pythia's nomination of Battos, which itself prefigures the poet's praise of the Founder's descendant. That present voice, by integrating the past into a ruthlessly present-orientated narrative, explains and celebrates its revealed meaning. Understanding this focus on the end throws a metapoetic light on the ode's formal games ('false closure' and 'counterfactual storytelling'; 'song as quest', with its

---

<sup>251</sup> See esp. Segal (1986) 51, 152, 180–93 (whose analysis inspired the present one).

<sup>252</sup> Stephens (2011) 191 suggests a similar intention in relation to Damophilus' return: 'Arcesilas can comply or obstruct, but in the latter case can only delay its inevitability'.

<sup>253</sup> On typology: Auerbach (1959) esp. 28–49 (on the difference between typology and allegory, p. 54), Gransden (1973–1974) 19–22, Miner (1977), Kermode (1979), Young (1997) 152–4, Kennedy (1997) (esp. 49–50), Mohnhaupt (2000) 13–36, Hall (2002). Cf. also Grethlein (2010) 40, on the formal structure of *O.* 2.

concomitant theme of divagation and ‘return’; wild oscillations between genres marked by changes in the narrative form; and, finally, that constant hovering, particularly evident in the Jason-narrative and ‘coda’, on the edge of a certain meaningful pattern of identifications which remains just out of reach), as if the poem itself were struggling under the burden of a conflict between its own deterministic pattern and the human freedom to act and fail.

The closest ancient parallel, I think, is Vergil’s *Aeneid*; not least in the scene where Aeneas, as he examines the divine shield crafted for him by Hephaestus,

*miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet  
attolens umero famamque et fata nepotum.*<sup>254</sup>

One of that epic’s most remarkable features is the line of prophecy developed on both the divine and human levels of the narrative, which relates the epic plot and the characters’ actions and words to a future located in the narrator’s present. Horsfall has shown how the *Aeneid* exploits the tropes of Greek foundation-traditions (examining such myths, and comparing them to Vergil, to determine whether such a thing as ‘colonial time’ existed in the Greek mythical tradition would be a fruitful endeavour).<sup>255</sup> It shares with *Pythian* 4 the ironic clash of perspectives, backward- and forward-looking perspectives, and also an underlying sense of history as suffering and failure overwritten by divinely-assured success. ‘The past carries with it a temporal index by which it is referred to redemption’;<sup>256</sup> but in each case the eschatological moment has already happened, and the meaning-giving endpoint coincides with the narrator’s present. Vergil explores the ideological and moral implications of typology more richly and objectively than Pindar, since his understanding of the individual’s place in history takes full account of human suffering, and what is lost when the present must wade through the blood of innocent and guilty alike to build the promised future. But as Auden said famously in ‘Secondary Epic’, typological history (‘hindsight as foresight’) has an essential weakness. It tends to freeze time at the fulfillment of the prophecy. Rather than being thrown forward into a future still just

---

<sup>254</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 8. 730–1: Aeneas ‘is filled with wonder, and – though ignorant – rejoices in the image, lifting on to his shoulder the glory and destined deeds of his progeny in days to come’. Although extensive addressed in older German scholarship (e.g. Knauer (1964) 345–59; von Albrecht (1967) 157–62), ‘typology’ in the *Aeneid* received less attention from scholars in English: see however Thompson (1970), Gransden (1973-1974) and (1976); Horsfall (1976), (1989), (1991) and (1995) 162–7, and Franke (2005). Griffin’s (1982) invective doesn’t seem to me to disqualify the idea, but only some of its absurder uses.

<sup>255</sup> Horsfall (1989).

<sup>256</sup> Benjamin (1968) 254.

out of view, and thus immune to demystification, the apocalyptic moment sticks rigidly in the present.<sup>257</sup> Such constructions rarely survive for long, for they cannot adapt to social change. So it happened in Cyrene, where the monarchy's fall falsified Pindar's ideological fabrications, reducing his odes to the status of literary texts. Despite their Panhellenic reach, entextualised longevity and jubilant virtuosity of style, *Pythians* 4 and 5 hardly influenced the collective memory of Cyrene itself.

#### APPENDIX: An Outline of Pindar, *Pythian* 4

LINE(S)	SECTION/THEME/TOPIC	COMMENT
1–11	<b><u>Opening section</u></b>	11 verses, 3.6% of the total length.
1–3	<u>Proem</u> : address to the Muse	<b>PRAISE/OCCASION.</b> Setting: <i>komos</i> at Cyrene; speaker: the <i>laudator</i> ; Arcesilas present.
4–11	Movement into narrative	<b>NARRATIVE.</b> From line 4, the speaker moves ('present>'past') back in time (retrograde narration), first to 'Battos at Delphi'; then to Medea's 'Theraean word' (vv. 4–11). <i>Laudator</i> becomes narrator. Opening of first myth ( <i>Vormythos</i> ).
11–57	<b><u>First myth (<i>Vormythos</i>)</u></b>	<b>NARRATIVE:</b> direct character-speech: 46 verses: 15.38% of total length.
11	Speech-formula	<i>εἶπε δ' οὐτως</i> introduces Medea's speech
12–56	Medea's 'Theran word'	12–20: Introductory prophecy 20–37: Euphemus and the clod (Lake Triton): 20–5: tableau vivant

<sup>257</sup> See Kermode (2000), esp. ch. 1.

		25–7: retrograde narration
		28–37: progressive narration
		8–56: Loss of clod; prophecy (counterfactual and real).
<b>57–69</b>	<b><u>Praise of Battos and Arcesilas</u></b>	<b>PRAISE/OCCASION.</b> <i>Laudator</i> takes over. <b>13</b> verses: 4.3% of total length. Break-off (‘past’>‘present’). ‘Battos at Delphi’: Address to Battos. Connection between origins and present; praise of Arcesilas; Arcesilas and Jason.
<b>70–246</b>	<b><u>Second (epic) myth: Jason</u></b>	<b>NARRATIVE</b> (in three movements: <b>see below</b> ). 176 verses: 59% of total length.
70–1	Epic invocation	Beginning of Jason-narrative (‘present’>‘past’)
<b>71–167</b>	<b>Part I: ‘pure’ epic narrative (balance of summary and scene). <b>95</b> verses: <b>31.77%</b> of total length. c. <b>58</b> verses of character-speech = <b>61%</b> character-speech vs. <b>39%</b> narrator-speech (description/summary/speech-formulae).</b>	
71–86	Epic narrative	Narrator-speech. Pelias’ prophecy (summary: back-story); Jason’s arrival in Iolcus (description; scene).
87–92	Character-speech (scene)	Response of unnamed people in the marketplace to Jason’s appearance.
93–8	Epic narrative (scene)	Pelias arrives (narrator-speech)
98–100	Character-speech (scene)	Pelias addresses Jason (note speech-formulae).
101–19	Character-speech (scene)	Jason responds to Pelias (note speech-formulae).

120–38	Epic narrative (summary)	Jason meets his father Aeson; his relatives come to support him; Jason and his friends go to confront Pelias; Jason addresses Pelias (note the speech-formula).
138–55	Character-speech (scene)	Jason speaks to Pelias.
156–67	Character-speech (scene)	Pelias addresses Jason (note speech-formulae).
<b>168–211</b>	<b>Part II: ‘attenuated’ epic narrative mode (summary dominates; catalogue; all narrator-speech). 43 verses: 14.38% of total length.</b>	
168–71	Narrator-speech (summary)	Jason sends messengers to call together the Argonauts.
171–87	Catalogue of Argonauts	A formal epic-style catalogue.
187–201	Departure of Argo (scene)	Jason musters the men, Mopsus prophesies; Jason sacrifices; Zeus’ thunderbolt; <i>Argo</i> sails.
202–11	Voyage of Argo (extremely rapid summary with ellipsis)	
<b>211–46</b>	<b>Part III: ‘lyric’ narrative with epic elements (character-speech; focalisation; simile: all narrator-speech except where noted). 35 verses: 11.7% of total length (3 verses of character-speech at 229-231).</b>	
211–13	Argo arrives at Colchis	Fight with Colchians (summary)
213–23	Jason and Medea	Lyric narrative
224–38	Jason’s trial of the bulls	Lyric narrative. Note character speech at 229–31 (Aietes); note focalisation at 237–8 (Aietes).
239–41	Jason’s epinician <i>komos</i>	
241–6	Jason is about to steal the Fleece	Note the simile (245–6).
<b>247–99</b>	<b><u>Return; coda; final movement</u></b>	<b>PRAISE/OCCASION.</b> Spoken by the <i>laudator</i> . 52 verses: 17.3% of total length.

247–62	Break-off/Return	Rapid summary; rapid movement back (‘past’>‘present’) up the timeline past Battos to Arcesilas; address to Arcesilas (250).
263–9	‘Riddle of Oedipus’	
270–6	Situation at Cyrene	<i>Laudator</i> addresses Arcesilas.
277–99	Damophilus	<i>Laudator</i> addresses Arcesilas (ends on imagined ‘future’ celebration at the Kyra-spring: 293–9)

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorjáni, Zs. (2015) ‘Oidipus bölcsessége. Pindaros P. 4. 263–269’, *Antik Tanulmányok* 59 (2): 231–6.
- Ager, S. L. (2008) ‘Rescuing Local History: Epigraphy and the Island of Thera’, in C. R. Cooper, ed., *Epigraphy and the Greek Historian*, *Phoenix* supplement, 47: 150–76.
- Agócs, P. (2009) ‘Memory and Forgetting in Pindar’s Seventh *Isthmian*’, in L. Doležalová, ed., *Strategies of Remembrance from Pindar to Hölderlin* (Newcastle) 33–91.
- Agócs, P. (2012) ‘Performance and Genre: Reading Pindar’s *Komoi*’, in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, edd., *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge): 191–23.
- von Albrecht, M. (1967) ‘Vergils Geschichtsauffassung in der Heldenschau’’, *Wiener Studien* 80: 156–82.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London).
- Assmann, J. (2011) *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge).
- Athanassaki L. (1997) *Οι Κυρηναϊκοί θρύλοι στη μυθολογική πρόταση του Πινδάρου*, in *Acta: First Panhellenic and International Conference of Ancient Greek Literature (23-26 May 1994)* (Athens): 199-234 (English resumé: 231–3).
- Athanassaki, L. (2003) ‘Transformations of Colonial Disruption into Narrative Continuity’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101: 93–128.

- Athanassaki, L. (2009) 'Apollo and his Oracle in Pindar's Epinicians: Poetic Representations, Politics and Ideology', in L. Athanassaki, R. Martin and J. F. Miller, ed., *Apolline Politics and Poetics* (Athens): 405–72.
- Auerbach, E. (1959) "Figura", in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature: Six Essays* (New York): 11-76.
- Austin, M. (2004) 'From Syria to the Pillars of Herakles', in Hansen and Nielsen (2004): 1233–49.
- Austin, M. (2008) 'The Greeks in Libya', in G. R. Tsetschladze, ed., *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, vol. 2, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 193/2 (Leiden): 187–18.
- Baragwanath, E. (2008) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford).
- Benjamin, W. (1968) *Illuminations* (New York).
- Bertelli, L. (2001) 'Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 67–94.
- Boardman, J. (1966) 'Evidence for the Dating of Greek Settlements in Cyrenaica', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63: 149–56.
- Boardman, J. (1968) 'Bronze Age Greece and Libya', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 63: 41–4.
- Boardman, J. (1994) 'Settlement for Trade and Land in North Africa: Problems of Identity', in G. R. Tsetschladze and F. de Angelis, ed., *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation: Essays Dedicated to Sir John Boardman* (Oxford): 137–49.
- Boardman, J. (1999) *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade* (London).
- Braccesi, L. (1987) 'Antenoridi, Veneti e Libyi', *Quaderni di archeologia della Libya* 11: 7–14.
- Braswell, B. K. (1988) *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin).
- Brillante, C. (1989) 'Gli Antenoridi a Cirene nella Pitica V di Pindaro', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* n.s. 33.3: 7–16.
- Bundy, E.J. (1986). *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley).
- Burkert, W. (1995) 'Lydia Between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, ed., *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily T. Vermeule* (Austin): 139–48.
- Burnett, A. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford).

- Calame, C. (1990) 'Narrating the Foundation of a City: The Symbolic Birth of Cyrene', in L. Edmunds, ed., *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore) 277–341.
- Calame, C. (1996) *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY).
- Calame, C. (2003) *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony* (Princeton).
- Carey, C. (1980a) 'Three Myths in Pindar: N.4, O.9, N.3', *Eranos* 78: 143–62.
- Carey, C. (1980b) 'The Epilogue of Pindar's Fourth Pythian', *Maia* 32: 143–52.
- Chamoux, F. (1949) 'Les Antenorides et Cyrene', in *Mélanges d'archaeologie et d'histoire offerts à Charles Picard à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire* (Paris): 154–61.
- Chamoux, F. (1953) *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris).
- Cobet, J. (2002) 'The Organization of Time in the *Histories*', in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong and H. van Wees, ed., *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden): 387–412.
- Colvin, S. (2007) *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koiné* (Oxford).
- Condilo, C. (2017) 'Agonistic Intertextuality: Herodotus' Engagement with Hecataeus on Genealogies', *Journal of Ancient History* 5.2: 228–79.
- Conte, G.B. (1992) 'Proems in the Middle', *Yale Classical Studies* (1992): 147–59 (reprinted in a different translation in *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*. Oxford 2007: 219–31).
- Corcella, A. (2007) 'Book IV', in D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, ed., *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford): 545–721.
- Currie, B. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).
- Currie, B. (2012), 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in I. J. F. de Jong, *Space in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* vol. III, *Mnemosyne* Supplement no. 339 (Leiden-Boston): 285–303.
- Currie, B. (2013) 'The Pindaric First Person in Flux', *Classical Antiquity* 32/2: 243–82.
- D' Alessio, G. B. (1994) 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 39/1: 117–39.
- D' Alessio, G. B. (2005a) 'The *Megalai Ehoiai*: A Survey of the Fragments', in R. L. Hunter, ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge): 176–216.

- D' Alessio, G. B. (2005b) 'Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry', in R. L. Hunter, ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge): 217–38.
- Danto, A. C. (1965) *Analytical Philosophy of History* (Cambridge).
- De Vido, S. (1998) 'Regalità e aristocrazia a Cirene', *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 132: 3–44.
- Defradas, J. (1952) 'Le culte des Antenorides à Cyrene', *Revue des Études Grecques* 65: 289–301.
- Demand, N. (1990) *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece: Flight and Consolidation* (Bristol).
- Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek Particles* (Oxford).
- Dougherty, C. (1993) *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (Oxford).
- Drachmann, A. B. (1910) *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. vol. II *Scholia in Pythionicas* (Leipzig) [abbr. Dr.].
- Duchemin, J. (1967) *Pindare. Pythiques (III, IX, IV, V)*. Édition, introduction et commentaire (Paris).
- Eckerman, C. (2010) 'The κῶμος of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration', *CQ* 60/2: 302–12.
- Eckerman, C. (2014) 'Pindar's Delphi', in K. Gilhuly and N. Worman, edd., *Space, Place and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (Cambridge): 21–62.
- Fabbricotti, E. (2003) 'Appunti sulla storia di Cirene', in *Storiografia e regalità nel mondo greco. Colloquio interdisciplinare Cattedre di Storia della Storiografia Greca, Chieti, 17-18 gennaio 2002* (Alessandria, Edizioni dell' Orso): 121–5.
- Faraone, C. A. (1993) 'The Wheel, the Whip and other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar, *Pythian* 4.213–19', *CJ* 89: 1–19.
- Faraone, C. A. (1999) *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, MA).
- Farnell, L. R. (1932) *The Works of Pindar* (London).
- Felson, N. (1999) 'Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian* Four', *HSCP* 99: 1–31.
- Fentress, J. and C. Wickham (1992) *Social Memory* (Oxford).
- Ford, A. (1992) *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY).

- Foxall, L., N. Luraghi and H-J. Gehrke, edd. (2010) *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart).
- Fragoulaki, M. (forthcoming) 'The Mytho-political Map of Spartan Colonial Activity in Thucydides', in P. Debnar and A. Powell (eds.) *Thucydides and Sparta* (Wales).
- Franke, W. (2005) 'Virgil, History and Philosophy', *Philosophy and Literature* 29/1: 73–88.
- Fuhrer, T. (1988) 'A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus', *AJP* 109.1 (Spring 1988): 53–68.
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore).
- Gehrke, H-J. (1994) 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik: antik und modern'. *Saeculum* 95: 239–64.
- Gehrke, H-J. (2001) 'Myth, History and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 286–313.
- Genette, G. (1980) *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. (Ithaca, NY) [Orig. French edn. *Discours du récit*. Editions du Seuil (1972)].
- Genette, G. (1988) *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. (Ithaca, NY).
- Gentili, B. (1988) *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore).
- Gercke, A. (1906) 'Die Myrmidonen in Kyrene', *Hermes* 41/3: 447–59.
- Geuss, R. (2013) 'The Wisdom of Oidipous and the Idea of a Moral Cosmos', *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, 20/3: 59–89.
- Giangiulio, M. (1981) 'Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione: Batto, Miscello e l'oracolo delfico', *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa. Classe di lettere e filosofia (ASNP<sup>3</sup>)* 11: 1-24 (reprinted in Giangiulio 2010 below: 45–62).
- Giangiulio, M. (2001) 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History: The Case of Cyrene', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 116–37.
- Giangiulio, M. (2010) *Memorie coloniali, Hesperia* 27 (Rome).
- Giannini, P. (1979) 'Interpretazione della *Pitica* 4 di Pindaro', *QUCC* n.s. 2 (31): 35–63.
- Giannini, P. (1990) 'Cirene nella poesia greca: tra mito e storia', in B. Gentili, ed. *Cirene. Storia, mito, letteratura. Atti del convegno della S.I.S.A.C. (Urbino 3 luglio 1988)* (Urbino): 51–95.

- Giannini, P. (1995) 'Pitica IV' and 'Pitica V', in B. Gentili, P. A. Bernardini, E. Cingano and P. Giannini, ed., *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* (Milan): 103-157 (introduction and text) and 426-510 (commentary) for *P.* 4; 159-181 (introduction and text) and 511-40 (commentary) for *P.* 5.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (1885) *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London).
- Gill, D. H. (2006) 'Early Colonization at Euhesperides', in G. Bradley and J-P. Wilson, ed., *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea): 1-23.
- Giovannini, A. (1995) 'La guerre de Troie entre mythe et histoire', *Ktema* 20: 139-76.
- Gomme, A. W. (1945) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* vol. I (Oxford).
- Gottesman, A. (2010) 'The Beggar and the Clod: The Mythic Notion of Property in Ancient Greece', *TAPA* 140. 2: 287-322.
- Gould, J. (1989) *Herodotus* (London).
- Gransden, K. W. (1973-1974) 'Typology, Symbolism and Allegory in the *Aeneid*', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*: 14-27.
- Gransden, K. W. (1976) *Virgil, Aeneid Book VIII* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein, J. (2010) *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge).
- Grethlein, J. and C. B. Krebs, ed., (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the 'plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge).
- Griffin, J. (1982) 'The Creation of Characters in the *Aeneid*', in B. K. Gold, ed., *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin): 118-34.
- Hainsworth, B. (with S. West and A. Heubeck) (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, I-VIII* (Oxford).
- Halbwachs, M. (1925) *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris).
- Halbwachs, M. (1941) *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte. Étude de mémoire collective* (Paris).
- Halbwachs, M. (1950) *La mémoire collective* (Paris).
- Hall, S. G. (2002) *Typologie, Theologische Realencyclopädie* 34: 208-24.
- Hansen, M. H. and T. H. Nielsen (2004) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis. An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation* (Oxford).

- Hansen, P. A. (1983) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. Texte und Kommentare* 12 (Berlin) [abbr. CEG].
- Harvey, A. E. (1955) 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *CQ* n.s. 5: 157–75.
- Heath, M. (1988) 'Receiving the Komos: The Context and Performance of the Epinician', *American Journal of Philology* 109: 180–95.
- Higbie, Carolyn and Horster, Marietta (2007), 'Theotimos, On Cyrene, Against Aielouros (470)', in: *Brill's New Jacoby*, General Editor: Ian Worthington. Consulted online on 30 May 2018 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363\\_bnj\\_a470](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a470). First published online: 2016.
- Hirschberger, M. (2004) *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai: ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* vol. 198. (Berlin).
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, edd. (2006) *Erinnerungsorte der Antike. Die Römische Welt* (Munich).
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, edd. (2010) *Erinnerungsorte der Antike. Die Griechische Welt* (Munich).
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp (2011) 'Erinnerungsorte (in) der Antike – Programm eines Projektes', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 62.1/2 (2011): 37–49.
- Hornblower, S. (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides*. vol. I. (Oxford)
- Hornblower, S. (2004) *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (2011) *Thucydidean Themes* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (2013) *Herodotus, Histories Book V. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics* (Cambridge).
- Hornblower, S. (2015) *Lykophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary and Introduction* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. and C. Morgan, edd. (2007) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals: from Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford).
- Horsfall, N. (1976) 'Virgil, History, and the Roman Tradition', *Prudentia* VIII: 73–89.
- Horsfall, N. (1989) 'Aeneas the Colonist', *Vergilius* XXXV: 8–27.
- Horsfall N. (1991) 'Virgil and the Poetry of Explanations', *G&R* XXXVIII: 203–11.

- Horsfall, N. ed. (1995) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Mnemosyne Supplement no. 151 (Leiden).
- Hunter, R. L. (1993) *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. Literary Studies* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R. L. (2015) *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica: Book IV*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge).
- Hurst, A. (1983) 'Temps du récit chez Pindare (Pyth. 4) et Bacchylide (11)', *Museum Helveticum* 40: 154–68.
- Hurst, A. (1985) 'Aspects du temps chez Pindare', in *Pindare. Entretiens Hardt* 31 (Vandoeuvres-Geneva): 155–206.
- Huxley G. L. (1969) *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London).
- Huxley, G. L. (1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast).
- Iles Johnston, S. (1997) 'Corinthian Medea and the Cult of Hera Akraia', in J. J. Clauss, S. Iles Johnston, edd., *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art* (Princeton): 44–70.
- Illig, L. (1932) *Zur Form der Pindarischen Erzählung* (Berlin).
- Jackson, S. (1987) 'Apollonius' Argonautica. Euphemus, a Clod and a Tripod', *Illinois Classical Studies* 12: 23–30.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2004) *Narrators and Focalisers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (London).
- Kennedy, D. (1997) 'Modern Receptions and their Interpretative Implications', in C. Martindale, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge): 38–55.
- Kermode, F. (1979) *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative*, Charles Eliot Norton lectures (Cambridge, MA).
- Kermode, F. (2000) *The Sense of An Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction, with a new epilogue* (Oxford). First edition (1967).
- Knauer, G. (1964) *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis, Hypomnemata no. 7* (Göttingen).
- Köhnken, A. (1971) *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte vol. 12* (Berlin).
- Köhnken, A. (1993) 'Narrative Peculiarities in Pindar's Fourth Pythian Ode', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 12: 26–35.

- Krummen, E. (2014) *Cult, Myth and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes. A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1 and Olympian 3*. English translation by J. G. Howie (Prenton) = E. Krummen (1990) *Pyrros Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)* (Berlin).
- Kuhr, A. (1988) 'Earth and Water', in A. Kuhr and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, ed., *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory. Proceedings of the London 1985 Achaemenid History Workshop* (Leiden): 87–99.
- Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, NY).
- Kurke, L. (1993) 'The Economy of *Kudos*' in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, ed., *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge): 131–63.
- Laronde A. (1987) *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique. Libykai historiai de l'époque républicaine au principat d'Auguste* (Paris).
- Laronde, A. (1990a) 'Cyrène sous les derniers Battiades', in B. Gentili, ed. *Cirene. Storia, mito, letteratura. Atti del convegno della S.I.S.A.C. (Urbino 3 luglio 1988)* (Urbino): 35–50.
- Laronde, A. (1990b) 'Greeks and Libyans in Cyrenaica', in J.-P. Descœudres, ed., *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford): 169–80.
- Lasserre, Francois (1976) 'Historiographie grecque à l'époque archaïque', *Quaderni di storia* 2 (1976): 113–42.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1991) *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'* (Oxford).
- Longley-Cook, I. (1989) *A Literary Study of Pindar's Fourth and Fifth Pythian Odes*. University of St. Andrews PhD dissertation: <http://hdl.handle.net/10023/2644>.
- Lord, A. B. (1960) *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA).
- Lowrie, M. (1997) *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).
- Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge).
- Maddoli, G., M. Nafissi and V. Saladino, ed. (1999) *Pausania, Guida della Grecia, vol. 6, Libro 6. L'Elide e Olimpia* (Milan).
- Maehler, H. (2004) *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge)
- Malkin, I. (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion*, 3 (Leiden).

- Malkin, I. (1994) *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge).
- Malkin, I. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley).
- Malkin, I. (2003) ‘“Tradition” in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene’, in P. Derow and R. Parker, edd., *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford) 153–70.
- Malten, L. (1911) *Kyrene, Sagengeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen* (Berlin).
- Marinatos, S. (1974) *Excavations at Thera VI (1972 season)* (Athens).
- Maslov, B. (2015) *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature* (Cambridge).
- Masson, O. (1976) ‘Le nom de Battos, fondateur de Cyrène, et un groupe de mots grecs apparentés’, *Glotta* 54: 84–98.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. (2002) *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge).
- Merkelbach, R. and M. L. West (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford) [abbr. M-W].
- Miner, E. R. (1977) *Literary Uses of Typology from the Middle Ages to the Present* (Princeton).
- Mitchel, F. (1956) ‘Herodotus’ Use of Genealogical Chronology’, *Phoenix* 10: 48–69.
- Mitchell, B. (2000) ‘Cyrene: Typical or Atypical?’, in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, edd., *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece* (Oxford) 82–102.
- Mohnhaupt, B. (2000) *Beziehungsgeflechte. Typologische Kunst des Mittelalters* (Bern).
- Morgan, K. (1993) ‘Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the Komos’, *Classical Philology* 88: 1–15.
- Morgan, K. (2008) ‘Generic Ethics and the Problem of Badness in Pindar’, in I. Sluiter, R. M. Rosen, edd., *Kakos: Badness and Anti-value in Classical Antiquity*. *Mnemosyne Supplement* 307 (Leiden).
- Morgan, K. (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford).
- Morrison, A. (2007) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Most, G. W. (1985) *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar’s Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, *Hypomnemata* 83 (Göttingen).

- Moyer, I. (2013) 'Herodotus and an Egyptian Mirage: The Genealogies of the Theban Priests', in R. Munson, ed., *Oxford Readings in Herodotus*, vol. II (Oxford): 292–335 (updated second edition of an essay first printed in *JHS* 122 (2002): 70–90; also reprinted in *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism* (Cambridge 2011): 42–83.
- Nafissi, M. (1985) 'Battiadi ed Aigeidai: per la storia dei rapporti tra Cirene e Sparta in eta Arcaica', in G. Barker, J. Lloyd and J. Reynolds, edd., *Cyrenaica in Antiquity, Society for Libyan Studies Occasional Papers 1*, BAR International Series 236: 375–86.
- Nicholson, N. (2001) 'Polysemy and Ideology in Pindar *Pythian* 4.229–30', *Phoenix* 54: 191–202.
- Nicholson, N. (2005) *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
- Niese, B. (1907) 'Herodot-Studien. Besonders zur Spartanischen Geschichte', *Hermes* 42: 450–7.
- Nora, P. (1997) 'Entre mémoire et histoire', *Les Lieux De Mémoire* (Paris) 23–43.
- Nünlist, R. (2007) 'Chapter Fourteen: Pindar and Bacchylides', in I. J. F. de Jong and R. Nünlist, edd., *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. 2, Mnemosyne Supplement 291* (Leiden) 233–54.
- Ong, W.J. (1977) *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Ithaca, NY).
- Osborne, R. (1996) *Greece in the Making, 1200-479 BC* (London).
- Osborne, R. (1998) 'Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees, edd. *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London): 251–69.
- Pasquali, G. (1986) 'Quaestiones Callimacheae', in F. Bornmann, G. Pascucci, and S. Timpanaro, edd., *Scritti filologici, vol. 1: Letteratura greca* (Florence): 152–301.
- Pavlou, M. (2012) 'Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past', in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. A. MacIver, edd., *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History Without Historians. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6* (Edinburgh): 95–112.
- Pfeijffer, I. L. (2004) 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in I. J. F. de Jong, R. Nünlist and A. Bowie, edd., *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative vol. 1. Mnemosyne Supplement 257* (Leiden): 213–32.

- Pinsent, J. (1985) 'Pindar's Narrative Technique: *Pythian* 4 and Bacchylides 5, *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 10: 2–8.
- Poltera, O. (2008) *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und fragmente*, SBA vol. 35 (Basel).
- Potamiti, A. (2015) 'The Theme of Hospitality in Pindar's Fourth *Pythian*', *Greece and Rome* 62/1: 1–11.
- Powell, J.E. (1938) *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge).
- Privitera, G. A. (1982) *Pindaro. Le Istmiche* (Milan).
- Race, W. H. (1989) 'Elements of Style in Pindaric Break-Offs' *AJPh* 110.2 (Summer 1989): 189-209 = Race, *Style and Rhetoric* (APA, 1990): 41–57.
- Race, W. H. (1997) *Pindar*. vol. I: *Olympian and Pythian Odes*; vol. II: *Nemean and Isthmian Odes and Fragments* (Loeb Classical Library: Cambridge MA and London).
- Rawles, R. (2018) *Simonides the Poet: Intertextuality and Reception* (Cambridge).
- Ricoeur, P. (1984–1988) *Time and Narrative*. 3 Vols. (Chicago).
- Reger, G. (2004) 'The Aegean' in Hansen and Nielsen: 732–93.
- Rizzo, M. A. and M. Martelli (1988-1989) 'Un incunabolo del mito greco in Etruria', *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene* 66-7: 7–56.
- Robbins, E. (1975) 'Jason and Cheiron: The Myth of Pindar's *Pythian* IV', *Phoenix* 29: 205–13.
- Rose, P. (1992) *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY).
- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).
- Schadewaldt, W. (1928) *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*. *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 5. Jahr, Heft 3. (Halle).
- Schmidt, M. (1980) [Untitled: Discussion/Comment on the Iconography of the Apulian Krater from Gravina, RVAp 32, 1), *L'epos greco in Occidente*, Atti del XIX Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Graecia – Taranto, 7-12 ottobre 1979 (Taranto): 211-15.
- Schneider, J. (2000) 'De Cadmos aux Emménides', *Kentron* 16, 1-2: 65–81.
- Schroeder, O. (1922) *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig).
- Segal, C. (1986) *Pindar's Mythmaking: The Fourth Pythian Ode* (Princeton).
- Sigelman, A. (2016) *Pindar's Poetics of Immortality* (Cambridge).

- Silk, M. S. (1974) *Interaction in Poetic Imagery: With Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).
- Slater, W. J. (1969) *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- Slater, W. J. (1983) 'Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle', *Classical Antiquity* 2/1: 117–32.
- Snell B. and H. Maehler (1997) *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis. Pars I: Epinicia. Post Brunonem Snell edidit Hervicus Maehler* (Leipzig) [abbr. SM].
- Stephens, S. (2008) 'Ptolemaic Epic' in T. D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos, edd., *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Second, Revised Edition (Leiden-Boston): 95–114.
- Stephens, S. (2011) 'Remapping the Mediterranean: the Argo Adventure in Apollonius and Callimachus', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, edd., *Culture in Pieces* (Oxford): 188–207.
- Stucchi S. (1967) 'Il giardino delle Esperidi e le tappe della conoscenza greca della costa Cirenaica', *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 8: 19–73.
- Stucchi, S. (1976) 'Prime tracce tardo-minoiche a Cirene. I rapporti della Libia con il mondo egeo', *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 5: 19–45.
- Studniczka, F. (1890) *Kyrene, eine altgriechische Göttin* (Leipzig).
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- Thomas, R. (2001) 'Herodotus' Histories and the Floating Gap', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 198–210.
- Thomas, R. (2007) 'Fame, Memorial, and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinikian Poetry—an Historical Study', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan, edd. (2007): 141–166.
- Thompson, D. (1970) 'Allegory and Typology in the *Aeneid*', *Arethusa* 3: 147–53.
- Trendall A. D. and A. Cambitoglou (1978–1982) *The Red-figured Vases of Apulia (RVAp)* (Oxford).
- Vannicelli, P. (1992) 'Gli Egidi e le relazioni tra Sparta e Cirene in età arcaica', *QUCC* 41/70: 55–73.
- Vannicelli, P. (1993) *Erodoto e la storia dell' altro e medio arcaismo (Sparta, Tessaglia, Cirene)* (Roma).
- Vannicelli, P. (2001) 'Herodotus' Egypt and the Foundations of Universal History', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford): 211–40.

- Vansina, J. (1985) *Oral Tradition as History* (London).
- Varto, E. (2015) 'Stories Told in Lists', *Journal of Ancient History* 3.2: 118–49.
- Vernant, J-P. (1982) 'From Oedipus to Periander: Lameness, Tyranny, Incest in Legend and History', *Arethusa* 15.1-2 = *American Classical Studies in Honor of J-P. Vernant*: 19-39. Reprinted in R. Buxton, ed. (2000) *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (Oxford): 109–29.
- Vian, F. (1981) *Apollonius de Rhodes, Argonautiques*, vol. 3 (Paris).
- Wade-Gery, H. T. (1952) *The Poet of the Iliad* (Cambridge).
- West, M. L. (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford).
- West, S. (2007a) 'Herodotus lyricorum studiosus', *Palamedes: A Journal of Ancient History* 2: 109–30.
- West, S. (2007b) 'Lycophron's Argonautica', *Phasis* vol. 10 nos. 1-20: 204-14.
- West, S. (2011) 'A Diplomatic Fiasco: The First Athenian Embassy to Sardis (Hdt. 5, 73)', *RhMus* n.f. 154.1: 9–21.
- White, H. (1973) *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination of Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore).
- White, H. (1978) *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore).
- White, H. (1980) 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 7.1: 5–27.
- White, H. (1987) *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore).
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- Wüst, E. (1967) *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter: Interpretation der zwölf vorsizilischer Siegeslieder des sechsten Paians und der zehnten olympischen Ode*, diss. phil. (Tübingen).
- Yates, F. A. (1966) *The Art of Memory* (Chicago).
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2004) 'Ritual Poetics in Archaic Lesbos: Contextualising Genre in Sappho', in D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos, ed., *Greek Ritual Poetics. Hellenic Studies* 3. (Washington, DC): 56–70.
- Young, D. G. (1968) *Three Odes of Pindar. A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7. Mnemosyne Supplement* 9 (Leiden).
- Young, D. G. (1970) 'Pindaric Criticism', in W. M. Calder and J. Stern, ed., *Pindaros und Bakchylides. Wege der Forschung* vol. 134 (Darmstadt): 1–95.
- Young, F. M. (1997) *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge).

