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Introduction
Bacchylides of Keos was a choral song composer of the first half of the fifth century BCE, one of the nine archaic/classical Greek lyric poets canonised by the Alexandrians. Although he was famous in his lifetime, attracting commissions from across the Hellenic world, fifth-century poetry shows few obvious traces of his influence and there are no obvious quotations in fourth-century writers. His songs gained wider currency from the third century BCE onward thanks to the editorial work of Alexandrian scholars. They were certainly read by Callimachus, Strabo, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Horace and Plutarch. While the number of books in Bacchylides' Alexandrian 'edition' is unknown, he worked in a variety of choral lyric genres: later sources attest books of epinicians, hymns, paeans, dithyrambs, prosodia, partheneia, hyporchemata, erotica, and encomia (or skolia). (Two epigrams of the Palatine Anthology are also ascribed spuriously to Bacchylides). Of this large body of work only about 100 verses survived the shipwreck of the third-fourth centuries CE, with a small number of fragments anthologised or preserved by commentators and lexicographers as well as Athenaeus. In 1896 the magnificent London Papyrus (British Library, P. Lond 733) was discovered and published a
year later by F.G. Kenyon. Dated to the 1st-2nd centuries CE, it preserves the remains of a single book roll containing what transpired to be substantial parts of 14 epinician odes (probably almost the whole of Bacchylides’ epinician production as it was known in Hellenistic times) as well as six dithyrambs, five of which were also largely complete. Since then, remains of fifteen more papyri have been attributed to Bacchylides: two more papyri contain fragments of commentaries on his dithyrambs and epinicia. The implications of these extraordinary discoveries are by no means yet fully understood. Already in Antiquity, Bacchylides suffered from comparison with Pindar (see e.g. Ps.-Longinus, On the Sublime 33.5). Only in recent decades has his poetry begun to be appreciated in its own right, with ongoing editorial work having produced a text that is dependable enough to leave scholars free to examine his poetic technique and his poems’ relation to their historical and performance contexts. The scholarly bibliography is still, however, quite limited. Though little known outside the world of Classical scholarship, Bacchylides is well served with commentaries and translations in major languages, but many aspects of his poetry remain to be explored.

**Historical and Cultural Context**

There is no book-length critical overview of Bacchylides, nor can he really be studied in isolation from the other choral poets (especially Pindar and Simonides) or indeed from the other literature, material culture and history of his time. Since Bacchylides has become increasingly popular in recent years as a teaching text in undergraduate lyric courses, this section aims to list the best general accounts of the poet himself, catering to the needs of a reader engaging with Greek choral song for the first time. Fränkel 1975, Herington 1985, Gentili 1988, Kurke 2000 and Budelmann 2009 are a good place to start in learning about the general literary, cultural and historical context in which Bacchylides worked. Bundy 1962 has exercised an enormous influence over modern approaches to the poet, not only in his rejection of the old-style ‘man and works’ type of conjectural biographical reading, but also in his focus on the syntax, rhetoric and tropes of choral praise. Segal 1985 is a good basic discussion of the fifth-century choral poets.


Useful, up-to-date collection of basic readings on archaic and classical Greek song, including metre, genre, language and social context, with good bibliography.


Influential study of the rhetoric of ancient Greek choral praise poetry. Re-issued by University of California Press as a combined edition in 1986 (a digital version is available online[^1]).


Fascinating account by a great scholar of the pre-1945 generation of the intellectual background to Bacchylides (if somewhat too focused on a developmental view) with some fine close readings of particular odes and fragments.


Exceptionally clear and thoughtful introduction to the contexts and themes of early Greek song. Translated from the original Italian and introduced by A. Thomas Cole.


Chapters 1-3 (pp. 3-78) are essential reading for anyone beginning the study of ancient Greek lyric.


An excellent brief introduction to the genres and contexts of choral song.

Sensitive discussion of the literary qualities of Simonides, Pindar and (pp. 235-39) Bacchylides.

**Life and Works**

For a concise presentation of the poet’s life and works, see Robbins 1997, Maehler 2012 or Hutchinson 2001: 321-28 (cited in "General Greek lyric commentaries"). Excellent longer overviews of Bacchylides can be found in Jebb 1905, 1-76 (cited in "Editions") though outdated and rather biased towards Pindar, Maehler 1997, vol. I: 1-45 (in German) and Maehler 2004: 1-31 (in English, especially strong on dialect, prosody, metre and the manuscripts) and Cairns 2010: 1-62 (whose excellent General Introduction is confined mostly to the victory odes but strong on the epinician genre, narrative style and questions of performance: all three are cited in "Commentaries"). See also the introduction to Irigoin et al. 1993 (cited in "Editions"): good on language and the history of the text. Several more limited but still general accounts of the poet and his works must be mentioned here. Burnett 1985 (probably not a book for the beginner) presents close readings of several Bacchylidean odes. Fearn 2007, Kowalzig 2007 and Athanassaki 2009 give a window on the historical context of choral song, focusing (as has become the fashion in recent years) on performance, re-performance and questions of myth and ritual. Carey 1999 thoughtfully compares Bacchylides’ poetic style with Pindar’s, emphasising the emotional qualities of his myths and his use of irony. Stenger 2004 focuses on the poet’s use of gnomai, but has useful things to say about the structure and argument of his more important victory odes.


Close readings of several odes, focusing on evidence for performance. Mostly Pindaric, but two extended discussions of Bacchylides (odes *17* and *18*). In Greek; an English translation is apparently forthcoming.


Sensitive and enthusiastic reading of several odes (see "Works") with general discussion of choral poetics: should be used with care.


Good on poetic voice and irony.


Close study of several odes (see "Works"), with informative sections on Bacchylides’ praise poetry and his dithyrambs, and a long section on the dithyrambic genre more generally.


Stimulating (if often conjectural) study of the political and religious background of Greek choral song performance, especially good on use of myth and the ritual frame; contains extended discussions of specific odes (see "Works").


Brief article with the basic facts.


 Longer article with some literary discussion.


Excellent if somewhat dry account of Bacchylides’ use of gnomai (proverbs or maxims), with good general comments on proverbs as a genre, and discussions of particular odes, especially from the perspective of structure and unity.
Biographical works
Almost nothing is known of Bacchylides’ life. For the main sources, see Maehler 1997, vol. I: 6-8 (in German) and Maehler 2004: 9-10 (in English: both cited in “Commentaries”), and his article in the Oxford Classical Dictionary s.v. Bacchylides (see Maehler 2012 in “Life and Works”), along with the excellent critical discussion in Cairns 2010 (in “Commentaries”: pp. 1-7) and Jebb 1905 (in “Editions”), 1-26. The sparse testimonia are collected in volume IV of Campbell’s Loeb translation (Campbell 1992: 100-5, cited in “Translations”) and in Maehler’s editions (same section). Strabo (10.5.6 p. 486) and other late authors mention that Bacchylides was from Ioulis, one of three main cities on the island of Keos, and the nephew (probably on his mother’s side) of Simonides; the Suda gives his father’s name as Meidon. The only other ‘fact’ known about the poet’s life comes to us from Plutarch (De exilio 14, 605C), who says he was exiled from Ioulis and spent some time in the Peloponnese. His dates are uncertain: according to Maehler, he was born probably shortly after 520, but he may have been younger than Pindar. His epinicians for Hieron of Syracuse are firmly dated (B. 5 to 476, B. 4 to 470 and B. 3 to 468 BCE), the latter coinciding with the floruit given in the Chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome (another similar source, the Chronicon Paschale, places the poet’s floruit in 480 BCE). The dates of his other songs are conjectural and to different degrees contestable. Eusebius says Bacchylides was still ‘known’ in 431 BC, but most authoritative modern opinion (see Maehler 2012 cited in “Life and Works” and Fatouros 1961) has assumed he was dead by about 450 (the crucial piece of evidence being a 4th-century Keian epigraphic victor-list). This position was, however, challenged by Schmidt 1999. The scholia to Pindar’s epinicians preserve a tradition of Bacchylides’ (and Simonides’) bitter rivalry with the Theban poet (they did indeed compose songs for some of the same patrons), but it is unclear to what extent this is a false inference from the poems themselves (on this problem in general, see Lefkowitz 2012). There is a general account of Bacchylides’ life in Severyns 1933. Although many of its premises and methods today seem overly conjectural and some quite obsolete, the book is still worth a look.

Standard Greek edition of the Pindar scholia, reprinted several times since the first edition and available (in searchable form) also on the “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae[http://www.tlg.uci.edu]” website.

Disputes Eusebius’ late dating of the poet.


Refutation of the arguments of Fatouros and Maehler on the conjectural dating of certain Bacchylidean epinicians and the date of the poet’s death.

The only full-dress monograph on the life of Bacchylides.

Bibliographies
**L’Année Philologique** contains the full record of Bacchylidean scholarship from 1924 to 2012. Gerber 1990 covers much of what was published from 1934 to 1987 (for earlier bibliographies, see his references). The excellent new bibliography by Neumann-Hartmann 2010 brings the record up to 2007. Di Marco, Palumbo Stracca and Lelli 2000- is a bibliography of recent work on Greek lyric, with annotated entries, published yearly. Readers may also wish to use the online database maintained since 2007 by the *Network for the Study of Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. [au: We do not allow links to external sources in the commentary paragraph per House style. Assuming L’Année Philologique deserves to be cited here, please add an annotation below to the citation we’ve created for you.]

Comprehensive collection of material (with indices and annotations).


Constantly expanding moderated database of recent scholarship on Greek lyric poetry and related topics run by the Network for the Study of Archaic and Classical Greek Song, which also organises yearly conferences. Includes a list, more or less up to date, of on-going PhD dissertation projects.

**Editions**
Because of the peculiarity of his textual history, Bacchylides had to wait until 1897 for an editio princeps (Kenyon 1897). Other important early editions included Blass 1899 and Jebb 1905, the latter containing Kenyon’s text and incorporating suggestions from others, with a rich commentary and facing English translation. Further papyrological discoveries in subsequent decades led to the publication of substantial new fragments and the renumbering of the poems. Bruno Snell’s landmark Teubner edition, first published in 1934, went through several editions, being continually revised in accordance with new discoveries and editorial ideas, and culminating in the tenth edition (Maehler 1970). The most recent complete Greek text is Maehler 2003 (the eleventh edition of the Snell-Maehler series, again substantially revised, with some supplements deleted, others added, and the apparatus generally shortened). Both Maehler 1970 and Maehler 2003 contain all the extant papyrus- and other fragments, including dubia (Maehler 2003 leaves out the spurious epigrams), as well as scholia and testimonia, and have a detailed Latin-language preface. The only full edition for the general reader (with Greek text, facing translation, limited apparatus and some notes) published in English since Jebb’s is Campbell 1992 (cited in "Translations"), whose text follows that of Maehler 1970. Irigoin et al. 1993 is a scholarly edition with facing French translation, critical apparatus, notes and introductory essays (its renumbering of the fragments makes it hard to use in concert with Maehler). Sevieri 2010 is a handy reading text that presents Maehler 2003’s text faced by an Italian translation of the poems, with notes and useful introductory material. Bastianini et al. 2006 contains a new edition by Maehler of Bacchylides papyri with scholia and the ancient papyrus commentaries with a useful introduction.

Maehler re-edits a number of papyri with scholia and ancient commentaries on Bacchylides providing a brief commentary and an introduction on the history of the fragments.

First Teubner edition with important supplements (the numbering of poems and fragments differs from current editions).

French edition with translation; the text and numbering of fragments differs (at times substantially) from Maehler’s.
Still useful for its notes on specific passages (the numbering of poems and fragments differs from current editions); in style it resembles Jebb’s commentaries on Sophocles (a good thing).


Last edition of the poet to contain substantial editorial input from Snell: still very useful (and preferred by some to Maehler 2003).

Completely revised edition with new supplements and missing the epigrams, but incorporating important unpublished work by W.S. Barrett; the apparatus is substantially shorter than in the 1970 one; and fr. 65 and fr. 66 are renumbered (see *Works: Fragments*).


**Commentaries**

The essential commentary to all of Bacchylides is Maehler 1997 (Part I consisting of volumes one and two containing the epinicians (text with translation and commentary) which were first published in 1982 and reissued as a single volume in 1997), in two volumes. For commentaries on selected odes see Maehler 2004 and Cairns 2010. Campbell 1992 (cited in "Translations"), Irigoin et al. 1993 and Sevieri 2010 (both cited in "Editions") also have useful notes designed to help the general reader.

McDevitt 2009 (cited in "Translations") also contains extensive notes; and Bastianini, et al. 2006 (cited in "Editions") also contains some material essential for more advanced students. For some further commentaries on specific Bacchylidean odes and fragments, see "General Commentaries".


Contains a Greek text (with very full apparatus) and a good facing English translation of five of Bacchylides’ most important victory odes. The general introduction covers the poet’s life and work, the epinician genre, performance, and style (especially strong on Bacchylidean narrative); there are exhaustive introductions to each poem, commentary and an up-to-date bibliography, but nothing on metre. Unmissable for those interested in the literary aspects.

Contains much useful introductory material (with sections on social context, the poet’s life and works, dialect and prosody, metre, Bacchylides’ style, ancient textual tradition and the papyrus), a Greek text with full apparatus (differing somewhat from that in Maehler 1970) a German translation and a full commentary on all poems and fragments. Part I, on the epinicians, was first published in 1982 as *Mnemosyne* Supplement no. 62 (Leiden: Brill).

Cambridge ‘Green and Yellow’ commentary on a well-chosen selection of Bacchylides (incorporating his epinician ‘greatest hits’ -- 3, 5 and 11 as well as 4 and 6 -- and all the dithyrambs, as well as the most important fragments: fr. 22+fr. 4, fr. 11+fr. 12, and frs. 20A-D) with helpful introduction. It is essentially a version of Maehler 1997 adapted for use by non-specialists, and makes teaching Bacchylides at undergraduate and graduate level very easy.
General Greek lyric commentaries containing one or more poem of Bacchylides

Several good general ‘Greek lyric’ commentaries written for school or undergraduate use incorporate some Bacchylidean material. Smyth 1900 was one of the earliest serious school commentaries in English on the Greek lyric poets: while the texts as printed are frequently out of date, it still contains many interesting critical observations, and the introduction represented a major leap forward in the study of the Greek poetic genres. Gerber 1970 is a fairly basic but useful commentary with a nice survey of lyric texts including some Bacchylides: it is, however, rather hard to obtain. Hutchinson 2001 is particularly valuable; Campbell 1982 is an excellent introduction to lyric, and a perennial favourite in undergraduate courses in the UK and North America: it is a second, updated edition of the author’s 1967 commentary, and should probably be updated again soon for university use. For the odes and fragments discussed by each, see the relevant sections within "Works". Gentili and Catenacci 2007 is an excellent Italian school commentary that has been through several editions and was recently thoroughly modernised to reflect the latest scholarship on the poets; De Martino and Vox 1996 and Neri 2011 are more suited to university-level work and contain much material of interest and references to recent scholarship.


Volume 1 of a 3-volume advanced Greek lyric textbook for university students containing Greek text with commentary of Bacch. 17 and 18 and fr. 20B.

Third edition of a general Greek lyric commentary (the first edition, published in 1948, was by Gentili and Gennaro Perotta) for use in schools. Contains Bacchylides’ third and sixth epinicians.

Contains text and basic commentary on Bacch. 5 and 17.

Contains a good brief introduction to Bacchylides, and a fine commentary on the third epinician (especially strong on literary aspects).

Anthology of Greek lyric texts designed primarily for the undergraduate market, with useful background material and bibliography and strong on metre. Contains text, apparatus and notes to Bacch. 18.

Old but still useful anthology of Greek melos containing extensive Bacchylidean material. The text and metrical principles are outdated, but the commentary still has something to offer; the introduction contains one of the earliest (and indeed still one of the best) extensive discussions of the sources for Greek choral and monodic lyric genres in English.

Translations

The best translations for students and scholars who need to understand Bacchylides’ Greek are Campbell 1992 and Cairns 2010 (cited in "Commentaries"), the latter restricted to a few epinicians. Jebb 1905 (cited in "Editions") contains translations of all the poems known at the time, but the Greek text has moved on and the style of the English seems outdated. Several translators have attempted more or less poetic versions for the elusive ‘general’ reader: of these, Fagles 1961, Slavitt 1998 and
McDevitt 2009 (for the victory odes) are today the best known. For German translations, use Maehler 1997 (cited in "Commentaries"), with excellent and accurate translations. For Italian, see Sevieri 2010; for French, see Irigoin et al. 1993 (both also cited in "Commentaries"). For Spanish, see Garcia Romero 1988.

With facing Greek based on the Snell-Maehler text of 1970 (rather more supplements and a shorter apparatus than the Teubner) and notes.

Forceful writing in English with notes by Adam Parry. One of his most poetic works, it often feels more like vintage Fagles than translated Bacchylides.


This sometimes irritating translation covers the surviving epinicians and dithyrambs. The tone is often colloquial and doesn’t represent the qualities (or the syntax) of the Greek very well.

Scholarly translation which puts faithfulness before poetic effect, but manages at its best a certain noble simplicity that isn’t miles away from Bacchylidean Greek. Designed primarily for student use, it contains a lot of contextual material and commentary. Could be used in a ‘Greek literature in translation’ course.

Collections of Papers
There are three dedicated collections of papers on Bacchylides: Calder and Stern 1970, Pfeijffer and Slings 1999, and Bagordo and Zimmermann 2000. Of these, Bagordo and Zimmermann 2000 is the most important. Essays from these volumes and other pieces published in conference proceedings will be listed in other sections as they arise.

Proceedings of a conference held in Freiburg: a rich volume with articles mainly in German but a few in English and Italian. Essential reading.

Contains several important early articles on Bacchylides, including pieces by Wilamowitz, Blass, Snell, Comparet and Maas.

English-language conference volume with some duplication of Bagordo and Zimmermann 2000. Contains a couple of important pieces.

Lexica
The existence of resources like the online "Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG)" has made single-author lexica less necessary for everyday work. However, the indices in Maehler 1970 and Maehler 2003 (cited in "Commentaries") are useful help in understanding Bacchylides’ vocabulary. Fatouros 1996 and Gerber 1984 are valuable research tools.

General index to early Greek lyric, including Bacchylides.

*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG)* [https://www.tlg.uci.edu/]

Searchable online database, now at version ‘L’, containing almost the whole of extant Greek literature from Homer down to 1453 AD. The Bacchylides text is based on the edition of Irigoin 1993 (cited in "Commentaries"). Accessing the whole database requires an expensive subscription, but the authors most commonly taught at universities, including Bacchylides, are available for free through the project *website* [https://www.tlg.uci.edu/demoinfo/demo.php]*

**Works**

Bacchylides’ surviving works fall into three main groups: the epinicians and dithyrambs known from the London papyrus and other more recently discovered sources, and fragments of various genres known either from the papyri or the secondary tradition. These choral lyric ‘genres’ are of course to some extent a consequence of Alexandrian editorial practice, and the extent to which they reflect the genre-system of fifth-century song is still essentially an open question: see Harvey 1955, Käppel 2000, and Lowe 2007. This section provides a poem-by-poem list of commentaries and important secondary bibliography. Poems whose only significant discussion is in Maehler 1997 (cited in "Commentaries") are omitted. This heading is divided into three sections: a) the "epinicians", b) the "dithyrambs", and c) the "fragments". After a brief summary of the main scholarly problems connected with each ode or fragment, relevant commentaries are listed (where these exist; use of Maehler 1997, which discusses all the poems, is assumed): for these, see "Commentaries". Then some recommended scholarly discussions are mentioned either with a full citation or with cross references to the relevant part of this article. Citations are selective, the emphasis placed on more recent discussions that reflect the current state of play: for the full bibliography, see "Bibliographies". Gentili 1958 discusses several important Bacchylidean poems and fragments.


Monograph on the poet with discussion of epinicians 3 and 5, Dithyramb 16 and a brief discussion of sympotic or ‘anacreontic’ praise poetry including the Bacchylidean encomia (esp. fr. 20B).


Most important discussion of the choral song genres in English.


Study of the Bacchylides odes with respect to their genres and the principles of Alexandrian genre-classification (‘eidography’).


Elegant recent study of the editorial practices involved in creating the Alexandrian editions of the choral poets’ epinician odes.

**Epinicians**

Virtually nothing was known about Bacchylides’ victory odes until the discovery of the London papyrus, but they can now be studied both in their own right and in comparison with Pindar’s. At present, fifteen odes belonging to this genre are known (for the fragments, see the separate subsection "Fragments"), in various states of preservation, numbered from 1 to 14B in Maehler’s editions (Maehler 1970 and Maehler 2003, cited in "Editions"). Maehler’s view of praise poetry is influenced by Bundy 1962 (cited in "Historical and Cultural Context"), the fundamental study of epinician conventions: cf. also Finn 1980. On the epinician genre and Bacchylides, see especially the General Introduction to Cairns 2010 (cited in "Editions", pp. 17-29), Hornblower 2004 and Hornblower and Morgan 2007 (both cited in "Historical Context, Patrons, Politics and Performance"), and the essays in Agócs, et al. 2012. On epinician poetics see most recently Eckerman 2010. Lefkowitz 1976 offers close verbal analysis of several odes, and stylistic comparison of Bacchylides’ technique with...
Pindar's. The performance of epinician odes has been much discussed recently. Gelzer 1985 is an important article which argues that the shorter Bacchylidean victory odes (2, 4 and 6) were sung at the site of the victory, and the longer ones in the victor's home city. On the dating of Bacchylides' odes for Hieron (3, 4, and 5) see also Schade 2006. Hadjimichael 2010-11 and Calame 2011 address an exciting field of contemporary research: the lyric voice in epinician song.

The following odes do not have separate subsections below, but it is useful to list the available discussions and commentaries here: 1) Ode 8. Epinician for Liparion of Ceos [?]. Only the final strophe and parts of the penultimate strophe of this ode survive. Blass argued that it is not in fact an independent poem, but rather the last part of Ode 7; this explains the different numbering in his and Jebb's editions (Blass 1899 and Jebb 1905, cited in "Editions"). On this question, see Maehler 1997, cited in "Commentaries". 2) Ode 12. Epinician for Teisias of Aegina, wrestling, Nemean games. Very little of this ode survives; most of what does came from a sensational 1938 papyrus discovery by Medea Norsa (on which see Maehler 1997: 244, cited in Commentaries*). 3) Ode 14, Epinician for Kleoptolemos of Thessaly, chariot race, Petraean games. The opening triad of this ode, containing a long 'run' of gnomai, in celebration of a victory won at local games in Thessaly is preserved in the London papyrus. For *commentaries*, see Smyth 1900. For secondary literature, Stenger 2004: 249-60 (cited in *Life and Works*).


Ode 1

Epinician for Argeios of Keos, child boxer [?] at the Isthmian games. Little remains of the first three strophes of this (monostrophic) ode, one of four surviving songs composed by Bacchylides to commemorate victors from his home island. This ode is noteworthy for its account of the mythical


Important Italian article by a major epinician scholar.


Major edition of Pindar’s Paeans with superb introduction and commentary, containing excellent discussion of the poem in its relation to Pindar’s Paean IV.

Ode 2


Important discussion of a key phrase in the poem (also discussed by Gelzer 1985 cited in "Epinicians").

Ode 3


Useful discussion of the variants of Bacchylides' myth.


Discussion of the myth in the light of Near Eastern sources.


Excellent brief discussion of Bacchylides' use of wealth and light imagery.


Comparison of Bacchylides' and Herodotus' versions of Croesus’ fall.

Analysis of the myth.


Ode 4


Good on the social background.


Commentary on the poem and its opening image of the cock.


Bacchylides' reference to a failed attempt at the Olympic Games provides a dating-point for Pindar's ode.

Ode 5

Epinician for Hieron of Syracuse, horse race, the Olympic games. A magnificent ode composed probably for Hieron’s victory in the horse race in 476 BCE (the same occasion which produced Pindar's first Olympian), this is perhaps Bacchylides' finest epinician ode. Its description of the victory, and its myth, which involves the meeting of Heracles and Meleager in the Underworld, are much discussed. For "commentaries", see Smyth 1900, Campbell 1982, Maehler 2004, and Cairns 2010. For secondary literature, see Burnett 1985: 129-49, Carey 1999 and Stenger 2004: 121-71 (cited in "Life and Works"), Gentili 1958: 11-65 (cited in "Works"), Lefkowitz 1976: 43-75 (cited in "Epinicians"), and Segal 1976: 115-22 (cited in "Language, Diction, and Style"). Other important discussions include Lefkowitz 1969 (an important comparative discussion emphasising techniques and motifs shared with Pindar), Goldhill 1983 (a fine literary treatment, especially of the myth), Segal 1990 (important for Bacchylides' treatment of the mythical tradition), Briand 1997 (excellent structuralist account of narrative style and poetic diction), Cairns 1997 (fine discussion of the myth), and Karachalios 2009 (an interesting discussion emphasising links between myth and performance context).


Analysis of Bacchylides' ode as a 'polyphonic' text.


Discusses of Bacchylides' creative use of ring-composition in the ode.


Describes the ode's formal structure and the relevance of myth to praise.


Studies the relationship between the ‘myth’, with its sad and philosophical tone, and the ode’s praise of Hieron.
Discusses the role of poetic conventions in the ode.

Comparison of themes of violence and sacrifice following the theories of René Girard.

A valuable study, in the mode of American postwar New Criticism, of Bacchylides’ use of imagery in the ode.

Odes 6 and 7
Epinicians for Lachon of Keos, boy stadion runner, Olympic games. Bacchylides’ sixth and seventh epinicians were composed to celebrate a running victory by a boy from the poet’s home island of Keos: they are usually treated as his last dated odes (452 BCE: on this question see Maehler 1997 and Schmidt 1999, cited in *Biographies*). Ode 6 is a very short poem; only the beautiful opening of Ode 7 survives. For “commentaries” on ode 6, see Smyth 1900, Maehler 2004, Gentili and Catenacci 2007. For secondary literature, see Gelzer 1985 (cited in *Epinicians*) and Marcovich 1970.

Brief study that addresses the religious background of the ode, and the identity of the goddess addressed in the opening lines.

Ode 9
Epinician for Automedon of Phleious, Pentathlon, Nemean games. Thematically complex ode for an athlete from a small city-state in the northeast Peloponnese, which weaves a mythical texture from two foundation-myths of the Nemean Games (Herakles’ victory over the invulnerable Nemean Lion, and the funeral games of Archemoros in the war of the Seven Against Thebes), with a main myth (badly mutilated) concerning the story of the daughters of the river Asopos that links the victor’s homeland with the place of the festival and with other cities like Thebes and Aegina. For “commentaries”, see Smyth 1900 and Cairns 2010. For secondary literature, see Burnett 1985: 96-113 (cited in *Life and Works*). The themes of local pride, politics and kinship-diplomacy are explored in Fearn 2003; the poem’s use of the Seven Against Thebes myth by Cairns 1998. See also Garcia Romero 1987.

Major study of a neglected aspect of the poem’s myth.

Excellent article which examines the religious and political background of the ode, and the way it uses myth and genealogy to connect Phleious to other cities in the wider Panhellenic world.

Focuses on metre and textual criticism.

Ode 10
Epinician for an unknown Athenian runner, Isthmian games. This ode, quite well preserved except for the opening and the end, is important not least because it is the only epinician of any length for an athlete from Athens. It is remarkable also for its focus, uncharacteristic in epinician song, on the victor’s athletic performance at the games, and for its lack of a myth (odd in a song of this length). For secondary literature, see Stenger 2004: 223-48 (cited in *Life and Works*), Pfeijffer 1999: 55-60, Barrett 2007a, and Bernardini 1992.

Discusses the myth and its connections to politics and cult, as well as the total poetic programme of the ode.

Discusses the poem’s mention of an earlier athletic defeat.

Analysis of the ode’s structure and pragmatics which brings out the relationship of performance-time to mythical time. Published in Italian in Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica new series 62 (1999): 63-83.

Discusses the construction of the myth, with emphasis on Bacchylides' use of ring-composition, and the way he established verbal and thematic links between 'myth' and 'praise'.

Bacchylides’ myth compared with variants in other genres and localities (an English-language version is available at the *Oxford University Research Archive*[http://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk]*).

Elegant narratological analysis focusing on ring-composition.

Meaning of the myth in its performance context and connections to local cult.


Examines the religious background of the ode, and its connections to adolescent rites de passage and to the myth and cult of Dionysus.

**Ode 13**

Epinician for Pytheas of Aegina, pankration, Nemean games. Composed for the same victor, and the same occasion, as Pindar’s Nemean 5 (probably in the second half of the 480s BCE) this ode, one of Bacchylides’ most elaborate and splendid songs, is interesting for its systematic ‘re-writing’ of Homer (this is not an exaggeration: the central myth is an extended paraphrase of the Iliad which makes very precise intertextual references for an early fifth-century poem). The opening, which seems to have contained the myth of Heracles’ battle with the Nemean Lion and foundation of the Games, is largely lost. For “commentaries”, see Smyth 1900; Cairns 2010. For secondary literature, see Stenger 2004: 172-99 (cited in “Life and Works”) and Segal 1976 (cited in “Language, Diction, and Style”). Fearn 2007: 48-160 (cited in “Life and Works”) treats the ode’s performance context on Aegina and its debt to and reworking of Homer. For a good discussion of the date and probable performance context, see Cairns 2007. Barrett 2007b is an important textual study. Calame 2009 discusses pragmatics, performance and myth. Power 2000 discusses poetic voice in the ode, locating it within the wider phenomenon of ‘choral projection’ (cases where a chorus adopts or alludes to the voice of another choral group). Most 2012 compares Bacchylides’ ode with Pindar’s epinician for the same occasion.


Contains work on the text fundamental to recent editions.


Best account of the problems surrounding the dating of the ode and its relation to Pindar’s songs for the same patrons.


Discusses the poet’s use of myth in relation to performance and occasion.


Comparison of Bacchylides’ style of mythical narrative with Pindar’s.


Important study of poetic voice in Bacchylides and Pindar, focusing on the idea of ‘choral projection’ (when a chorus imagines or imitates another real or fictional chorus).

**Odes 14 A and B**

Finally, two fragmentary epinicians. Only a small fragment of 14A survives, along with a substantial portion of the first strophe of ode 14B, in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P. Oxy. 23, 2363) which overlaps with the London Papyrus. The latter was composed for a two-time Pythian victor named Aristoteles, from Larissa in Thessaly. It is either an epinician, or possibly (as Maehler 1997, i: 294 suggests) an ode (like Pindar’s Nemean 11) to celebrate the honorand’s elevation to a magistracy. For “Commentaries”, see (14B): Smyth 1900. For secondary literature (14B), see Fearn 2009, who accepts Maehler’s analysis of the song, compares Bacchylides’ Ode 14B to Pindar’s 11th Nemean, commenting on possible performance context and connection to cult and politics.

Compares Bacchylides ode 14B with a similar poem by Pindar, and examines the possible political context.

**Dithyrambs**

The five dithyrambs of Bacchylides preserved (with the beginning of a sixth) on the London Papyrus proved to be even more of a surprise to classical scholars than his epinicians. Attested from the time of Archilochus (fr. 120 West), the dithyramb had till then been understood primarily as a sacred song performed within the cult of Dionysus, an impression largely affirmed by the surviving dithyrambic fragments of Pindar. Bacchylides’ dithyrambic odes, on the other hand, are extended narrative compositions which make little reference to a cultic frame and none at all to the god of tragedy (the only exception being ode 19, which makes a brief reference to Dionysus’ genealogy at the end).

These songs, with their elaborate, frequently quite ‘Homeric’ narrative style, were apparently intended for performance by ‘circular choruses’ at the Athenian festivals (the Great Dionysia or the Panathenaia), or at public festivals in major Panhellenic ritual centres like Delos or Delphi (two of these poems make reference to Apollo). Unlike the epinicians, which are identified by victor, event and the games at which the victory was won, all of the Bacchylidean dithyrambs on the London papyrus have titles that foreground the mythical content of the narrative. These titles, which date to the Alexandrian period, refer instead of the performance contexts and occasions of the odes to the myths they tell (a practice also attested for the dithyrambs of Simonides and Pindar). The question what these songs actually are and their place within the fifth-century development of the genre (see especially on Odes 17 and 23, below) has engendered a lively debate: see Fearn 2007 (cited in *Life and Works*): 163–337 and Käppel 2000 (in *Works*); also García Romero 1993, García Romero 2000, Bremer 2000, and Calame 2013. Zimmermann 1992 offers a history of the genre. Of the poems and fragments, odes 15-20 are from the London Papyrus, and nos. 21 (either from epinicians or dithyrambs) and 22-29 (from dithyrambs), highly fragmentary, are assembled from the indirect tradition and a variety of other papyri. D’Alessio 2013 is a new and original attempt at a synthesis of the contradictory ancient testimonia on the genre (the entire volume in which it and Calame 2013 appear is of course worth reading for anyone interested in the background of Bacchylides’ dithyrambic odes).


Comments on the performance of Bacchylides’ dithyrambs and their relationship to traditional cult song.


Very recent paper on the pragmatics and performance of the dithyrambic genre in archaic and classical Greece, with particular focus on the cultic aspects, from an important scholar of the ethnography of ancient Greek song.


Excellent and highly original general study of the ancient evidence for ‘dithyramb’ as a genre-classification in ancient Greek music, with extensive discussion of Bacchylides.


General study of Bacchylides’ dithyrambs.


Comments on the history of the dithyramb genre and attempts to define its characteristic features, including metre. Places the dithyrambs of Pindar and Bacchylides at a medial stage between archaic hymn genre and the New Music of late fifth-century Athens. Published in


Historical survey of the genre from the 7th c. BCE to the end of the fifth (pp. 64-116 provide an overview of Bacchylides surviving dithyrambs).

Ode 15
"The Sons of Antenor, or The Request for the Return of Helen". Composed probably for performance in Athens (Maehler argues for the Panathenaia), this ode tells the story from the Epic Cycle (Cypria) and the Iliad of the embassy by Odysseus and Menelaos to reclaim Helen at the start of the war. About 22 lines of the narrative are missing; the surviving section focuses on the assembly of the Trojans and Menelaos' speech. For "commentaries", see Smyth 1900 and Maehler 2004. For secondary literature, see Fearn 2007: 257-337 (cited in "Life and Works"), Maehler 1998, Pfeijffer 1999 (cited in "Ode 10"): 44-5, Bernardini 2005, and Danek 2005.


Excellent discussion of the structure and sources of the narrative.


Discusses Bacchylides' handling and relation to the earlier tradition in poetry and art.


Discusses the text and performance of the ode.

Ode 16
"Heracles", for the Delphians. A brief ode for performance at Delphi, perhaps in the winter months when Dionysus ruled the sanctuary and Apollo was with the Hyperboreans, perhaps intended to call Apollo homeward. It consists of a proem addressed to Apollo and a very brief narrative, allusive and ironic, concerning Heracles' conquest of Oechalia and his death, which progresses backwards to his meeting with Deianeira and Nessus. The final strophe focuses on Deianeira: some kind of interaction with Sophocles' Trachiniae was suggested already by Kenyon, and has been a commonplace of scholarship on the ode ever since, but the relationship of model and imitation is debated. For "commentaries", see Maehler 2004. For secondary literature, Burnett 1985: 114-28 (cited in "Life and Works"), Gentili 1958: 11-58 (cited in "Works"), Segal 1976 (cited in "Language, Diction, and Style"): 103-5, and Pfeijffer 1999 (cited in "Ode 10"): 51-55. On the myth, see Platter 1994; both March 1987 and Riemer 2004 conclude that Bacchylides' version depends on Sophocles'.


Excellent study of mythical and poetic tradition in the archaic and early Classical periods (pp. 47-78 concern our poem).


Studies the temporal construction of the myth and its use of irony.


Bacchylides' ode a response to Sophocles' play.

Ode 17
"The Youths" or "Theseus", for the Keanes. Perhaps the most famous of Bacchylides' songs and certainly the most written-about. Composed for a Keian chorus to perform at Delos (the final lines are addressed to Apollo, and the song may have been a paean rather than a dithyramb), it narrates the
Athenian hero Theseus' sea-journey to Crete, his confrontation with King Minos, and his plunge into the sea to prove his paternity by recovering his enemy's ring from the depths. The ode's use of the Theseus myth has proved fertile ground for scholarship, with work focusing on the ode's presentation of the hero, its genre, and its religious and political background. Maehler 1997 and Maehler 2004 (cited in "Commentaries") has argued that the ode is one of Bacchylides' earliest, and that the myth influenced early fifth-century Athenian vase painters. Others prefer to place it after 479 BCE and the rise of Athenian imperialism and the Delian League. These debates are lively and ongoing. For "commentaries", see Smyth 1900, Campbell 1982, de Martino and Vox 1996, Maehler 2004 (cited in "General Greek lyric commentaries"). For secondary literature, only a part of the extensive bibliography can be covered here. See Segal 1976 (cited in "Language, Diction, and Style"): 105-7; also Fränkel 1975 (cited in "Historical and Cultural Context"): 450-53, Burnett 1985: 15-37 (cited in "life and Works"), Bernardini 2005 (cited in "Ode 15"), Fearn 2007: 242-56, Kowalzig 2007: 88-94 and Athanassaki 2009: 208-319 (all cited in "Life and Works"). On the performance and genre of the ode (including earlier bibliography on the question), see Hose 1995, Calame 2009 and Tsagalis 2009; on the structure and symbolism (religious and political) of the myth, see Ieranò 1989; on connections to vase painting and date, Maehler 1991; for the alternative date after 479 and the politics of the ode, see (among others) Van Oeuveren 1999, Fearn 2011 (cited in "Historical Context, Patrons, Politics, and Performance") and Pavlou 2012. For a fresh approach to the influence of epic on Bacchylides, see Skempis 2011. Calame 2009b is an interesting anthropological reading; Palmisciano 2007 discusses possible influence of popular song genres and also of folktale. The ode's metrical construction has also been debated (see "Prosody and Metre").


Comparative anthropological reading that privileges the concept and poetics of gender.


Dates the ode to the 490s and argues that it is probably a dithyramb.


Important study of the ode's ethical and religious background.


Date of the ode and parallels in late archaic art.


Opens with a suggestive study of possible influences of folk song on passages in Alcman, Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides, before carrying out an extensive analysis of story motifs and narrative structure following the methods of Vladimir Propp.


Argues that the ode is a paean. Extensive, up-to-date bibliographical notes.


First published in Eranos 77 (1979): 23-37, the essay discusses initiatory and sexual symbolism in the myth.


Argues that Bacchylides’ ode is a site where two alternative views of epic narrative, ‘male’ heroic poetry of the Homeric sort and ‘female’ genealogical poetry on the model of Hesiod’s Catalogue of Women clash; and that this interplay of genres results in a systematic ironic undermining of the Homeric model.


Ode 18

"Theseus", for the Athenians. One of Bacchylides’ most masterful uses of dramatic irony, the poem is celebrated for its quasi-theatrical division of roles in a ‘sung dialogue’ over four alternating strophes between an actor/soloist/lead singer playing Aegeus, and the chorus. The ode was most likely commissioned by the Athenians for performance in Athens, perhaps at the Great Dionysia; or perhaps, as Merkelbach 1973a suggested, a festival connected to the Athenian ephebeia, where young men in the second year of their military service (for whom Theseus was a kind of ‘mythic prototype), demonstrated their dancing skills before the ekklesia. The ode presents the arrival of Theseus, still young and unknown and not yet a king, to Athens from his childhood exile in Troezen to claim his birthright. Its date and possible political context are still by no means secure. The ode is an important touchpoint for scholarly discussion of the genetic relationship (assumed by Aristotle’s Poetics) of dithyramb to tragedy. For "commentaries", see Smyth 1900, De Martino and Vox 1996, Maehler 2004, and Neri 2011. For secondary literature, Burnett 1985: 114-28, Athanassaki 2009: 80-91 (cited in "Life and Works"). On the possible occasion of performance see Merkelbach 1973a and Ieranò 1987, which describe performance at the Theseia festival which involved a group of ephebes (Theseus being the ideal Athenian ephebe). A variety of other possible festival contexts have been proposed: see Maehler 1997: 211 (cited in "Commentaries"). Barron 1980 argues (very speculatively) that the poem may reflect the career of Kimon and his sons, positing a date after 460 BCE, when Theseus’ relics were returned from Skyros to Athens, and when the Megarid, mentioned in the poem as the border of the polis, was under Athenian control. Arnould 2001 dates this ode, like 17, to the early 470s BCE. Genard 1997 discusses the relationship between the dithyramb and tragedy.


Ode 19
“Io, for the Athenians”. A short poem of great structural and narrative complexity, which narrates the rape and wanderings of Io. It is also also the only one of Bacchylides’ dithyrambs to mention Dionysus. It was possibly intended for performance at the Athenian Great Dionysia. For "commentaries", see Maehler 2004. For secondary literature, see Segal 1976 (cited in "Language, Diction, and Style"): 102-3; Garcia Romero 1994.


Discusses the text, metre, probable performance context, date, and the structure of the proem and finally the myth, focussing on how it varies from other extant poetic versions of the story.

**Ode 20**

("Idas, for the Lakedaimonians.") See Nobili 2013 and Colab 2012. Only the first 11 verses of this ode, composed apparently for performance at Sparta (perhaps at a festival of Artemis) survive, a passage that, with its allusion to wedding-performances by Spartan maiden choruses, may have influenced Theocritus' Helen poem (Idyll 18). The ode told the story of Idas, Euenos and Marpessa. An interesting example of 'choral projection': on which see Power 2000 (cited in "Ode 13"). For "commentaries", see Maehler 2004. For secondary literature, see Fearn 2007 (cited in "Life and Works"): 226-34 and Di Marzio 2006 (cited in "Dithyrambs") has a section that discusses the possibility of the ode being performed by women, and connects it to fr. 61 Maehler (on which see "Fragments").


Analyses the poem as an example of ‘choral projection’ (when a chorus imitates, assumes or alludes to the voice of another real or fictional chorus in its own performance).


Discusses Odes 20 and 20A in connection with the customs and practices of Spartan festivals.

**Odes 21-29**

Fragmentary dithyrambs follow. Ode 21 is a small fragment from the beginning of a column in the London Papyrus, and seems to come from an independent poem: mention is made of the Mantineans and their shields. Ode 23: ‘Cassandra’ is from P. Oxy. 2368, an ancient commentary on Bacchylides: it mentions a disagreement between Aristarchus, Callimachus and Dionysus of Phaselis about the genre-classification of the ode (paean or dithyramb?): it seems to have included the paean-cry. Small fragments of the ode survive, which allude to a sanctuary of Athena, and some kind of song-performance accompanied by auloi. The title must allude to a myth involving the daughter of Priam prophesying about the Trojan War. The ode is mentioned in the (5th CE) Horace commentary ascribed to Pomponius Porphyrio, where it is said to have influenced Hor. Carm. 1. 15 (‘hac ode Bacchylidem imitatur. nam ut ille Cassandram facit vaticinari futura belli Troiani, ita hic Proetum’): see Lefèvre 2000. For the debates surrounding the text and interpretation of this papyrus, see Rutherford 1991 and Ucciardello 1996-7. Odes 24-29 consist of small fragments, some of them restored from multiple papyri, of a narrative character and often incorporating direct speech, which can be best assigned to the Dithyrambs (of these poems, 26 have concerned Pasiphae and the bull of Crete, 27 Achilles, and 28 Orpheus). For discussion of these fragments, see Maehler 1997: ii, 273-86 (cited in "Commentaries"); on Ode 28, see Maehler 1999 (cited in "fr. 66").


Examination of the evidence for Bacchylides’ influence on Horace. (see "Collected Papers")


Examination of the treatment of Cassandra’s myth in several fifth-century poetic texts, with comments on ode 23 and its possible influence on Horace.
The fragments of Bacchylides, most of which come from the indirect tradition (i.e. quotations in later ancient authors) belong to a variety of genres: there are epinicians (fr. 1), hymns (fr. 1A-B, 2, 3), paean (fr. 4, a mixture of papyrus and secondary tradition, and fr. 5-6), dithyrambs (fr. 7-10), prosodia (fr. 11-13, processional songs), hyporchemata (fr. 14-16, songs for dancing), erotik (fr. 17-19, love songs), and encomia or skolia (fr. 20A-20G, from papyri in Oxford, and fr. 21). Many (usually smaller) fragments cannot be classified (fr. 21-52); and there are a number as well that may or may not be by Bacchylides, including the significant series fr. 60-64, published first in the 20th century from papyri in Florence, Oxford and Berlin. Fragments 65 and 66 were still printed as separate poems by Maehler, following Snell, in his edition of 1970 (see Maehler 1970 cited in *Editions*), but Maehler 2003 now accepts them as Bacchylidean, renumbering the old 65 to form part of Bacchylides odes 28 (old fr. 65, 1-10) and 29 (the rest of old fr. 65), while fr. 66 is now taken as part of fr. 44. This section lists specific bibliography for only the most important larger fragmentary poems, notably 1) the Paean (fr. 22 + fr. 4) with its famous ‘Hymn to Peace’, 2) the Prosodion fr. 11+fr.12, 3) the so-called Encomia (especially fr. 20A-20E), and 4) fr. 65; it also includes an entry 5) on the spurious Bacchylidean epigrams. For other literature, see “Bibliographies” and the relevant notes in Maehler 1997 (cited in *Editions*), fr. 11+12, fragments of a prosodion which survive in the same chapter of Stobaeus (metrical response shows they belonged to the same ode, and Stobaeus’ title indicates the existence of a separate Bacchylidean book of Prosodia or ‘processional songs’, are not listed separately below. Both fragments form part of a moralising argument about the need to retain a good mindset in the face of life’s troubles. fr. 11 is particularly striking poetry. No clues remain as to the performance context or purpose of the ode. For commentaries, see Smyth 1900 (cited in *General Greek lyric commentaries*) and Maehler 2004 (cited in *Commentaries*).

**fr. 22+4**

Paean to Apollo Pythiaeus, for Asine. A remarkable ode, and the only Bacchylidean paean of which substantial remains were preserved, mostly in the indirect tradition. It consists of several fragments, incorporating a long narrative section on a rare myth, known otherwise from Herodotus and Pausanias (see Maehler 1997: ii, 292-4, in “Commentaries” and Snell 1932). The surviving text begins with Herakles in the house of Keyx near Mount Parnassos before he defeats the Dryopes and brings them to Delphi as an offering to Apollo, and then goes with them at the god's request to found the city of Asine. The ode ended in a ‘Hymn to Peace’ that was quoted by Stobaeus and Plutarch: it is one of the most beautiful passages in Bacchylides, and unique in early fifth century poetry. *Commentaries* include Smyth 1900 and Maehler 2004. Secondary literature: the text was restored by Barrett 1954, a model example of papyrological reconstruction; on the poem in its context (the regionally important cult of Apollo Pythiaeus at Asine in the southern Argolid), see Kowalzig 2007 (cited in “Life and Works”): 132-60, who reveals traces of contemporary politics.


**fr. 20 A-G and fr. 21**

Encomia or skolia. Ancient quotations confirm the existence of a book of Bacchylidean *Encomia* (non-athletic praise poems) or *Skolia* (drinking-songs), but the texts come mostly from two Oxyrhynchus Papyri published in the 20th century. On the problem of defining poems of this genre (there is a similar problem in Pindar), see Harvey 1955 (cited in “Works”) and Budelmann 2012. The odes are marked, like Pindar’s of the same type, by a simple metrical structure based on short repeating strophes, very different from their epinicians and dithyrambs. In themes and metre alike, these fragments are more similar to monodic or symptic lyric of the kind practiced by Archilochos, Alkaios,
Sappho and Anacreon (see e.g. Gentili 1958 in "Works"; Cavallini 1998 and Danielewicz 2008) than to the longer praise- or sacred poems. frs. 20A and D are especially problematic. fr. 20A preserves a stretch of narrative about Marpessa and her father Euenos; the tone and content of the myth makes it unlikely this ever was a praise-poem. fr. 20B and C are both for royal patrons. fr. 20B, often thought to be one of Bacchylides' earliest surviving compositions, is a lively praise song for Alexander I of Macedon set in the context of the symposium and which makes imaginative use of sympotic lyric tropes. fr. 20C, for Hieron of Syracuse, is another praise-poem of sympotic character that makes reference to the patron's earlier athletic victories. fr. 20D mentions the grief of a mythological woman, developing an extended comparison with Niobe. fr. 20E seems to involve an Iliadic narrative about the death of Sarpedon. fr. 21 is a lovely short strophe set again in the context of the symposium. Much more work remains to be done on these intriguing fragments. Commentaries: Smyth 1900 on part of fr. 20B, also De Martino and Vox 1996; fr. 20 A to D have a full commentary in Maehler 2004.


**Discusses the skolion genre of sympotic choral song, focusing mainly on Pindar but with useful remarks on the Bacchylidean fragments.**


Discusses possible connections between fr. 20A and fr. 10 and 42 of Alcaeus, also mentioning thematic and verbal links to Archilochus and Anacreon.


Presents arguments for dating fr. 20C to 470-67 BCE.


Finds a possible link between fr. 20A and the 'New Sappho', and defends a different supplement to the text.


Argues that fr. 20A is not an encomium, but probably rather a dithyramb intended (like Ode 20, above) for performance at a Spartan cult-festival.


Recent study of Bacchylides fr. 20D.


Important early study of the (then new) fragments 20B and C, also with notes on the dating of Bacchylides' life.


"fr. 60-66"
These fragments from a variety of papyri were published by Snell in the Bacchylidean dubia (see Maehler 1970 cited in "Editions") and their authenticity has often been doubted. Davison 1934 argues that fr. 60 and 61 are Simonidean; Page 1941 argues that the evidence for either Bacchylidean or Simonidean authorship is not strong. Fr. 65 and fr. 66 have since been accepted by Maehler 2003 (cited in "Editions") as authentic Bacchylidean poems. For reconstruction and literary discussion of fr. 65 and 66, see Maehler 1999.


The pseudo-Bacchylidean Epigrams
Snell 1970 prints two spurious Bacchylidean epigrams: both dedications. One (Anth. Pal. 6, 313) apparently celebrates a victory by the poet (the text is uncertain, and probably Hellenistic in date); the other (Anth. Pal. 6, 53), is a dedication (probably fictional) by one Eudemos of a temple to the West Wind. For closer discussion, see Page 1981: 149-52.


Language, Diction, and Style

Dolfi, Ezio. 2010. Storia e funzione degli aggettivi in Bacchilide. Universita degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Scienze dell’ Antichita “Giorgio Pasquali”. Studi e testi vol. 28. Firenze. Historical study of Bacchylides’ epithets, which aims to show the sources and traditions on which his diction draws.


Formal functioning of gnomai in Bacchylides, with emphasis on the epinicians.


Sensitive analysis of several Bacchylidean poems focusing on tone, use of epithets, and poetic diction.

**Prosody and Metre**

This section does not list introductory works on Greek metre. Bacchylides’ metre has much in common with Pindar’s: his odes are either triadic or monostrophic, and most fall into one of two groups: dactyloepitrite or iono-aecolic: for the basic facts, see Maehler 1997 or Maehler 2004. (Irigoin et al. 1993 also has a useful section on metre: for all these see "Editions" and "Commentaries"). Bacchylides’ dactyloepitrites (the metre in which the larger part of his surviving odes, including almost all his longer epinicians and dithyrambs, are composed, differ from Pindar’s in several respects: see Barrett 1956 (with earlier bibliography) and Rossi 2008. Ode 3 is unique in that the strophes/antistrophes are aecolic while the epode is in dactyloepitrites: see Irigoin 1984. Ode 16 is composed entirely in iambics. The metrical form of Ode 17 is unique (it is similar but not identical to Pind. Ol. 2 and fr. 541 PMG of Simonides) and poses real problems for metrical theorists (not least because of the apparent freedom of responsion in the papyrus. Multiple interpretations exist: the most convincing derives the poem’s form from cretic/paenic metre: Merkelbach 1973b and Maehler 2004: 17 (for interpretations based on a loosely iamb-trochaic model see West 1980 with earlier bibliography). All solutions require emendations to the papyrus text. Recently, there has been debate about the extent to which the colometry (i.e. line-divisions) of Bacchylides’ papryi represent the original rhythmical phrases of the songs as they were performed in the fifth century (a question also for the texts of Pindar and tragedy): for a taste, see the preface to Snell 1970 (cited in "Editions"), Gentili 1974, Nagy 2000, Gentili and Lomiento 2001 and Parker 2001. Slings 2000, taking Ode 5 as his main illustration, discusses Bacchylides’ use of metrical boundaries to aid the comprehensibility of his text in oral performance.


Presents the other side of the argument to Parker 2001.


Metrical analysis of the ode which emphasises its links to aecolic and iono monody.


Interpretation of Bacchylides ode 17 and Pindar, Ol. 2.


Uses the papyrus to reconstruct the ancient system of voiced reading.


Sceptical discussion of verse-divisions in the main Bacchylidean papyrus and their implications for the Alexandrians’ knowledge of classical metre.


Study of dactylo-epitrite metre which refers to debates and presents a new conspectus metrorum for Pindar and Bacchylides.
Use of Myth and Narrative Technique
Bacchylides' treatment of his myths differs in many respects from Pindar's, and his narrative technique has been a fruitful area of literary exploration in recent years. Kirkwood 1966 is an early and still important discussion, one of the first to try to establish Bacchylides as a narrative artist in his own right; see also Suárez de la Torre 2000, Rengakos 2000, Cairns 2010 (in "Commentaries and Texts"), and Fearn 2012; material on specific myths can also be found in Maehler's commentaries. For comparison of the narrator's voice in Pindar and Bacchylides see Carey 1999 (in "Life and Works") and Pfeijffer 2004. Nünlist 2007 discusses temporality in choral lyric, dedicating a few pages (pp. 247-51) to Bacchylides; Currie 2012 discusses space in Pindaric and Bacchylidean narrative.

Discusses space in Pindaric and Bacchylidean narrative, with useful material especially on imaginary travel by the speaker/performer of the poem.

Studies Bacchylides' relation to Homer, focusing particularly on his use of direct speech and similes.

Discusses the basic forms that time and narrative structure take in Pindaric and Bacchylidean narrative.

Studies the narrator's voice, primarily in Pindaric and Bacchylidean epinicians.

Focuses on Bakchylides' endings and use of irony, and examines possible models in the tradition for his narrative style.

Studies B.'s myths particularly in relation to their occasions or ritual contexts, with sections on the dithyrambs and the epinicians, and inquires why B. chooses the myths he does.
Historical Context, Patrons, Politics, and Performance

Recent work on Pindar and Bacchylides, particularly the epinicians and especially over the last decade, has begun to focus more strongly on their songs’ relationship to the society of their times, and to social, religious and political subtexts. Fearn 2007 and Kowalzig 2007 (both in “Live and Works”) offer examples of how this approach, often characterised as ‘New Historicism’, can be applied to a close reading of the text. Hornblower and Morgan 2007 is a selection of articles covering the cultural and social context of epinician poetry; much of which, like the prosopographically-based studies in Hornblower 2004, can be applied to Bacchylides as well. On epinician prosopography see also Neumann-Hartmann 2008. Many of the chapters in Agócs, et al. 2012 also engage with these problems. On the culture of Greek athletics and the place of epinician poetry within it, see Golden 1998 and Mann 2001. On the performance of choral poetry, particularly epinician, see Neumann-Hartmann 2010 and Athanassaki 2009 (in “Life and Works”). For the relationship of poet and patron, see Mann 2000; on Bacchylides and Hieron see Luraghi 2010 and Arnson Svarlien 1991; on Keian song-culture, see Fearn 2011a; on Bacchylides’ poems for Aegina, Fearn 2011b. Those interested in these questions should consult the entry on Pindar as well.

Excellent unpublished PhD dissertation that deals with Hieron the tyrant and the poets who worked for him.

Study of Bacchylides’ odes 1, 2 and 17, focused on what the poems can tell us about Cean local politics and the island’s relationship to imperial Athens.

Collection of articles on a single island city-state whose elite commissioned several victory odes from Pindar and Bacchylides: chapter 5 by Fearn is particularly useful for Bacchylidean background, as is Andrew Morrison’s piece in the book, who treats the question of intertextual dialogue between Pindar’s fifth Nemean and Bacchylides’ 13th ode (see “Works”).

Chapter 5 (pp. 129-266) contains stimulating discussion of the patrons and historical context of Pindaric and Bacchylidean epinician; the book also has some interesting observations (see the indices) on politics, religion and style.

Collection of essays on the social and historical background of epinician poetry.

Examines the way the figure of the tyrant is presented in victory odes of Pindar and Bacchylides.

Studies the relationship of Pindaric and Bacchylidean epinician to society.

Prosopographical essay on the athletes celebrated in the victory ode of Pindar and Bacchylides.

Discussion of performance contexts of Pindaric and Bacchylidean victory odes.

Reception
On the reception and textual history of Bacchylides, see first of all the works cited in *Historical and Cultural Context* and *Life and Works*: Stern 1970 is a useful if dated survey of the poet’s critical reception in modern times. There are few clear allusions in classical poets (except perhaps in Horace, on which see: Lefèvre 2000 (cited in "Ode 23"); the disappearance of his poems until the 1890s meant his disappearance from the record, and a reception-history largely confined to modern scholarship. Hadjimichael 2011 concentrates on Bacchylides’ audiences, his fifth-century influence, and the pre-Hellenistic history of the text. On Bacchylides’ status for early Christian anthologizers see Opelt 1975. On the shenanigans surrounding the ‘rediscovery’, ‘purchase’ or theft of the London papyrus, see Fearn 2010.

Studies the effect (both on early readers and on the physical fabric of the Bacchylides papyrus itself) of a disturbing combination of imperialist deviousness, neo-classicist idealism, and museum collecting policy.

Studies Bacchylides’ fifth-century reception and the early history of the text; soon to appear as a book.

Examines the criteria of selection used by anthologists, especially Clement of Alexandria, in preserving fragments of the lyric poets.

Influential systematic overview of the older criticism on the poet, from the rediscovery of his odes to the late 1960s.