Check for updates

Greece & Rome (2026), 73.1 48–75 © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that no alterations are made and the original article is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press or the rights holder(s) must be obtained prior to any commercial use and/or adaptation of the article.
doi:10.1017/S0017383525100545

THE 'PROBLEM OF UNITY' IN PINDAR: AN OLD CHESTNUT, NEW PERSPECTIVES*

The article considers unity and its counterpart, digression, as themes within Pindar's own poetry, rather than a 'problem' for criticism to 'solve'. The article considers Pindar's treatment of action, time, and place (the so-called 'Aristotelian unities') alongside the modern critical concept of deixis (temporal, spatial, and person deixis). The property of indexical statements of being centred on a certain person, place, or time ('me', 'here', 'now'; 'him', 'there', 'then') makes them naturally conducive to the creation of centripetal or centrifugal dynamics in a Pindaric ode, according to whether the implied deictic centre is constant or variable. It is argued that an important way of understanding Pindaric unity is as a complex equilibrium and counterpointing of competing and complementary principles of centripetalism and centrifugalism, not only acting within and across the areas of action, time, place, and person, but also observable in Pindar's handling of grammatical, metrical, and thematic structures.

Keywords: Pindar, unity, centripetalism, centrifugalism, counterpoint, deixis, action, place, time

Unity as a 'problem' in Pindaric criticism: an overview

Unity, an issue in literary criticism more broadly, is said to be *the* cardinal issue of Pindaric criticism.[1] Referred to as the 'problem of

*I am grateful for comments and suggestions to Denis Feeney and Philip Hardie, as well as to the journal's anonymous reader.

[1] See E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte: Textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert, mit einer Analyse der pindarischen Epinikien* (Heidelberg, 1968), i.7; D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of* Pythian *11*, Pythian *3, and* Olympian *7* (Leiden, 1968), 63; D. C. Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', in W. M. Calder and J. Stern (eds.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt, 1970), 2; A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unity',[2] it invites us to reflect on what kind of a problem this is. Usually, it is regarded as a problem of Pindaric criticism. The problem is then the product of a discrepancy between the critic's expectation of what the poem ought to be about and their perception of what it is actually about, and the critic's task is to eliminate the discrepancy, the 'problem' being one either to be solved or else to be revealed as somehow a non-problem. One simple solution is flatly to deny the presence of unity in Pindar's odes.[3] The requirement for unity and coherence, it has been pointed out, is a 'cultural variable'.[4] It may thus be mistaken to impose a 'centripetal aesthetic' on poems that were themselves more 'centrifugally conceived'.[5] On the other hand, others have insisted on the presence of unity in Pindar's odes, but have differed as to how to define it, wherein they suppose unity to reside, whether they require a high or a low level of unity from a Pindaric ode,[6] and whether they consider all of Pindar's odes to be answerable to the same requirement of unity.[7]

The many different approaches that have been taken in scholarship to the 'problem of unity' have been surveyed and critiqued in several valuable histories of Pindaric criticism.[8] This discussion will not attempt to replicate these. Instead, it will offer a cursory overview of some trends in scholarship, before taking a different tack, suggesting

Pindargedichten (Berlin and New York, 1971), 1–2; G. W. Most, 'Des verschieden Gesinnten Sinnesverbindung: Zur poetischen Einheit der Alten', in K. Gloy and E. Rudolph (eds.), *Einheit als Grundlage der Philosophie* (Darmstadt, 1985), 10; C. Lattmann, *Das Gleiche im Verschiedenen. Metapher des Sports und Lob des Siegers in Pindars Epinikien* (Berlin and New York, 2010), 1; E. Krummen, *Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes: A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian 3* (Prenton, 2014), 12–13; C. Brown, 'Pindar', in L. Swift (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Lyric* (Hoboken, NJ, 2022), 344. In literary criticism in general: e.g. R. H. Fogle and J. Barnouw, 'Unity', in *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton, fourth online edn, 2017); in antiquity: Most (n. 1), 1–29; M. Heath, *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (London, 1987), 98–111; M. Heath, *Unity in Greek Poetics* (Oxford, 1989); A. Ford, 'Unity in Greek Criticism and Poetry' (review of Heath 1989), *Arion* 1.3 (1991), 125–54; L. E. Rossi, 'L'unità dell'opera letteraria: gli antichi e noi', in *κληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο. Scritti editi e inediti*, vol. iii: *Critica letteraria e storia degli studi* (Berlin and Boston, 2020), 109–21.

[2] As is standardly the case: e.g. Young (n. 1, 1970), 2; cf. C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York, 1981), 7; Most (n. 1), 10.

[3] On these 'anti-unitarians' (including Drachmann, Dornseiff, and Wilamowitz), see, conveniently, Young (n. 1, 1970), 12, 15, 43–58; cf. Krummen (n. 1), 13, cf. 19–20.

[4] Heath (n. 1, 1989), 150; cf. 149, 153, 155; cf. 2, 9; also Rossi (n. 1).

[5] Heath (n. 1, 1989), esp. 5–11, 149, 150, 155, 171 ('General Index' s.v. 'centrifugal/centripetal'). Contrast Köhnken (n. 1), 229 and n. 42.

[6] High: G. W. Most, *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second* Pythian *and Seventh* Nemean *Odes* (Göttingen, 1985), 47. Low: M. Heath, 'The Origins of Modern Pindaric Criticism', *JHS* 106 (1986), 85–98; Heath (n. 1, 1989); Rossi (n. 1).

[7] Heath (n. 1, 1989), 155, n. 3; M. S. Silk, 'Reading Pindar', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge, 2012), 358; cf. Thummer (n. 1), i.9–10.

[8] Especially Young (n. 1, 1970), 1–95; Heath (n. 6, 1986); Heath (n. 1, 1989), 143–6, 148–9. See also Thummer (n. 1), i.7–13; Most (n. 6), 31–2, 39–49; Krummen (n. 1), 12–37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

how unity is problematized in Pindar's poetry itself, rather than in the criticism of the poetry.

The most fundamental, perhaps naïve, approach taken in Pindaric criticism to the problem of unity has been to posit a single 'basic thought' (*summa sententia*, *Grundgedanke*) that the whole poem is seeking to convey, frequently identified with a maxim at the start of the poem; this approach typified nineteenth-century Pindaric criticism.[9] Thus, the *summa sententia* of *Pythian* 5 was discovered in the *gnome* in the first five lines of the poem.[10] This approach has been criticized for trading on a 'fallacy of paraphrasable content'.[11] The idea that a work of art can be summed up in a single commonplace ought not to hold more appeal with epinician than, for instance, with tragedy.[12] Nor should the *gnomai* of a Pindaric ode be assumed to deliver unqualified truths, but rather partial, defeasible ones.[13] For all that, there is something to be salvaged in the *Grundgedanke* method.[14] It is plausible that *gnomai* contribute to the meaning of the ode, even if they cannot be said themselves to constitute that meaning.

The attempt to find unity in a single recurring image incurs a similar objection:[15] images, like *gnomai*, are organic, evolving things, not readily susceptible to paraphrase.[16] Images, again, may contribute to unity, but they do not suffice to confer it. Still, they may play an important auxiliary role in the creation of unity.[17]

'Historical allegory' is a method, employed by ancient as well as modern scholars, of creating a link between the mythological narrative and the praise of the victor (and perhaps also *gnomai*).[18] The idea that positing some historical circumstance can suddenly unlock all the arcana of a Pindaric ode represents this approach in an untenably extreme form.[19] Even when the critic may be justified in positing some

[9] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 3–36.
[10] Ibid., 4.
[11] Ibid., 19, 24, 33, 34, 35.
[12] Ibid., 7. On tragedy, compare R. G. A. Buxton, *Sophocles* (Oxford, second edn, 1995), 23; Heath (n. 1, 1989), 37–8, 76–7; R. B. Rutherford, *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation* (Cambridge, 2012), 367–8; M. E. Wright, *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics* (London, 2012), 152.
[13] B. G. F. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford, 2005), 78–81. Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 26.
[14] Ibid., 19, 22, 36, 46, 89.
[15] G. Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley, 1945), 94–164.
[16] Young (n. 1, 1970), 25–6 (Croiset), 34–5 (Fraccaroli), 75–8; Krummen (n. 1), 23–4.
[17] Cf. Krummen (n. 1), 72–3, 96, 342 ('Subject Index' s.v. 'image, imagery'); Most (n. 6), e.g. 57–9.
[18] Schol. *Isthm.* 1.1 Inscr. a; see also A. B. Drachmann (ed.), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina* (Leipzig, 1903–1927), iii.196.11–18, Index xx 'Sermo technicus', s.v. αἰνίττομαι.
[19] Young (n. 1, 1970), 9–11 (Boeckh), 20, 42–3, 45–6, 59 (Bornemann). Cf. Krummen (n. 1), 19 (Wilamowitz).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

historical circumstance of which the mythological narrative is an allegorical reflection, this can only produce a partial account of the unity of an ode.[20] It is also unsatisfactory when literary criticism devolves into a (pseudo-)historical guessing-game (of course, it is also fully possible to conduct historicizing criticism in a careful and informed way).

At the opposite end of the critical spectrum to historical allegory are structuralist approaches to unity: most influentially, Bundy's *Studia Pindarica*.[21] Such studies tackle the perception that 'the movement within an epinikion often appears random and the ode's structure incoherent'.[22] Armed with proper 'knowledge of the expected parts and their order', audiences, it is argued, were able to experience the odes as unities.[23] Individual utterances that seem to lack relevance or cohesion with what preceded or followed are revealed to do so when subsumed under general categories: Bundy's various motifs (in Bundy's preferred spelling, 'motives'), themes, and topics.[24] Nothing, it turns out, is irrelevant or digressive: everything conduces to the programme of praise.[25] Bundy does away with an abiding conception of Pindar's poetry as having 'a dual unity',[26] an 'objective purpose' (praise of the victor, the poet's actual commission) and a 'subjective purpose' (the poet's own personal agenda),[27] a conception borne both of critics' difficulty in relating some parts of the odes to the actual commission and also of a sense, which evidently Bundy did not share, that commissioned praise alone did not amount to real poetry.[28]

Various objections can be made: for instance, that Bundy elevates praise or the climactic naming of the victor ('name cap') to the status of a unifying factor;[29] that he dismisses much that is essential to the poem

[20] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 89–90, and see below.

[21] E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley, 1962), with a significant forerunner in W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle, 1928); note also Thummer (n. 1); W. H. Race, *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta, 1990); R. Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (The Hague, 1974).

[22] Hamilton (n. 21), 1. Contrast the perception of the odes as a '*beau désordre*' (Boileau, cited by Young [n. 1, 1970], 3, n. 4; Krummen [n. 1], 13).

[23] Hamilton (n. 21), 85. Cf. Most (n. 6), 45 and n. 17; Krummen (n. 1), 24; A. C. Sigelman, *Pindar's Poetics of Immortality* (Cambridge, 2016), 7–8.

[24] Bundy (n. 21), 'Subject Index', s.vv.

[25] Ibid., 3–4.

[26] Young (n. 1, 1970), 8–9, 20 (Schmidt), 32, 61 (Bundy as reacting to Dissen, Boeckh, Fraccaroli, Schadewaldt, et al.).

[27] Young (n. 1, 1970), 8 (Boeckh), 32 (Fraccaroli), 60–3 (Schadewaldt), cf. 90: 'the traditional praise of the victor' versus 'the personal ideas of the poet'.

[28] Compare the distinction of a 'personal voice' and a 'public voice' in Virgilian criticism (A. Parry, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2.4 [1963], 66–80).

[29] Young (n. 1, 1970), 86; Silk (n. 7), 351–2; Most (n. 6), 41.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(in particular, the mythical narratives) as mere 'foil' or 'decorative';[30] that he overemphasizes the 'linear development' of ideas in an ode, at the expense of non-linear structures (such as ring-composition or counterpoint).[31] More fundamentally, it offers an understanding only on the abstract, not the concrete level (*langue*, not *parole*).[32] It is a bit like being told that a sentence is a perfectly-formed unity because it has a subject, verb, object, etc., but not what it may have meant for a particular person to have uttered the particular sentence to another particular person in a particular situation. Further, the epinician poet risks, on this analysis, becoming little more than a shuffler of conventional elements.[33]

In the history of Pindaric criticism, the search for unity has too often been conducted in a monistic vein.[34] Critics who have entered the battleground of Pindaric unity have typically contended that something, one thing, in the odes is being missed, and that systematically. For some, the critical desideratum is to make good deficiencies in their predecessors' literary or historical sensibilities, by discovering a basic idea, underlying image, or presupposed historical circumstance that would confer unity.[35] For others, it is a more general type of ignorance that needs remedying: for instance, of the rhetorical 'grammar' of epinician;[36] of the nature of the odes' occasions of performance, at civic festivals or symposia;[37] of the heroizing tendency of fifth-century Greek culture, with its intrinsic capacity to conflate mythical heroes and athletic victors.[38] A fundamental difference here is whether we opt to look inside or outside the ode for unity. Historicizing approaches are often opposed to text-immanent ones.[39] Yet these are crucially misconceived as mutually exclusive. Approaches that sideline one or the

[30] Cf. Köhnken (n. 1), 227; Most (n. 6), 214; Lattmann (n. 1), 2. See, however, Race (n. 21), 7.
[31] Young (n. 1, 1970), 87–8 ('the term "unity" means little more than consecutiveness in Pindar's work'); Thummer (n. 1), i.11; Krummen (n. 1), 24–5; but see also Race (n. 21), 6–7. For counterpoint in Pindar's odes, see below.
[32] Currie (n. 13), 14.
[33] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 107–8; Köhnken (n. 1), 227–8.
[34] Young (n. 1, 1970), 76: 'the hopeless attempt, frequent in Pindaric studies, to solve a multitude of problems by a single simple discovery, the hope, in other words, for a short cut to serious criticism'; cf. Young (n. 1, 1968), 106: 'the woeful inadequacy of another common critical method, which seeks to grasp the meaning and art of the ode in some monotone, such as a homogeneous and all-embracing thought, symbol, or latent topical reference'.
[35] Norwood (n. 15), 116: 'our utmost subtlety'.
[36] Bundy (n. 21), 32–3; cf. 3–4.
[37] Krummen (n. 1).
[38] Currie (n. 13).
[39] Silk (n. 7).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other are unlikely to give more than a partial account of the problem.[40] We should not be looking for a silver bullet to the problem of unity. Different aspects of the problem are capable of being illuminated by each of the approaches surveyed here. It is in fact the exclusive privileging of just one of these that has perpetuated the 'problem' of unity in Pindaric criticism. It will also be apparent how discussion of the problem of unity in Pindaric criticism is apt to become coextensive with the debate about how to conduct Pindaric criticism *tout court*.

Reacting to the deficiencies of the monistic approach, a number of scholars writing in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s concurred both that unity must result from the harmonious combination of multiple (or even 'all') features of an ode, and that this was realized in a unique way in each ode.[41] These scholars thus developed a suitably complex and holistic approach to the question of unity that was more adequate to the material; yet they avoided espousing general principles about Pindaric unity such as might be transferable from one poem to another. Alone the ability to demonstrate unity in the most difficult odes (such as *Pyth.*2, *Pyth.*11, *Nem.*7) was taken to imply *a fortiori* that some other demonstration of unity would be possible also for the less difficult odes.[42]

The term 'new perspectives' in this article's title refers to the intention of espousing some general principles about Pindaric unity that may be transferable from one poem to another.

Unity as a theme in Pindaric epinician

We should remember that Pindar's 'digressions' are not just a preoccupation of his critics (ancient and modern).[43] Digression is thematized by Pindar in his earliest datable ode (*Pyth.* 10.53–4). The poet claims to feel himself 'pulled' in a particular direction (*Nem.* 4.35;

[40] Text-immanent approaches are sidelined by Wilamowitz (Young [n 1, 1970], 39, 52–4), historicizing ones by Bundy (Krummen [n. 1], 24) and, differently, Silk (n. 7), 347–64.

[41] Young (n. 1, 1968), 64: 'a multiplicity of phenomena cause the various parts of the poem to combine to form a unit'; 105: 'The "unity" of the ode, then, depends on many contributing factors, some easy to discern and to describe, others more difficult'. Köhnken (n. 1), 227: '"Unity" must be understood as the interplay and intertwining of the poem's motifs'; 231: 'None of the six poems are alike' (translated from the German). Most (n. 6), 48: 'the unity of a Pindaric poem is derived not from any single element or group of elements within it, but rather from the formal design whereby *all* the elements are integrated into a coherent totality'; 48: 'each Pindaric ode ... is unique'.

[42] See Most (n. 6), 49, for this *a fortiori* argument. *Pyth.*2 is treated by Most (n. 6); *Pyth.*11 by Young (n. 1, 1968), Most (n. 1); *Nem.*7 by Köhnken (n. 1), Most (n. 6).

[43] For 'digression' in ancient Pindaric scholarship, see Drachmann (n. 18), iii.390 s.vv. παρεκβαίνω, παρέκβασις; Heath (n. 1, 1989), 160–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cf. *Pyth*. 11.38–40, *Nem*. 3.26-8). 'To an extent ... the problem of unity is provoked by Pindar himself.'[44] The problem of unity here is neither a critical problem to be solved nor a critical chimaera, but a real feature of the poetry that demands to be recognized and appreciated. Callimachus, in the *Aetia* and *Hecale*, and Apollonius, in the *Argonautica*, make play with ideas of poetic unity.[45] These Alexandrian poets were reacting to Aristotle's strictures that poetry should have a 'unified plot' and 'unitary action' (*Poetics* ch. 8). If Pindar were doing something similar, then he would be engaging with ideas of unity in a pre-Aristotelian and pre-theoretical context; poetic practice would here (as often) be well in advance of theory, and Pindar would be in the vanguard, anticipating (here as in certain other respects) the Alexandrians.[46] On such a scenario, Pindar's own thematizations of (ir)relevance would not be just part of his 'oral subterfuge', or pretence of stream-of-consciousness composition.[47] They would be rather a considered and self-conscious engagement with notions of poetic composition. Such 'modern' concepts (if that is what they are) should not be foisted on an ancient poet lightly; only a reading of the texts themselves can determine whether we are warranted in attributing them to Pindar. Pindar's handling of *action*, *time*, and *place* are obvious places to look for any self-conscious engagement with unity. These were singled out in the Renaissance and Early Modern period as the 'Classical (or Aristotelian) unities'.[48] Although that label is problematic, the Attic tragedians themselves were keenly aware of the significance of action, time, and place, and could handle them boldly; so too, already, could Homer.[49] Also relevant is the modern concept of deixis, which implies a (singular) *origo*, the implied point of reference for pronominal, spatial, and temporal indexical statements, e.g. those featuring 'I', 'here', and 'now'.[50] The idea of statements being referred to

[44] Most (n. 6), 39.

[45] G. O. Hutchinson, 'Hellenistic Epic and Homeric Form', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and †R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford, 2006), 105–29; cf. Heath (n. 1, 1989), 56–70.

[46] Pindar as anticipating the Alexandrians: J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels, 1967), 45–8.

[47] Carey (n. 2), 8.

[48] Cf. Rossi (n. 1), 110.

[49] N. J. Lowe, *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge, 2000), 164–5, 170, 180 (tragedians), 129–37 (Homer).

[50] See especially N. Felson (ed.), *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric*. Special issue, *Arethusa* 37.3 (2004); E. van Emde Boas, 'Deixis and World Building', in L. Swift (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Lyric* (Hoboken, NJ, 2022), 162–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such a stable *origo* (or not) overlaps with ideas of centripetalism or centrifugalism in an ode.[51]

The present discussion cannot be comprehensive. Its aim is to indicate certain tendencies of Pindar's epinician poetry, by drawing eclectically on the extant corpus. The tendencies in question are not evidenced in every single ode, and perhaps no one ode evidences them all at once. Nevertheless, the tendencies are real and demonstrable. The tendencies in question concern the creation of multiple dynamic equilibria between diversifying (or centrifugal) and unifying (or centripetal) treatment of various elements in the ode, and the offsetting or counterpointing of these against each other. The approach taken here is necessarily a generalizing one. It is an alternative to analysing all (or, in practice, selected) odes individually, seeking to demonstrate unity, and perhaps 'consistency of thought' or 'coherency of expression'[52] or 'compositional unity'[53] in each one. That approach ('the integrated interpretation of individual poems')[54] has been adopted fruitfully elsewhere,[55] though with the drawback, as noted above, of not leading to readily transferable or generalizable conclusions.

Unity of action?

Epinician does not have a 'unified plot' or 'unitary action' of the kind envisaged by Aristotle. It has, typically, two types of action, one (at least) involving mythological heroes, and one (at least) involving the laudandus and/or relative(s).[56] 'The problem of unity … resolves itself ultimately into the problem of the relationship between the myth and the rest of the ode.'[57]

For long stretches of mythological narration, Pindar and Bacchylides seem to behave very much like the 'lyric epic' poets of the sixth century BCE (exemplified for us by Stesichorus).[58] In their mythological

[51] See above, n. 5.
[52] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 5–6, 19, 26, 34.
[53] Most (n. 6), 42 *et alias*.
[54] Köhnken (n. 1), 228.
[55] E.g. Young (n. 1, 1968); Köhnken (n. 1); Most (n. 1), 1–29; id. (n. 6).
[56] Cf. B. G. F. Currie, 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in I. J. F. de Jong (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden and Boston, 2012), 286.
[57] Carey (n. 2), 7. Cf. Köhnken (n. 1), 13–14, 228–9; cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 44 (on Drachmann), 48 (on Romagnoli).
[58] For the term 'lyric epic', see M. L. West, 'Epic, Lyric, and Lyric Epic', in P. J. Finglass and A. Kelly (eds.), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge, 2015), 75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

narratives, the epinician poets have their eyes trained on the canonical hexameter narratives of (especially) the Epic Cycle and Pseudo-Hesiod (less frequently, Homer), which, just like their lyric epic predecessors, they are concerned to transpose from recited hexameter verse into the sung-and-danced medium of choral lyric: *Nemean* 10 does this with the *Cypria*, *Pythian* 3 with the Coronis-*ehoeë* of the *Catalogue of Women*, and Bacchylides Ode 13 with Book 15 of the *Iliad*.[59] Stesichorus, however, had the luxury of performing extensive heroic mythological narratives in choral song without having to accommodate any specific occasion or patron.[60] The epinician poets were differently placed. Theirs was an occasional, commissioned poetry. The problem of the divergence of the mythical narration from the occasion or commission is variously registered in ancient critical discourse on epinician poetry. The Simonidean biographical tradition featured an anecdote in which a patron withheld half the fee, telling Simonides to get the rest from the Dioscuri, to whom he had devoted half the praise (Simon. fr. 510 *PMG*). A Pindaric scholion records the criticism that the mythical narrative of *Nemean* 1 'has no germaneness to the present circumstances' (Σ 1.49c).

The problem of a perceived mismatch between the performance occasion ('the here-and-now') and the mythological narration ('the there-and-then') is not confined to epinician. In antiquity it was cavilled against Phrynichus and Aeschylus, contemporaries of the epinician poets, that their tragedies, dealing with heroic mythological subjects, had 'nothing to do with Dionysus', the point being that tragedy, performed at Dionysiac festivals (Dionysia, Lenaea), ought to have been drawing its subject matter from Dionysiac myth.[61] One modern scholarly response to the apparent disjunction of the there-and-then with the here-and-now in tragedy is to posit that the subject matter of the earliest choral songs out of which tragedy developed had in fact originally been Dionysiac myth, and that the heroic myths favoured by historical tragedy are extensions of or,

[59] B. G. F. Currie, 'Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry: The Special Case of Epinician', *Trends in Classics* 13.2 (2021), 292–9.

[60] W. Burkert, 'The Making of Homer in the 6th Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichorus', in *Kleine Schriften*, vol. I, *Homerica* (Göttingen, 2001), 210. For choral performance of Stesichorus' poems as being 'now the majority view', see P. J. Finglass and A. Kelly, 'The state of Stesichorean studies', in Finglass and Kelly (n. 58), 12.

[61] Plutarch *Table-Talk* 615a.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more or less obliquely, analogically related to Dionysiac myth and are therefore able to deputize for it.[62]

The equivalent argument, that the heroic myth narrated is analogically related to the patron's achievement(s), is actually easier to make with epinician. An analogical relation between the two types of action is occasionally explicit. In Bacchylides' third ode, Hiero is said, like Croesus, to have made many dedications at Delphi and to have thus secured Apollo's favour (61–6). In Pindar's *Pythian* 2, Cinyras' celebration in song by the Cyprians, in gratitude for some service or other, is explicitly paralleled with Hiero's celebration in song by the maiden(s) of Locri, for saving them from the dangers of war (15–20). How far to press the analogy even when it is made explicit, beyond what is made explicit, remains a key critical problem. 'Myths are examples, but are also different.'[63] The question remains, how different? What details are to be pressed and how far? How applicable, for instance, are Croesus' posthumous translation or Cinyras' hero cult to Hiero?

To speak of 'analogical relations' is, crucially, to recognize both divergence and convergence between the two types of action. The type of analogy with which epinician operates is always eclectic, sometimes eccentric, never a thoroughgoing or systematic allegory. Analogical relations come only sporadically into more-or-less sharp focus. We are thus entitled to say that there is both a centrifugal and centripetal principle in play.

Where an analogical relation between the mythical narration and the encomiastic occasion is not made explicit, the existence of such a relation may be intimated by certain formal features (for instance, by verbal echoes);[64] or it may be intimated simply by the fact that the there-and-then and the here-and-now occupy metrically (and musically and choreographically) identical parts of the ode.[65] An analogical relation is most forcefully suggested, however, when the there-and-then and the here-and-now converge in content. In *Isthmian* 6, the prayer of the Theban Heracles for the prowess of his Aeginetan host Telamon's

[62] C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 2003), 149–54; cf. R. Friedrich, 'Everything to Do With Dionysos? Ritualism, the Dionysiac, and the Tragic', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford, 1996), 271–2; H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Ritual and Tragedy', in F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale* (Stuttgart, 1998), 274, 294, 295. Differently, P. E. Easterling, 'A Show for Dionysos', in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1997), 46–7.

[63] G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford, 2001), 347.

[64] See Currie (n. 13), 225, n. 123 (where add D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* [London, 1986], 24–5).

[65] D. S. Carne-Ross, *Pindar* (New Haven, 1985), 52–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prospective son in the there-and-then converges with the prayer of Theban Pindar for the continuing prowess of his Aeginetan host Lampon's son in the here-and-now.[66] There is a similar, but less complete, convergence in *Nemean* 1: the Theban seer Tiresias' prophecy of Heracles' career corresponds to the Theban poet Pindar's celebration of Chromius' career.[67] In *Pythian* 6, the devoted son Antilochus saves, at the cost of his own, the life of 'horseman' Nestor; this corresponds, with (humorous?) hyperbole, to the devoted son Thrasybulus ensuring the afterlife of the hippic victor Xenocrates, by commissioning the ode from Pindar.[68] In *Olympian* 1, Pelops' chariot race against Oenomaus in Elis corresponds to Hiero's single-horse victory at Olympia, as well as to a hoped-for chariot victory at the same venue.[69]

The search for correspondences often takes us close to historical allegory.[70] This method has led critics into absurd postulates, such as that Sogenes (*Nemean* 7) was killed by sunstroke or that Diagoras (*Olympian* 7) was an involuntary homicide.[71] These are pure 'historical romances'.[72] However, such interpretative excesses do not mean that the critic is not often legitimately impelled to posit real-life correlates of mythical events. It would be comforting to think that anything relevant to the real-life situation was more or less securely inferable from the Pindaric text itself.[73] We might, for instance, have inferred from *Pythian* 1.50–7 that Hiero had some physical infirmity like Philoctetes, even without the more specific information proffered in the scholia.[74] More doubtful, however, is whether we could have made much headway with the comparison of Hiero and Cinyras at *Pythian* 2.15–20 without external assistance.[75]

[66] Sigelman (n. 23), 47–8.

[67] Ibid., 46–7. Compare Virg. *Aen.* 8.288–301, where Hercules' career serves as an analogy for both Aeneas and Augustus (see below on the relationship between Pindaric epinician and Virgil's *Aeneid*, and the importance of Heracles-Hercules for each). The relevance of the Heracles myth to the occasion of *Nemean* 1 has been seen as problematic: Σ *Nem.* 1.49c (cited above); Rossi (n. 1), 114.

[68] B. G. F. Currie, *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford, 2016), 250.

[69] R. L. Fowler, *Pindar and the Sublime: Greek Myth, Reception, and Lyric Experience* (New York, 2022), 172.

[70] See above.

[71] See Young (n. 1, 1970), 42–3; Young (n. 1, 1968), 80, n. 2, critiquing Bornemann and Dissen respectively.

[72] B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The* Olympian *and* Pythian *Odes* (New York, second edition, 1908), 358. Cf. Most (n. 1) on *Pyth.* 11.

[73] H. Spelman, *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence* (Oxford, 2018), 32–3; cf. Fowler (n. 69), 63–5; Young (n. 1, 1968), 106–7, 113.

[74] Σ *Pyth.* 1.97, 89b.

[75] See Currie (n. 13), 261–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We might say in general that there is a tension between Pindar and Bacchylides seeming to narrate myth like a lyric epic poet unfettered by any encomiastic occasion and their operating as epinician poets acutely conscious of the exigencies of their commission (compare *Nem.* 4.33–5).[76] When the there-and-then and the here-and-now diverge, as for the bulk of most mythological narrations, a centrifugal principle holds sway. When, however, they converge, a contrary centripetal principle asserts itself. The epinician poets often selected whole myths or particular mythological variants, or introduced their own innovations, with a view to enabling the mythological narrative to align with the epinician occasion.[77] There are, of course, odes in the epinician corpus that do not conform or whose analogical relations, if any, elude us. But there are sufficient examples that do conform to establish this firmly as a characteristic of epinician.

Unity of place?

It was very easy for places to proliferate in epinician. The most obvious differentiation of locales is that of the venue of performance (the 'here' of the 'here-and-now') and the setting of the mythological narrative (the 'there' of the 'there-and-then'). There seems to be something like a soft rule that these should be distinct. The setting of the mythical narrative of *Nemean* 10, an Argive commission, is Laconia (61), even though Argos herself offered an embarrassment of mythological riches (2–20). Likewise, none of Pindar's five Theban commissions have their extended mythical narrations set on Theban soil, despite an abundance of local mythological material (*Isthm.* 7.1–15), which is mined without qualms in Sicilian (*Ol.* 6.13–17, *Nem.* 1.35–72, 9.18–27) or Aeginetan commissions (*Pyth.* 8.39–56). Significant exceptions are few: *Olympian* 7 (Rhodes), *Olympian 9* (Opus), *Olympian* 13 (Corinth), and *Isthmian* 6 (Aegina). The last of these is unusual and striking, since the same two localities, Aegina and Thebes, are in play in both the there-and-then and the here-and-now (see above). The strongly centripetal character of this ode is, however, exceptional.

[76] See Köhnken (n. 1), 14, for Pindar's myths as appearing to have 'a life of their own' (*Eigenleben*).

[77] C. Carey, 'Prosopographica Pindarica', *CQ* 39 (1989), 5 (on *Ol.* 8); B. G. F. Currie, 'L'*Ode* 11 di Bacchilide: il mito delle Pretidi nella lirica corale, nella poesia epica, e nella mitografia', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Generi poetici e storiografia* (Alessandria, 2010), 229–31 (on Bacch. 11).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The longer mythological narratives of other Aeginetan commissions are not set in Aegina, but, preferentially, in Troy or Thebes.

Apart from the basic divergence of the locations of the there-and-then and the here-and-now, there may be proliferating locales even within the there-and-then (see below on *Pyth.* 4). So too are there within the here-and-now, where regularly there is divergence between (a) the place of performance (the laudandus' hometown), (b) the venue of the victory or venues of the victories (when a victory catalogue is given), and (c) the place where the poem originates (the poet's hometown). The distinctness of these is frequently emphasized; we are entitled therefore to recognize a centrifugal principle at work.[78] Yet it does not hold sway completely unchecked: a counterbalancing centripetal principle is often also in play. One or other of these three types locales may turn out to be identical,[79] or the poet may contrive some other significant association between them.[80]

Likewise, although a centrifugal treatment of the there-and-then and the here-and-now seems to be the rule, there may be a balancing centripetalism. In *Pythian* 1, the mythological figure of Typhoeus, once reared in a cave in distant Cilicia (16–17), has been interred following his defeat by Zeus under Cyme and Aetna (17–20), precisely the sites where in the here-and-now the laudandus Hiero has, respectively, won a major naval battle (72–5) and founded a city (30–3). The 'arrival motif' can provide a link between the places of the there-and-then and the here-and-now. In *Pythian* 9, Telesicrates' return to Cyrene leading with him 'lovely Reputation' (75) mirrors Apollo's arrival at the same Cyrene leading as his bride the nymph Cyrene (5–13, 55–56a), although the bulk of the preceding mythological narrative had played out in Thessaly. In *Pythian* 1 and *Pythian* 9, despite initially divergent settings, we get punctual, climactic, convergences in place.

Place and unity are handled especially complexly in a long ode like *Pythian* 4. Cyrene, site of the ode's performance, is the spatial *origo* of the here-and-now (1–2). Yet Medea's long speech (9–58), a mini-epinician

[78] (a) and (b) as distinct: e.g. *Ol.* 4.11–12; (a) and (c) as distinct: e.g. *Ol.* 10.85.

[79] (a), (b), and (c) identical: *Isthm.* 4.69–72; (a) and (b) identical: *Ol.* 7.80–1, *Nem.* 10.24; (a) and (c) identical: *Isthm.* 1.1–5.

[80] Between (a) and (c): *Ol.* 6.84–90, *Isthm.* 8.16–23, cf. *Nem.* 4.19–24; between (a) and (b): *Nem.* 9.1–2, *Nem.* 1.1–2; between (b) and (c): *Pyth.* 9.79–80, *Nem.* 4.19–24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in itself,[81] effects a shift in the *origo* for nearly fifty lines.[82] 'I' is now Medea, not the poet (14, 27, 38, 40); 'now' is the time of the Argo's sailing, not the time of the ode's performance (42); 'here' is Thera, not Cyrene (14 [cf. 10], 20, 42, 51–2; cf. 258). In her speech, places multiply: Thera, Lake Triton (20), Taenarus (44), Delphi (53–5), and Libya (56). In the long, mythological primary narration that follows her speech (67–262), further places are added: Iolcus (77), Delphi again (163), Phasis (Colchis: 211–46), Lemnos (252–6). There are, moreover, multiple journeys: the Argo's outward (203–12) and return (251) voyages; and the peregrinations of the descendants of Euphamus from Lemnos to, successively, Sparta, Thera, and finally Cyrene (256–62).

All this constitutes a quite disorienting centrifugalism. Yet there is also a centripetal side, made up of overlapping journeys. First, to and from Delphi, made variously by or on behalf of Pelias, Battus, and Arcesilas (3–8, 53–6, 59–67, 163, 259–62). Second, to Cyrene, made by Battus and, implicitly, by Arcesilas' winning chariot team (7–8, 56–7; 1–3, cf. *Pyth.* 5.52–3). The poet is himself on a metaphorical 'chariot journey', whose route is 'long' – though the poet knows a 'short-cut' (247–8), which must take him back to Cyrene (259–62; cf. 276, 279). The ode ends with Thebes, and the poetic commission (299). Implicitly, the Cyrenean (ex-) exile Damophilus must make the journey to his hometown, Cyrene, from Pindar's hometown of Thebes (299), like other such figures to whom Pindar similarly entrusts his odes (compare Nicasippus: *Isthm.* 2.47–8). These various journeys are non-identical, but crucially intersecting, diverging, and converging at either Cyrene or Delphi or both.

Place seems, in general, custom-made for self-conscious explorations of unity. Pindar, like other poets after him, styles the poem as a 'journey' (*Nem.* 6.54, *Ol.* 6.22–6, *Pyth.* 4.247–8, *Ol.* 1.110; compare *Isthm.* 2.2, 8.61, Bacch. 5.176–8). There are multiple 'paths' that can be taken (*Isthm.* 4.1; cf. Bacch. 5.31–3). The poem must reach its destination, but it can veer off and needs to be brought back on track (*Pyth.* 11.38–9). Ancient and modern critical spatial metaphors (παρέκβασις, digression, centrifugality, centripetality) are far from being the preserve just of criticism, ancient or modern. Pindar, too, avails himself abundantly, implicitly and explicitly, of such metaphors in his own engagement with ideas of unity and relevance.

[81] B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth* Pythian *Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1988), 26.

[82] B. G. F. Currie, 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in M. de Bakker and I. J. F. de Jong (eds.), *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden and Boston, 2022), 396.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Unity of time?

Epinician characteristically toggles between the 'now' of the encomiastic-performative present and the 'then' of the mythical past.[83] A typical device for segueing from the former to the latter is a relative pronoun, referring to a person or a place, combined with the temporal adverb ποτέ, 'once (upon a time)' (*Ol.* 3.13, etc.).[84] The mythical past may subsequently be further differentiated. Thus, in *Olympian* 7 we get various successive temporal regressions (30, 34, 55, 71),[85] and different times are handled discombobulatingly in *Pythian* 4 (compare above, on place).[86] Here, time is centrifugally handled.

There is, however, a complementary centripetal dynamic. The discrete[87] temporal levels may be collapsed, bringing the 'now' into close alignment with the 'then'. Notably, this happens when the past mythological narrative culminates in an *aition* for a rite whose performance continues into the present, in particular, a festival at which the ode is being performed. The best illustration of such a collapsing of temporal levels is a poem which is neither Pindaric nor epinician. Bacchylides 17 comprises the mythological narration of the 'twice-seven' Athenian youths who sailed with Theseus to Minos' Knossos. This voyage was the *aition* for the Delia festival.[88] Bacchylides' poem (transmitted as a 'dithyramb' in the Alexandrian edition, but more easily regarded as a paean) indicates at its close that it is being performed at the Delia by a chorus of Ceans (130–2). These Cean choreuts are re-enacting in the here-and-now the ritual dances once instituted on Delos in mythical time by Theseus and the Athenian youths. The here-and-now and the there-and-then are not only aetiologically connected, they are also analogically connected: the sexually unrestrained, tribute-exacting King Minos behaves like a fifth-century BCE Persian despot (in Greek depictions of them: compare Herodotus 3.80.5, 5.18–20), while Theseus, leaping to the defence of vulnerable 'Ionians' (3), and then leaping literally into the sea to prove Poseidon's parentage (76–129), evokes Athens' (self-)image in the 470s

[83] R. Nünlist, 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in I. F. J. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden and Boston, 2007), 234.
[84] Nünlist (n. 83), 233–4.
[85] Ibid., 241.
[86] See *Pyth.* 4.10, 14, 20, 24, 28, 42, 46, 48, 50, 53, 64, 255, 258; Nünlist (n. 83), 246–7.
[87] Sigelman (n. 23), 44–5, argues differently for a 'prophetic unity of time' in Pindar.
[88] Plato, *Phaedo* 58a–b.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

BCE as protector of the Ionian islanders against Persian imperial aggression and herself as an aspiring thessalocracy.

The ease with which it can be inferred that Bacchylides 17 was performed at the Delia cannot generally be replicated for epinicians, where all we have to go on are our own (rarely ancient scholars'; but see Didymus at Σ *Nem. 1*.7b) inferences from the text.[89] These are shaky enough for scholars to question whether epinicians were indeed performed at public festivals.[90] However, *Nemean* 10.22–3 should suffice to defuse extreme scepticism on this score; it references the Argive Heraea as the occasion for the ode's performance in a way that resists interpretation as a performative fiction.[91]

Olympian 7.79–80 refers in detail to a festival celebrated in honour of Rhodes' heroic founder Tlepolemus (the Tlepolemeia). This has prompted some scholars to infer that the ode was performed at that festival.[92] The outer ring of the ode's three concentric mythological narratives tells of Tlepolemus' vicissitudes of fortune (27–33, 77–8), culminating in his founding of Rhodes and the institution of his ongoing cult (79–80). If the ode were performed at the Tlepolemeia, then the mythical past would here zoom to the performative present; 'then' would merge into 'now'. An analogy is also implied between Diagoras and Tlepolemus.[93] The question how far to press the analogy takes us again into the treacherous territory of 'historical allegory' (see above). There is, in particular, the question of whether the hero cult paid to Tlepolemus has implications of similar for Diagoras.[94] (Compare above, with Hiero in *Pythian* 2 and Bacchylides 3.)

Similar things may be found in odes other than *Olympian* 7. *Isthmian* 4, if performed at the Theban Heracleia (61),[95] would see the celebration of the laudandus Melissus coincide with the cultic celebration of Heracles.

[89] Cf. Fowler (n. 69), 73–4.

[90] C. Carey, 'Pindar, Place, and Performance', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* (Oxford, 2007), 201–4; C. Eckermann, 'Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes', *BMCR* 2015.03.24 (review of Krummen [n. 1]); cf. G. B. D'Alessio, 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39 (1994), 123, n. 19.

[91] B. G. F. Currie, 'Epinician *choregia*: Funding a Pindaric Chorus', in E. L. Bowie and L. Athanassaki (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (Berlin and Boston, 2011), 272. Contrast Spelman (n. 73), 21.

[92] B. Kowalzig, *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford, 2007), 247–8; Currie (n. 91), 284–6; Fowler (n. 69), 177. Differently, Spelman (n. 73), 24–5.

[93] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1968), 104–5.

[94] Fowler (n. 69), 177; cf. Currie (n. 13), 408–9 with n. 4.

[95] Krummen (n. 1), 50, 67, 69–70, 72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pythian 5, if performed at the Cyrenean Carneia (78–81),[96] and if this festival incorporated the heroic cult of Battus as Cyrene's founder (93–5), would see the celebration of Arcesilaus coincide with that of Battus. *Pythian* 1, if performed at the Aetnaea festival in honour of Zeus Aetnaeus (that is, Zeus worshipped at the site of the mountain he put atop the defeated Typhoeus),[97] would see the celebration of Hiero coincide with that of Zeus; the poem parallels Hiero's founding of Aetna and his victory in the sea battle of Cyme in an analogical relationship with Zeus' victory over Typhoeus. Clearly, this is not generalizable to all or even a majority of epinicians. The Heraea, for instance, does not seem obviously significant for the interpretation of *Nemean* 10 nor the festival of Ajax Oiliades for *Olympian* 9.[98] Nor are festivals even mentioned in many odes. But the pattern is observable in sufficient odes for us to assert that Pindar was interested in the treatment of time – like that of place and action – as giving him scope to co-ordinate diversifying (or centrifugal) and unifying (or centripetal) principles.

Not only have doubts sometimes been raised about whether Pindar's odes were ever performed at public festivals, it has also been questioned whether it would much matter for the odes' appreciation even if they were.[99] On the contrary, we should recognize that we are dealing here with a phenomenon of considerable literary and historical importance. At issue here is the following cluster of features: the fêting of a charismatic individual at a public festival; an implied equation of the individual with the deity or hero in whose honour the festival is celebrated; an implied equation of the recent exploits of the charismatic individual with those of the deity or hero that are commemorated in the aetiological myth of the festival; and the framework of a continuous or iterated festival implying the repeatability of a single archetypical moment and the collapsibility of 'now' and 'then'. Classical Greek epinician pioneered this cluster of features, but it transmitted it to subsequent poetry: notably, to Hellenistic *aduentus*-poetry (that is, poetry fêting the ceremonial arrival in a city of a charismatic individual).

[96] Ibid., 129, 135–6.

[97] Currie (n. 91), 274–5; A. Fries, *Pindar's 'First Pythian Ode': Text, Introduction, and Commentary* (Berlin, 2023), 13–14.

[98] Spelman (n. 73), 25–6.

[99] Silk (n. 7), 349–50; Spelman (n. 73), 18–27, esp. 20–1; Fowler (n. 69), 66, 74, 81–2; cf. A. D. Morrison, 'Performance, Re-performance and Pindar's Audiences', in P. Agócs, C. Carey, and R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge, 2012), 133. Differently, L. van den Berge, 'Unity in Context: Cohesion and Coherence in Pindar's *Olympian* 3', *Eranos* 107 (2012), 41–64, and, in general, Krummen (n. 1).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The stand-out specimen of the genre is the 'ithyphallic hymn' for Demetrius Poliorcetes on his arrival in Athens (*circa* 291 BCE), coinciding with the celebration of the festival of his divine namesake, Demeter (Duris *BNJ* 76 F13 esp. 1–4).[100] Greek poetry of this genre is barely preserved.[101] However, Roman 'ruler panegyric' poetry is appreciably better preserved and perpetuates exactly the same tradition.[102] A superb example of this, which perfectly displays our feature-cluster, is to be found in Book 8 of Virgil's *Aeneid* in the ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield, climaxing with its depiction of the celebration of Octavian's 'triple triumph' (*Aen.* 8.714–28).[103] This triple triumph was held on 13, 14, and 15 August 29 BCE.[104] It thus coincided (though not, of course, fortuitously) with the annual Hercules festival in Rome centred on the *Ara Maxima* held on 12 August.[105] The mythological *aition* of the annual Hercules festival was Hercules' defeat of Cacus (*Aen.* 8.268–305).[106] The one-off celebration of Octavian for his recent exploits coincides with the recurring celebration of Hercules for his ancient exploits. This creates 'a sense of identity of the "same" day, which connects the present with the distant past', so that 'you can travel between time zones through a version of what the space-time physicists call a wormhole'.[107] The 'choruses of mothers' who gather at the temples and altars for Octavian (718) in Virgil's description merge with the chorus of young men and of old men who do likewise to sing of the deeds of Hercules (287). Octavian's consecration of 'the greatest shrines' (716) throughout the city corresponds to the establishment of

[100] A. Chaniotis, 'The Ithyphallic Hymn for Demetrios Poliorketes and Hellenistic Religious Mentality', in P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski, and C. C. Lorber (eds.), *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1–2, 2007)* (Leuven and Paris, 2011), 163. On such Hellenistic *aduentus*-poetry in general, see G. Pasquali, *Orazio Lirico: Studi* (Florence, 1920), 197–9.

[101] See S. Barbantani, 'Lyric for the Rulers, Lyric for the People: The Transformation of Some Lyric Subgenres in Hellenistic Poetry', *Trends in Classics* 9.2 (2017): 342–5.

[102] Pasquali (n. 100), 189–201.

[103] Numerous and far-reaching connections between Virgil and Pindar in general are explored by Philip Hardie in an as yet unpublished paper ('Virgil's Pindar Revisited'), which I am grateful to the author for sharing with me.

[104] See M. G. L. Cooley (ed.) and B. W. J. G. Wilson (trans.), *The Age of Augustus* (Cambridge, 2023), 50 (C25), 184–5 (H16), 312 (N2a); Suet. *Aug.* 22. G. Binder, *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), 42, 145–9, 258–62.

[105] L. Fratantuono and R. A. Smith, *Virgil,* Aeneid *8: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Leiden and Boston, 2018), 731. Aeneas' arrival at Pallenteum likewise 'coincides' with this festival of Hercules at *Aen.* 8.102–10 (Binder [n. 104], 42).

[106] Cf. Livy 1.7.10–15.

[107] D. Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 2007), 161–2 (where the use of the term 'wormhole' is attributed to Rob Sobak).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the 'greatest altar' (271–2) to commemorate Hercules' defeat of Cacus (Hercules' festival was celebrated at the *Ara Maxima*). Octavian's victory at Actium is also analogically related to Hercules' victory over Cacus.[108] Octavian (Augustus) is implicitly equated with Hercules.[109] How far to press the analogy between the (godlike?) human laudandus and the hero or god of the festival remains, as always, unclear.[110] There is the question of whether the deification of Hercules, and likewise the forthcoming deification of Aeneas, who is also paralleled with Hercules in this book, intimates a prospective deification of Augustus;[111] readers will now recognize this as a recurrent question (again, see above, on both Hiero and Diagoras).

Given a choice, Classical scholars will prefer parallels for given phenomena in earlier and contemporary texts; but often parallels in later ones can be just as significant and, given the state of our evidence, they may sometimes be the best or all we can get. Roman evidence for Greek traditions (whether for a textual tradition, a literary tradition, or a particular cultural tradition), where available, is not to be sniffed at. In this instance, it both permits and requires us to recognize vital convergences and continuities within Greco-Roman poetic tradition and cultural practices: on the one hand, in poetic tradition, encompassing Classical Greek epinician, Hellenistic *aduentus*-poetry, Virgilian and Horatian 'panegyric' poetry for Augustus;[112] on the other hand, in cultural practices, encompassing Classical Greek εἰσέλασις,[113] Hellenistic ὑπάντησις, Roman *adventus/supplicatio*.[114] The *Aeneid* strongly resembles

[108] R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid (Oxford, 1987), 28–32; cf. P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 118; Binder (n. 104), 145–6.

[109] Cf. *Aen.* 6.801; Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.1; *Epist.* 2.1.1–17 (etc.).

[110] Both Hercules and Augustus were honoured in the song of the Salii (Virg. *Aen.* 8.285–8; Augustus *RG* 10.1); Binder (n. 104), 146–7.

[111] P. Fedeli, R. Dimundo, and I. Ciccarelli, *Properzio: Elegie Libro IV* (Nordhausen, 2015), ii.1113.

[112] Pasquali (n. 100), 189–201.

[113] See Currie (n. 13), 139–40.

[114] Pasquali (n. 100), esp. 200–1, n. 1; cf. H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden* (Darmstadt, third edn, 2001), ii.136. The untranslatable, culturally specific, Greek and Latin terms *aduentus*, *supplicatio*, εἰσέλασις, and ὑπάντησις designate various ceremonies of 'arrival' and 'reception' of a charismatic individual by an enthusiastic community. On the continuities, see S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and London, 1981), 19 'an impressive continuity, both in the religious and in the secular associations of *adventus*'; '[Menander Rhetor (third century CE)] saw in this field a direct continuity between the Greek pre-classical and classical past and the practice of the rhetor's art in his own time. The religious content of cults and of their expression in literature and philosophy changed immeasurably even during the period from which Menander chose his examples, but the formal and ceremonial expression of cult was sufficiently stable to allow a rhetorical tradition to develop, which in its turn gave expression to cult and ceremonial.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in its encomiastic premise a Classical Greek epinician. It has a contemporary living 'laudandus', Augustus, who is praised obliquely via a mythological heroic narrative involving his ancestors.[115] Both Greece and Rome shared a liking for Heracles-Hercules as heroic paradigm for the athletic victor or *triumphator*/Emperor,[116] and for heroized or apotheosized city-founders in this role, such as Tlepolemus for Diagoras (*Ol.* 7), Battus I for Arcesilas IV (*Pyth.* 5), Aeneas and Romulus for Augustus. Four centuries separate Pindar from Virgil. The very longevity of this jointly poetic and cultural phenomenon is a powerful indication of its importance. This long continuity more than compensates for the lack of interest in the performance contexts of Pindar's odes in ancient scholarship. We should be under no illusions: an ode's first performance at a civic festival really does matter. It could be fundamental to an ode's 'composition and functioning',[117] and, in particular, to an ode's self-exploration of its own unity.[118] In such collapsing or identification of temporal levels ('worm-holes'), we see the inclusion of a centripetal dynamic, in addition to the centrifugal one, in the epinician treatment of time.

Unity of voice (person deixis)?

As for some scholars it is practically an article of faith that the Pindaric ode must have unity, so it is for others that the Pindaric ode should have unitary first-person reference (though they may still disagree over where to find it).[119] As unitarians are pitted against anti-unitarians, so we may see 'univocalists' as pitted against 'polyphonalists'.[120] Polyphonalists are not necessarily also anti-unitarians; they do not eschew 'internal coherence' in favour of 'non-coherent shifts'.[121] On the contrary, advocates of non-unitary reference in first-person statements are able to argue that shifts in the reference of the first person or in first-person

[115] Cf. Verg. *G.* 3.16–36; Servius, *Commentary on Virgil's* Aeneid, 1. pr: 'Virgil's intention is … to praise Augustus from his ancestors.'

[116] Currie (n. 13), 133–4; Syndikus (n. 114), 138.

[117] *Pace* Fowler (n. 69), 74.

[118] Krummen (n. 1), 136, on 'the dual time-level': 'present and past run seamlessly into each other to form an intuitively apprehended unity'.

[119] M. J. Schmid, 'Speaking *Personae* in Pindar's Epinikia', *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios griegos y indoeuropeos* 8 (1998), 169 ('single-speaker theory'); B. G. F. Currie, 'The Pindaric First Person in Flux', *Classical Antiquity* 32.2 (2013), 245.

[120] 'Polyphony': Schmid (n. 119).

[121] *Pace* G. B. D'Alessio, 'The Problem of the Absent I: Lyric Poetry and Deixis in "Mediated" Communication', *AION* (filol.) 42 (2020), 13, n. 14.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deixis produce powerful poetic effects that conduce precisely to the overall coherence of the ode.

The epinician norm regarding person deixis seems to be that 'I' standardly refers to the poet-laudator; the laudandus, meanwhile, is standardly spoken of in the third person or addressed in the second, as are the members of the chorus (*kōmos*),[122] whose leader may also sometimes be singled out and individually named.[123] However, such stability in person deixis may be undermined in various ways. One relatively unproblematic way in which this may happen is via direct speech in the mythical narrative, when 'I' will, of course, refer to the character who speaks. Consequently, the handling of person deixis differs somewhat in the here-and-now and the there-and-then. Medea's exceptionally long speech in *Pyth.* 4 (13–56) sets up a contrasting deixis to the rest of the ode.[124]

Sometimes first-person statements made by heroic characters in direct speech in the there-and-then closely align with something that the laudandus himself might want to say in the here-and-now.[125] Pelops' pronouncement at *Olympian* 1.81–5 ('this contest shall await me', ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν οὗτος ἄεθλος | ὑποκείσεται) would fit snugly in the mouth of Hiero.[126] In *Olympian* 4.22–7, the Argonaut Erginus boasts: 'this is me, in fleetness of foot' (οὗτος ἐγὼ ταχυτᾶτι), before going on to declare that prematurely grey hairs belie a person's true age; Erginus here surely speaks for the laudandus, Psaumis.[127] In Bacchylides' eleventh ode, Proetus declares to Artemis, in the event of his daughters' healing, 'I will sacrifice to you twenty oxen' (104–5 θύσω δέ τοι εἴκοσι βοῦς); his vow approximates to something that the laudandus' father might have said, or wanted to say, especially if the epinician celebration took place in Artemis' Metapontine sanctuary (referenced at 116–20) and if the victory was considered Artemis' boon.[128] In these last two instances, narratological features invite us to relate these utterances of mythological characters in the there-and-then to the laudandus in the here-and-now. In Bacchylides' ode, it is a sudden shift from indirect to direct

[122] *Ol.* 6.87–90, *Isthm.* 8.2, *Nem.* 3.3–5, etc.
[123] *Ol.* 6.87–92, *Isthm.* 2.47–8.
[124] See above and Currie (n. 82), 396.
[125] Cf. Currie (n. 82), 389–90 (also including *Isthm.* 6 and *Nem.* 1).
[126] D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's* Olympian *One: A Commentary* (Toronto, 1982), 125; B. G. F. Currie, 'Pindar and Bacchylides', in K. de Temmerman and E. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden and Boston, 2018), 305; Currie (n. 82), 389–90.
[127] Cf. Currie (n. 126), 307; Currie (n. 82), 389.
[128] Currie (n. 77), 226–34. Differently, Spelman (n. 73), 25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speech.[129] In *Olympian* 4, it is the placement of Erginus' speech at the end of the ode, without any speech-capping formula and without the usual return to the here-and-now.[130] In these examples, the use of first-person statements in direct speech in the there-and-then suddenly open a window onto the here-and-now. While stopping short of metalepsis proper,[131] these instances exploit a remarkable porosity between what ought to be ontologically distinct narratological levels: the there-and-then and the here-and-now (another kind of 'wormhole': compare above).

This point may segue into something more controversial. At *Pythian* 8.56–60 and 9.89–92, we have first-person utterances whose content (according to some scholars of polyphonalist persuasion, both ancient and modern) requires us to identify the speaker as the athletic victor, even in the absence of explicit speaker-attributions,[132] in violation of the norm that the first-person statements refer to the poet, while the victor is spoken of in the third person or addressed in the second. The phenomenon of unsignalled brief intrusions of a different first-person speaking persona can be paralleled in divers other literature, such as Ciceronian oratory or the nineteenth-century English novel.[133] In Pindar, however, they seem to be used quite uniquely. These instances come at moments of 'zooming', transition from the past to the present via cult, moments where the boundary between there-and-then and here-and-now is at its most permeable. In each passage, a hero who has first been mentioned in the context of a mythological narrative passes into being the object of cult continuing into the present, in which capacity he has had a profound effect on the life of the laudandus in the here-and-now.[134] Alcmeon, 'neighbour-hero' of the laudandus Aristomenes and capable of epiphany in the present, made a prophecy to Aristomenes of his Pythian victory as he was on his way to compete

[129] Currie (n. 77), 233–4.

[130] R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Munich, 1967), 61. Cf. also, for a comparable effect in *Nem.* 1, Currie (n. 126), 398.

[131] On metalepsis in Pindar, see I. J. F de Jong, 'Metalepsis and the Apostrophe of Heroes in Pindar', in S. Matzner and G. Trimble (eds.), *Metalepsis: Ancient Texts, New Perspectives* (Oxford, 2020), 79–97.

[132] See Currie (n. 119), 244 and n. 7, 259–69; cf. A. Marinis, *Poetics and Religion in Pindar: Ambits of Performance and Cult* (Abingdon, 2024), 27–8, 40, 41–2.

[133] At Cic. *Rosc.* 32, 94, 145, 150, first persons suddenly refer to the defendant Roscius, not Cicero: see Currie (n. 119), 257–8 (also pointing to commonalities between Ciceronian oratory and Pindaric epinician). In Trollope, *Barchester Towers*, ch. 23 ('Mr Arabin Reads Himself in at St Ewolds'), we find first-person statements that must be referred to a hypothetical young clergyman, not the novelist-narrator ('Trollope').

[134] See Currie (n. 119), 270–4, with references.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Pyth*. 8.58–60), and Aristomenes is permitted to usurp the poet-laudator's first-person discourse to register this fact: 'rejoicing, *I myself* pelt Alcmeon with garlands' (56–7 χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτός | Ἀλκμᾶνα στεφάνοισι βάλλω). Iolaus, tutelary hero with Heracles of the Theban Heracleia-Iolaea festival, 'honoured' the laudandus Telesicrates with victory at that festival (*Pyth*. 9.79–80); Telesicrates is permitted to acknowledge this fact in the first person: 'I celebrate with them [Heracles and Iolaus], having been done a good turn in fulfilment of a prayer' (89–89a τοῖσι τέλειον ἐπ' εὐχᾶι κωμάσωμαί τι παθών | ἐσλόν).

In the examples considered in the previous paragraph but one (Pelops in *Ol*. 1, Erginus in *Ol*. 4, Proetus in Bacchyl. 11), the perspective of the laudandus is obliquely incorporated in the ode via characters' speeches in the mythological narrative. In those of the previous paragraph, the laudandus himself is permitted directly to make utterances in the first person that pertain to his situation in the here-and-now. We may recognize these as two complementary ways of bringing the laudandus out of the shadows of the third person and into the limelight of the first. We might say that we are dealing with different types of 'wormholes': those that take us respectively from the there-and-then to the here-and-now and those that take us from the here-and-now to the there-and-then. The fluctuating reference of first-person statements is a form of centrifugality in that it involves throwing over a fixed and stable deictic *origo*. But this is, crucially, done in the interests of unifying the situation of the hero in the there-and-then with that of the laudandus in the here-and-now; it can thus be said to involve a compensatory form of centripetality.

We should compare with this another related, and likewise contested, phenomenon. At *Pyth*. 5.72–81 (τὸ δ' ἐμὸν . . . κλέος . . . ἐμοὶ πατέρες . . . σεβίζομεν) and *Isthm*. 4.61–3 (ἀστοὶ . . . αὔξομεν) we have first-person utterances that 'polyphonalists' would attribute to local citizen choruses of Cyreneans and Thebans respectively,[135] again violating the 'rule' that first persons are used of the poet and second or third persons of the performers. These passages come at points where the there-and-then of the mythical narration (once again) zooms to the here-and-now of ongoing ritual celebration: at the Cyrenean Carneia and Theban Heracleia respectively (see above). We may compare the famous Sophoclean choral utterance, 'why should I dance?' (*OT* 896 τί δεῖ με χορεύειν;), where, according to some scholars, the identity of the

[135] Currie (n. 119), 245–6, with nn. 15–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

performers in the here-and-now (Athenian chorus-members dancing at a festival in honour of Dionysus) is submerged with the dramatic identity of the chorus in the there-and-then (Theban Elders). Both epinician and tragedy arguably have a 'double perspective': a there-and-then and a here-and-now (this is in fact clearer in epinician than in tragedy), which can momentarily be conflated into one.[136] Clearer still is the end of Bacchylides' Poem 17 (lines 128–32), where the identity of the performers in the here-and-now is finally disclosed: they are a chorus of Ceans singing a paean (probably) for Apollo at the Delia, and their voice is temporarily submerged with that of the Athenian youths of the there-and-then, who have themselves just 'raised a paean-cry' at the end of the mythological narrative (129 παιάνιξαν).[137] Once again, ongoing cult (the Delia festival) creates a 'wormhole' by which the speakers/performers in the here-and-now are connected with the there-and-then.

'Polyphonalists' can see a centrifugal approach being taken to one form of deixis (person deixis) in conjunction with a centripetal approach simultaneously being taken to others (temporal and spatial deixis). It involves a collapsing of there-and-then and here-and-now exploiting the perspective of either the athletic victor or the performers (chorus).

Grammatical and metrical unity

Having explored centrifugal and centripetal dynamics in Pindar's treatments of deixis (place, time, and person), it will be useful to glance briefly also at Pindar's treatment of grammar and metrical form. It will be found that here a similar balance between centrifugalism and centripetalism obtains.

Every sentence is necessarily a grammatical unity. Grammatical incompleteness is an impossibility – discounting interruptions, aposiopesis, anacoluthon, and modern nonsense compositions, such as Lewis Carroll's 'Humpty-Dumpty's Recitation' (where supposed 'sentences' end with conjunctions and connectives: 'because', 'if', 'but'). Pindar's sentences are complex unities, often with highly-involved syntax and

[136] A. Henrichs, '"Why Should I Dance?": Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy', *Arion* 3.1 (1994), 67, cf. 59; Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 62), 51, 199–200, 281–2, 513–14; cf. P. Wilson and O. Taplin, 'The "Aetiology" of Tragedy in the *Oresteia*, *PCPhS* 39 (1993), 170 and 178, n. 13. Differently, S. Scullion, '"Nothing to Do with Dionysus": Tragedy Misconceived as Ritual', *CQ* 52 (2002), 118–25; compare P. J. Finglass, *Sophocles:* Oedipus the King (Cambridge, 2018), 444. Cf. Currie (n. 77), 237 and n. 108.

[137] Currie (n. 82), 392–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gradually unfolding periods. Syntactical tension is created through the postponement of expected grammatical or semantic information, such as the subject of the sentence (e.g. *Ol.* 10.24–34). 'The attention is often kept alive by suspense, the object being held back as if it were the answer to a riddle, and this very suspense serves to preserve the organic unity.'[138] '[T]he separation helps to reinforce the organic character of Pindar's poetry inasmuch as the centrifugal arrangement which presides over the organization of the phrase is revealed to be paradoxically centripetal.'[139] This contrasts with the adding style that typifies Homeric composition.[140] A broadly comparable effect can be achieved in the German language, where the separation of grammatically linked terms in second and final position (for instance, auxiliary verb and past participle, or modal verb and infinitive, or a verb and its separable prefix) creates a tension spanning the whole sentence: in other words, a kind of balance between centrifugalism and centripetalism.

Pindar's handling of metrical form is likewise characterized by suspense and an 'organic unity', centrifugal tendencies balanced by centripetal ones. Pindar's epinicians employ unique and complex metrical structures, which span either stanzas or triads; contrast, again, Homer's stichic metre, which open-endedly piles verse on verse.[141] The indefinitely repeatable hexameter verse form itself has no inherent closure- or unity-conferring property – no sense of expectation, no point of departure (centrifugalism), no necessary point of return (centripetalism). The length of Pindar's stanzas and the number of stanzas or triads are open, which entails suspense right from the beginning. Thereafter, every stanza-end (for monostrophic compositions) or every triad-end (for triadic compositions) provides the potential for closure (completeness, unity), a potential that will only be realized when metrical closure coincides with grammatical and thematic closure.

The grammatical, metrical, and thematic structures of an epinician constitute three different kinds of independent self-contained 'organic' unities that are crucially offset with one another. 'Pindar ... does not insist on the grammatical structure coinciding with the metrical'; 'Pindar made his syntactical units run counter to his metrical, presumably because he saw the poem as a whole and did not wish it

[138] Gildersleeve (n. 72), cxiv.
[139] P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Louvain and Paris, 1993), 443 (translated).
[140] Ibid., 443–4.
[141] Ibid., 448.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to fall into separate and easily distinguishable sections.'[142] Sophocles has comparably been observed to have a predilection for having his syntactical units misaligned with the metrical, with trimeter lines ending on conjunctions and connectives (ἐπεί, ὅτι, ἀτάρ).[143] (Compare and contrast Humpty-Dumpty, above.) Similar offsetting is observable with Pindar's disposition of the thematic subject matter of epinician (victory data, poet's task, *gnōmai*, myth, etc.) across the metrical form. 'The ode ... has two structures. There is the formal, triadic design of strophe, antistrophe, and epode, upon which the actual content of the poem is laid or against which it is counterpointed.'[144] 'Once indeed [sc. in *Nem.* 10][145] Pindar makes each triad contain a separable and separate share of his main contents ... Otherwise his invariable method is to pursue his theme without respect for the metrical structure, or rather to take advantage of it for small surprises and changes of direction.'[146] For the effects achieved, we may compare the interplay of word-accent and metrical beat (*ictus*) in the Virgilian hexameter. These are two different but complementary principles, the former inherent in the Latin language itself, the latter conferred by the hexameter form. Typically, the two principles are aligned at the start and end of the line, misaligned in the middle (*Aen.* 1.1 *árma uirúmque cáno, Troíae quí prímus ab óris*): this may be compared with the offsetting of metrical, grammatical, and thematic structures in the majority of Pindar's epinicians. Rarely, the beat aligns with the accent in every foot (*Ecl.* 1.70 *ímpius haéc tám cúlta nouália míles habébit*): this may be compared with the unusual and striking effect created by *Nem.* 10.

What needs to be emphasized here is the interplay of different elements, which come in and out of alignment. We may speak of 'counterpointing' in the formal organization of Pindaric odes, as we arguably can in the treatment of action, place, time, and speaking voice (i.e. person deixis).

[142] C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964), 317, 319–20. Cf. Hummel (n. 139), 448.

[143] J. Gould, 'Dramatic Character and "Human Intelligibility" in Greek Tragedy', in *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford, 2001), 92–3; Rutherford (n. 12), 41–2, 402.

[144] Carne-Ross (n. 65), 52.

[145] Ibid., 81. Note, similarly, J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), xxxvii (but on *Nem.* 11, not *Nem.* 10).

[146] Bowra (n. 142), 320; cf. 317, 321, 353–4. Cf. Bury (n. 145), xxxvii–xxxix; M. M. Willcock, *Pindar: Victory Odes* (Cambridge, 1995), 25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conclusions

This article has urged that the 'problem of unity' should be approached not just as a controversy dogging Pindaric criticism, but as a theme of Pindar's own poetry. In discussions of poetic unity, scholars have tended to oppose a centrifugal to a centripetal aesthetic.[147] In fact, both seem to be inseparably and crucially in play in Pindar's poetic explorations of the 'unities' of action, place, and time (to which we may also add voice), as also in his handling of grammatical, metrical, and thematic structures. Tension, suspense, and counterpoint are key.

The 'problem of unity' was never likely to boil down to just one thing.[148] True, 'the attempt to use a plurality of unities to demonstrate the existence of a singular unity seems paradoxical'.[149] Nevertheless, we may perhaps entertain the notion of a unity of a plurality of unities, held in equilibrium by contending centrifugal and centripetal forces. Epinician comprises many disparate elements that pull in contrary directions and yet are pulled together, not necessarily all at the same time ('stretching the strands of many things together in a brief compass', *Pyth.* 1.81–2). For most critics concerned with unity what is most basically at stake is that the texts should 'make sense as a whole'.[150] 'The unity is achieved by the inter-relation of the elements of the text among themselves.'[151] Pindaric epinician involves the orchestration of many moving parts, coming in and out of sync, elaborately choreographed. To find unity is most fundamentally to affirm the presence of art, of care, of overarching control, and to recognize as disingenuous the poet's professions of naïve stream-of-consciousness composition, with its implication of arbitrary digression and vague or loose association of ideas.

The 'problem of unity' has, perhaps somewhat unsurprisingly, here turned out to unite many problems of Pindaric criticism: deixis, the reference of the first person, contexts of performance, historicizing versus text-immanent approaches, and so on. One's stance on unity is implicated in one's stance on each of these: this one Pindaric controversy is mired in many (or all?) others. It is not necessary for

[147] Heath (n. 1, 1989), *passim*: see 171 ('General Index' s.v. 'centrifugal/centripetal').

[148] Cf. Young (n. 1, 1970), 7, 30, 46 (citing Gildersleeve), 76 (on Norwood); Most (n. 1), 12–13; Most (n. 6), 40–1.

[149] Krummen (n. 1), 15.

[150] Young (n. 1, 1970), 2–3, n. 3; cf. 89, id. 1968: 64, 105; cf. Heath (n. 6), 97–8.

[151] Most (n. 6), 42, cf. 40; Young (n. 1, 1970), 87–8, cf. 35: 'the passages of the ode are not bound together by a single thought, but are bound together to make a single thought, which is the ode'; Köhnken (n. 1), 227; Lattmann (n. 1), 61–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the reader to subscribe to absolutely all the positions advocated in this article on all the controversies in question; it is necessary, however, to recognize their interconnectedness. Many of these 'problems of unity' are, moreover, not unique to Pindaric epinician, and it has seemed expedient to extend our purview to Bacchylidean 'dithyramb' (or rather, paean: poem 17), Athenian tragedy, and Virgil's *Aeneid*, among numerous other works that can help us to appreciate Pindaric unity in both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. To tackle 'Pindaric unity' not only calls for a holistic approach to Pindaric criticism, but can also benefit from consideration of Pindar's place in literary history.

BRUNO CURRIE

Oriel College and the University of Oxford, UK

bruno.currie@oriel.ox.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383525100545 Published online by Cambridge University Press