The Cambridge Classical Journal (2018) 64, 166–177 doi:10.1017/S1750270518000040
© The Author(s) 2018. Published by Cambridge University Press

COMMENTING ON PINDAR, *OLYMPIAN* 2: THE EMMENID GENEALOGIES

Antonio Tibiletti*
University of Bern, Switzerland

The article examines the two different genealogies of the Emmenids reported by the scholia on Pindar's *Olympian* 2: scholl. 16c ~ 70f Dr. connect Theron to the Labdacids Thersander and Polynices via Thera (the 'Therean' genealogy), whereas 82d Dr. links him with Eteocles via Rhodes (the 'Rhodian' genealogy). Modern interpretations associate the former with the *Epinician*, the latter with the *Encomium to Theron*. By contrast, it is argued that the 'Therean' genealogy originated from an ancient mistaken interpretation of the role of Thersander in *Ol.* 2.43–7: a careful reading of that passage and of relevant testimonia shows that Pindar endorsed the 'Rhodian' version in both poems, thus showing a unanimous tradition.

The scholia on Pindar's *Olympian* 2 relate two different genealogies of the Emmenids: one wonders how they can coexist in the exegetical context of the same ode, even though they explain different passages.[1] They are as follows.

(1) Scholl. 16c and 70f, which rely on the same 'Rhodian' account beginning with Eteocles and his son Haimon, comment respectively on l. 9 ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα and on l. 38 ἐξ οὗπερ:

> Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 2.38 (70f, 1.78 Dr.) περὶ τῶν Θήρωνος προγόνων, ὅτι οὗτοι τὸ γένος ἀπὸ Θηβαίων εἶχον, ἀπὸ Κάδμου τὸ ἀνέκαθεν. Κάδμου γὰρ Πολύδωρον· τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακον· τοῦ δὲ Λάιον· τοῦ δὲ Οἰδίποδα· εἶτα Ἐτεοκλέα· τοῦ δὲ Πολύδωρον· τοῦ δὲ Αἵμονα. τοῦτον δὲ τῶν ἐμφυλίων ἀνδρῶν ἀποκτείναντά τινα τῷ κυνηγεσίῳ Ἀθήναζε μεταστῆναι· τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου πάλιν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν μεταστάντας ἅμα τοῖς Ἀργείοις Ῥόδον κατοικῆσαι μέχρι τινῶν γενεῶν κἀκεῖ μείναντας ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀκράγαντα, καὶ μέχρι Θήρωνος τὰς ἁπάσας γενεὰς ζ΄ πρὸς ταῖς η΄ ἀριθμεῖσθαι. ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ οὗ ἡ ἀρχή [fr. 118 M.] βούλομαι παίδεσσιν Ἕλλάνων.

* anto.tibiletti@gmail.com

I am very grateful to the anonymous referees of *CCJ* for valuable contributions and helpful comments on this article.

1 For the Emmenids and their Cadmean origins see Catenacci (2006); Suárez de la Torre (2006) 99–100; and Finnerty Cummins (2010) 326–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> As for Theron's ancestors, [Pindar] says that they were Thebans, in particular descendants of Cadmus: Polydorus is the son of Cadmus and father of Labdacus, who is the father of Laius, who is the father of Oedipus, who is the father of Eteocles, who is the father of Polydorus, who is the father of Haemon; this Haemon killed a man of his community on a hunt and moved to Athens. Then his descendants moved again from Athens and settled in Rhodes together with the Argives. They remained there for some generations before they arrived at Akragas, and until Theron one counts all seven generations in addition to the eight. These facts are related [by Pindar] in the encomium whose beginning is [fr. 118 M.] 'I want … to the sons of the Greeks'.

The same material is related in schol. BEHQ Pind. *Ol.* 2.9 (16c, 1.64 Dr.), although it exhibits a lacuna in the genealogy: Κάδμου γὰρ <Πολύδωρος· τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακος· τοῦ δὲ Λάιος· τοῦ δὲ Οἰδίπους· τοῦ δὲ Ἐτεοκλῆς· τοῦ δὲ> Πολύδωρος· τοῦ δὲ Αἵμων κτλ. Schol. 16c does not transmit Pind. fr. 118 M. The two versions (scholl. 7of and 16c) are probably twins reporting material from a single source to a different degree of precision.[2]

(2) Schol. 82d, with the 'Therean' version beginning with Polynices and his son Thersander, comments on l. 46 ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντι:

> Schol. B(C)EQ Pind. *Ol.* 2.46 (82d, 1.81–2 Dr.) ἀφ' οὗ γένους, τοῦ Θερσάνδρου, ἔχουσι τὴν ῥίζαν οἱ περὶ Θήρωνα. τὸ δὲ γένος Λαΐου καὶ Οἰδίποδος ὁ Θήρων οὕτω κατάγει· Λαΐου Οἰδίπους· τούτου Πολυνείκης· οὗ Θέρσανδρος· οὗ Τισάμενος· οὗ Αὐτεσίων· οὗ Θήρας· οὗ Σάμος· οὗτος ἔσχεν υἱοὺς δύο, Τηλέμαχον καὶ Κλύτιον· ὧν ὁ μὲν Κλύτιος ἔμεινεν ἐν Θήρᾳ τῇ νήσῳ, ὁ δὲ Τηλέμαχος ἐν χώρᾳ …, ὅθεν συλλέξας δύναμιν ἔρχεται εἰς Σικελίαν καὶ κρατεῖ τῶν τόπων· ἐξ οὗ Χαλκιοπεύς· οὗ Αἰνησίδαμος· οὗ Θήρων.
>
> From that race, that of Thersander, Theron's ancestors have their origin. Theron descends from Laius and Oedipus in this way: Laius is the father of Oedipus, who is the father of Polynices, who is the father of Thersander, who is the father of Tisamenus, who is the father of Autesion, who is the father of Theras, who is the father of Samus. This Samus had two sons, Telemachus and Clytius: of these, Clytius remained on the island of Thera, while Telemachus on the land…; from there, after having gathered an army, he arrived in Sicily and reigned over those lands; he is the father of Chalciopeus, who is father of Aenesidamus, who is the father of Theron.

Most importantly, one wonders how these genealogies might have coexisted in Akragas and how Theron and his family could have justified them. Until now the two have been

2 On Pindaric scholia and their sources, in particular scholia which refer to the same material derived from a common source or author (the 'twin' scholia), see Deas (1931) 50–65 and Irigoin (1952) 102–5, 111–13; on Artemon see Broggiato (2011) and (2014); on Aristarchus see Vassilaki (2009).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

viewed as contemporary traditions which served different purposes.[3] Carmine Catenacci admits:

> Scholars have tried to make the two different traditions compatible with one another either by combining their genealogies or by explaining them according to the different propaganda they serve. However, it is definitely impossible to dismiss one of them as inconsistent invention or mere misunderstanding of the ancient genealogists. It is not only the scholia, but Pindar himself who, before Theron, declares the lineage from Thersander in *Olympian* 2 and the provenance from Rhodes in the encomium.[4]

This is not precisely true. I will try to show that one of the two is in fact the consequence of a specific misinterpretation of *Ol.* 2.43–47. In order to understand the text and its content correctly, it will be useful to describe how the narration (ll. 5–46) was devised by Pindar:

5–7	Eulogy of the *laudandus*
8–11	Eulogy of the *laudandus*' ancestors
12–15	Prayer to Zeus
15–22	First *gnōmē*: time and fate
22–30	Myth (1): Semele and Ino (*per aspera ad astra*)
30–7	Second *gnōmē*: fate and the destiny of a family
38–42	Myth (2a): Laius, Oedipus, Eteocles and Polynices (*per aspera*)
43–5	Myth (2b): Thersander (*ad astra*)
46–7	Conclusion: eulogy of the Emmenids and of Theron

In particular, ll. 5–11 are resumed at ll. 43–7:[5]

3 Cf. Miller (1970) 53–8; Buongiovanni (1985); Musti (1992); Fileni (1993); Lapini and Luraghi (1996); Caserta (1999) and (2000); Schneider (2000).

4 Catenacci in Gentili *et al.* (2013) 49 (my translation): 'Vari sono stati i tentativi di rendere compatibili le due tradizioni o combinando tra loro le liste genealogiche o giustificando l'uso dell'una e dell'altra ascendenza in funzione dei diversi scopi propagandistici … L'unica certezza è l'impossibilità di liquidare una delle due tradizioni come invenzione contraddittoria o fraintendimento dei genealogisti antichi. Non sono solo gli scolii, ma è Pindaro stesso dinanzi a Terone a dichiarare nell'*Olimpica* 2 la discendenza da Tersandro e nell'encomio la provenienza da Rodi.'

5 The *constitutio textus* of l. 46 as defended by Catenacci (2005) 25–31 and Catenacci in Gentili *et al.* (2013) 397–8 is here preferred: it was proposed by Didymus (schol. 82a). A similar asyndetic, epigrammatic syntax can be found in Pind. *Ol.* 6.71–6, 7.22–6 and *Isth.* 8.68–70; the asyndeton has the function of 'capping device' (a very close parallel is *Ol.* 6.72–4): cf. Maehler (2000) 425–8. The genitive Ἀδραστιδᾶν (l. 45) is partitive and the phrase Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος elliptical (= Ἀδραστιδᾶν τινος θάλος: Kühner and Gerth (1898) I.339 and Schwyzer and Debrunner (2013) II.116, 118 with Pind. fr. 120.1 M. ὁμώνυμε Δαρδανιδᾶν, 'Namesake of one of the Dardanians'), whereby the masculine is 'allgemeiner' (Kühner and Gerth (1898) I.82–3). For the meaning of ἐγκωμίων μελέων (l. 47) see Eckerman (2010), in particular 306. Snell and Maehler's text – widely accepted since Erasmus Schmid's edition (Vitebergae 1616) – runs: ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντα ῥίζαν πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου | ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν, 'It is fitting that the son of Aenesidamus, who has got his origins from there, receives songs during the celebration and melodies of the lyre.' The argument of this article is not affected by which reading

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

λείφθη δὲ Θέρσανδρος ἐριπέντι Πολυ-
νείκει, νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοις
ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου
τιμώμενος, Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις· 45
ὅθεν σπέρματος ἔχοντι ῥίζαν· πρέπει
τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου
ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν.
[46] ἔχοντι Ø (ἔχουσι schol. 82d) *P.Oxy.* 2092 Didymus apud schol. 82a (= fr. 5b Braswell) qui post ῥίζαν distinxit (probb. Gentili et Catenacci): ἔχοντα $E^{s.l.}$ $L^{s.l.}$ $N^{s.l.}$ fort. ex Aristarchi interpretatione apud schol. 82a (= fr. 4 Feine, probb. Sn.–M.)

Thersander survived the fallen Polynices, praised in the athletic games of the youth and in the battles of war, offspring of one of the Adrastids, saviour of the family house: from there they [*sc.* Theron's ancestors] have the root of the seed. It is fitting that the son of Aenesidamus receives songs during the celebration and melodies of the lyre.

The structure is chiastic:

A (ll. 5–7 Θήρωνα κτλ.): B (ll. 8–11 καμόντες … θυμῷ κτλ.) =
B (l. 46 ὅθεν … ῥίζαν): A (ll. 46–7 πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου κτλ.).

The 'illustrious forefathers who suffered greatly' (ll. 7–8) are connected to the Labdacids of the mythical section (ll. 22–45): ἔχοντι (l. 46) concludes the *Ringkomposition* recalling ll. 7–8 εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων … | καμόντες οἳ πολλὰ θυμῷ ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα ποταμοῦ and l. 36 τῶνδ(ε) … πότμον; in between we find two pictures of the Cadmean–Labdacid myth introduced by two *gnōmai* on human destiny. As for the composition, see *Nem.* 3.43–70, where the epigrammatic αὐτόθεν-clause (l. 64) connects myth and eulogy.

The adverbial clause (l. 46) introduced by the ὅθεν-*Anschluß* (Kühner and Gerth (1898) II.443) recalls the metaphorical δόμοις at l. 45. The scholia seem to understand this correctly, as they read ἀφ' ὧν (schol. 82a) and ἀφ' οὗ γένους (schol. 82d). Nonetheless, the passage would have been a fairly obscure riddle for ancient readers; the ambiguous phraseology employed to describe Thersander and the special emphasis given to him were probably suited to misinterpretation. Hence one might reasonably posit that the Emmenids' lineage departing from Thersander himself (the 'Therean' version) originated from a misunderstanding of the primary importance that Pindar bestowed on Polynices' son. Modern scholars, too, have had the same difficulty regarding the role of Thersander (see n. 3 above). Catenacci's observation quoted above summarises them all: 'it is Pindar

one accepts, since in the former case the lineage of the Labdacid house (l. 45) is understood by reference to Theron (= ἔχοντα) and in the latter by reference to his family (= ἔχοντι). For a brief discussion of schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 2.46 (82a, I.81 Dr.) see Braswell (2013) 138; for Thersander see van Leeuwen (1964) 126–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

himself who, before Theron, declares the lineage from Thersander in *Olympian* 2 and the provenance from Rhodes in the encomium'.[6]

So why did Pindar dedicate those impassioned lines to Thersander? As intimated, in *Olympian* 2 Theron and his ancestors are said to be born from the Cadmean–Labdacid γένος/δόμος, not from Thersander specifically. This finds confirmation in schol. 39a (commenting on l. 23 Κάδμοιο κούραις):

> Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 2.22–3 (39a, I.71 Dr.) εὖ δὲ τὸ τῶν Κάδμου θυγατέρων μεμνῆσθαι, ἵνα οἰκείῳ παραδείγματι χρήσηται· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ Θήρωνος γένος ἐνθένδε κατάγεσθαί φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ οὗ ἀρχή [fr. 118 M.] βούλομαι παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων.
>
> It is good that [Pindar] mentions Cadmus' daughters, insofar as he uses an example taken from the same family, since Pindar says that Theron's *genos* comes from there in the *Encomium* whose beginning is [fr. 118 M.] 'I want … to the sons of the Greeks'.

Pindar's *Encomium to Theron* clearly dealt with the tyrant's origins from Cadmus, probably described as his first progenitor, and from Rhodes, as schol. 15d shows and proves by quoting the *Encomium* itself (fr. 119 M.):

> Schol. BEHQ Pind. *Ol.* 2.8 (15d, I.63 Dr.) ἔνιοι δέ φασιν ὅτι οἱ τοῦ Θήρωνος πρόγονοι οὐδόλως εἰς τὴν Γέλαν κατῆραν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς εἰς τὴν Ἀκράγαντα ἀπὸ Ῥόδου, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος λέγει [fr. 119 M.]· ἂν δὲ Ῥόδον κατῴκισθεν …· | ἔνθεν δ' ἀφορμαθέντες ὑψηλὰν πόλιν ἀμφινέμονται …
>
> Some say that Theron's forefathers did not move to Gela at all, but [moved] directly to Akragas from Rhodes, just as Pindar says [fr. 119 M.]: 'they settled in Rhodes …; from there they departed and now dwell in the lofty city …'

From schol. 15a (Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 92) we learn that Timaeus was one, perhaps the first or the sole, of the ἔνιοι:

> Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 2.8 (15a, I.62 Dr.) τὸ 'πατέρων ἄωτον' λέγει ἐπὶ τῶν Θήρωνος προγόνων, οἳ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἰς τὴν Γέλαν μετῆραν, ἀλλὰ εὐθὺς ἀπὸ Ῥόδου εἰς τὴν Ἀκράγαντα. καὶ τοῦτο ἐξ αὐτοῦ Πινδάρου σαφηνίζεται, ὡς καὶ Τίμαιός [*FGrHist* 566 F 92] φησι.
>
> The 'flower of the fathers' refers to Theron's forefathers, who did not move to Gela, but to Akragas directly from Rhodes. This emerges clearly from the words of Pindar [i.e. fr. 119 M.], just as Timaeus says [*FGrHist* 566 F 92].

6 Race (1997) 61 also makes Theron a descendant of Thersander.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Like scholl. 7of and 16c, scholl. 15d and 15a are a pair which relates the same material (they thus refer to a common source, or to a common intermediary work): both of them quote the poet's *Encomium* in order to demonstrate that Theron's family came from Rhodes to Akragas. Schol. 15a is more accurate insofar as it mentions Timaeus as its authority;[7] by contrast, schol. 15d replaces the historian's name with a more general ἔνιοι, i.e. a formulaic expression not necessarily implying a plurality of authors (but note that scholl. 16a and 16c present this same view from Aristarchus and Menecrates). The phraseology of schol. 15a suggests that Timaeus quoted the Pindaric fragment (it will not be necessary to recall Pindar's importance as evidence for Sicilian history);[8] the quotation from Timaeus and the doxographical structure of schol. 15a suggest that Didymus was the intermediate source of both.[9] In brief: Pindar scholia < Didymus < Timaeus [< Pindar]. Schol. 29d (= Aristarch. fr. 2 Feine) proves that Aristarchus also believed that the Emmenids came from Rhodes:

> Schol. BCEHQ Pind. *Ol.* 2.15 (29d, I.68 Dr.) καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχός [fr. 2 Feine] φησι, διὰ τὸ κεκμηκέναι τοὺς τοῦ Θήρωνος πατέρας κατὰ τὴν Ῥόδον, τῶν πραγμάτων στασιαζομένων, καὶ οὕτω τὴν μετοικίαν εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν στειλαμένων.
>
> Aristarchus [fr. 2 Feine] says that it [i.e. the fact that Pindar asks Zeus to make an end of the terrible events for Theron's family, see Pind. *Ol.* 2.12–15] is because Theron's ancestors struggled in Rhodes during a period of *stasis*, and thus they led the move to Sicily.

Timaeus was followed, it seems, by both Aristarchus (scholl. 16c ~ 29d) and Didymus (scholl. 15a ~ 15d), although the two scholars read the text of *Ol.* 2.46 differently (see n. 5 above).

Unlike the *Encomium* – which spoke of Rhodes as the Emmenids' homeland in clear terms – *Olympian* 2 is not explicit in this regard. The myth starts at ll. 22–3 with Cadmus' daughters and concludes by mentioning his δόμος (l. 45). The main theme here is the fate (l. 35 Μοῖρα) which operates on a family's destiny (l. 36 πατρώιον τῶνδ(ε) … πότμον); in particular (ll. 33–4, but see the entire passage, ll. 30–7):

> ῥοαὶ δ᾽ ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλαι
> εὐθυμιᾶν τε μέτα καὶ πόνων ἐς ἄνδρας ἔβαν.
>
> But at various times various currents come to men both with moments of joy and sufferings.

7 See Caserta (2000) 13–4, who translates 'come dice anche Timeo'.

8 For Pindar as a source of Timaeus see Irigoin (1952) 20; for Timaeus' life and works see Brown (1958) and Baron (2013) 17–42, in particular 28–38 for the *Sicilian Histories*; selected bibliography in Gauger and Gauger (2015) 155–8.

9 Didymus often used Timaeus (Irigoin (1952) 71), as well as other historians, as a source for his *Commentary on Pindar* (see for example schol. *Ol.* 2.29d): Braswell (2011) 182–7, (2012) 13–18, (2017) 113–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The prayer (ll. 12–15) that the god might preserve the homeland for future generations (l. 15 λοιπῷ γένει), bestowing 'prosperity' (l. 36) against 'pain' (l. 37), is a necessary step to prevent a sudden reversal of good fortune. The Labdacids experienced tragedy. Thersander eventually comes as the θάλος who brings ῥοαὶ εὐθυμιᾶν and as the ἀρωγός who causes his γένος to emerge from a period of sufferings (l. 34 πόνων ~ l. 37 πῆμα): note the positive emphasis given by the participle τιμώμενος (l. 45). The myth is a functional, pragmatic and paradigmatic example (i.e. a form of teaching) employed to explain the previous *gnōmē* (ll. 30–7).[10] Such a mythical παράδειγμα is even more meaningful in the *laudandus*' eyes because it is οἰκεῖος, 'domestic' (= 'taken from the same family'), therefore 'familiar' (= 'well known') and 'appropriate', as was that of the daughters of Cadmus (see the expression οἰκείῳ παραδείγματι in schol. 39a quoted above): it involves τῶνδ(ε) πότμον, i.e. the destiny of Theron's οἶκος (see the connective ἐξ οὗπερ, 'since the time when', l. 38 ~ schol. 70e). Given that 'a *paradeigma* is the presentation of events that bear a resemblance to the present < events>' (Ps.-Herod. *Fig.* 65 Hajdú),[11] by means of the ὅθεν-clause Pindar connects myth to history, example to reality. If one puts the Pindaric thoughts in an equation,

πατέρες (ll. 38–42 (–)) : Thersander (+) = πατέρες (l. 8 (–)) : Theron (+),

the eulogistic function of the comparison emerges distinctly: only Theron (l. 7 πατέρων ἄωτον), whose πατέρες experienced πόνοι (l. 8 (–)),[12] must be the θάλος and ἀρωγός who assures his family of a good πότμος (ll. 6–7, 10–11, recalled at ll. 91–5 (+)); like Thersander, Theron is 'τιμώμενος in the athletic games [see l. 49] and in the battles of the war' (l. 6 ἔρεισμα).[13] In sum, Pindar proposes a *gnōmē* (the πότμος of a family fluctuates) and discusses it in the light of the family heritage,[14] ideally by means of the myth (πατέρες > Thersander) and concretely by reference to history (πατέρες > Theron).

10 A comparable 'functional role' of a myth explaining gnomic principles has been discussed, for example, by Privitera (1972) with regard to the myth of Heracles in *Nemean* 1.

11 Translation by Nünlist (2009) 262, with commentary at pp. 257–64.

12 The expression at ll. 8–10 probably refers to the ancestors chronologically closer to Theron (those within the period 'Rhodes–Akragas'): see Buongiovanni (1985) and Caserta (2000) 5–10. The expression may be an echo of the dark period between the fall of Phalaris and the 'Golden Age' of Theron's tyranny at Akragas: cf. Dunbabin (1948) 315, 323.

13 See Dunbabin (1948) 418, 424–5 for Theron's role in the battle of Himera (480 BC).

14 The role of the myth as both 'praise of the victor' and 'aristocratic *paideia*' has been discussed by Rose (1974) 145–55, who concludes that (p. 155) 'Pindar's preferred method seems … to see the victor's achievement as the validation of his inborn excellence, wherever possible with reference to his particular family heritage, but in any case with reference to the heroes of his homeland, who are presented metaphorically as bloodline ancestors' (see the catalogue of terms concerned with genealogy at p. 152: several are employed in these lines of *Olympian* 2). *Is.* 3/4.22–45 also presents the fluctuation of fortunes within the *potmos* of a family (ll. 23–4): the Cleonymids flourished (ll. 22–3, 25–33), faced tragedy and obscurity (ll. 34–5b), and flourished again thanks to the *laudandus*' success (ll. 36–7).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As for the Emmenid genealogy, the two incompatible versions arose from the same ode:

(1) scholl. 16c + 7of vs (2) schol. 82d.

(1) The story is evoked twice (scholl. 16c and 7of), both times to explain a decisive passage in the ode regarding the *laudandus*' progenitors, respectively l. 8 (καμόντες κτλ.) and l. 38 (ἐξ οὗπερ κτλ.):[15]

(1a) The syntax of schol. 7of is clear: the γάρ *explicativum* following the first sentence introduces the *interpretamentum* of the ancient source, which is summarised by means of a series of infinitive clauses; the subject and the *verbum dicendi* (λέγει, φησί or the like) went missing during the process of scholiastic synthesis: the identity of the ancient source of the scholium is not mentioned, but Timaeus is the most likely candidate on the grounds of parallel with scholl. 15a + 15d.

(1b) Schol. 16c is more intricate. The 'Rhodian' genealogy is in fact inserted into a series of scholarly views on the origins of Theron's family: Aristarchus (schol. 16a = fr. 1 Feine, see also 29d = fr. 2 Feine) supported the Rhodian origins of the Emmenids; Artemon (schol. 16b = *FGrHist* 569 F 1) wrote that the participle καμόντες (*Ol.* 2.8) must rather refer to the ἄποικοι Antiphemus of Rhodes and Entimus of Crete who led the colony from Rhodes (Lindos) to Gela in 688 BC;[16] Menecrates (schol. 16c = *FGH* II.344) argued against Artemon (ληρεῖν τὸν Ἀρτέμονα, 'Artemon is foolish') and interpreted the phrase as referring to Theron's ancestors; then, by means of a γάρ *explicativum* (*GP* 58–9, point 2), the Emmenids' Cadmean origins are elaborated; another γάρ introduces the 'Rhodian' genealogy in order to explain the Cadmean/Rhodian link. Schol. 16c concludes: ἴσως οὖν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀφορῶν ὁ Πίνδαρός φησι· καμόντες … ποταμοῦ, ('thus Pindar, probably having in view these arguments, says: …'). The ancient source knew this story from Pindar's *Encomium to Theron* and interpreted *Olympian* 2 in the light of this poem. The flow of thoughts in schol. 16c is analogous to that of schol. 39a (a much rougher version of the same account which, however, transmits Pind. fr. 118 M.) and the content has a close resemblance to schol. 7of: Timaeus' *Sikelika* is likely to be the source.

(2) The account elucidates Pind. *Ol.* 2.46: Schol. 82d is linear. It introduces a paraphrase of Pindar's words: 'from that race, that of Thersander, Theron's ancestors have their origin'. The 'Therean' genealogy follows. It is noteworthy that the writer focuses on Thersander: 'that of Thersander'. Is this a clue that the commentator considered him one of the

15 The two passages (ll. 9 and 38) are linked by the ancient commentators (schol. 7of): ἐν δὲ τοῖς προεκκειμένοις καὶ ταύτην τὴν πολλὴν ἄλην αὐτῶν ἀποκλαίοντα τὸν Πίνδαρον φάναι· καμόντες … ποταμοῦ, 'Pindar, bewailing their long wandering in the above-mentioned lines, says: … [*Ol.* 2.8–9].'

16 See also Hdt. 7.153, Thuc. 6.4.3, Paus. 8.46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Emmenids' forefathers alongside Laius and Oedipus? Possibly. The intermediary stage of this narration is not Rhodes but Thera, which was linked to the Labdacids through Polynices' dynasty: Hdt. 4.147–9 tells us the story of Theras, Thersander's descendant who colonised the island of Calliste and renamed it Thera. Herodotus also reports the genealogy as given in schol. 82d (from Polynices to Theras).[17] Although schol. 82d does not recall the story of Theras, Herodotus' passage hints that the myth was so old and well known that a commentator, understanding the Pindaric passage to mean that Thersander was the ancestor of the Emmenids, could easily provide a 'Therean' genealogy of Theron's family. Any substantial link between Thera and Sicily seems otherwise unattested.[18] Finally – in spite of scholl. 16c ~ 70f – schol. 82d transmits the recent lineage of Theron's family ('Telemachus – Chalciopeus – Aenesidamus – Theron'): the lacuna in the scholium makes it unclear whether it was Telemachus who guided the colonists to Sicily, or a descendant of his, whose name got lost in the process of scholiastic synthesis (if not afterwards). One cannot exclude the possibility that the lacuna hides the name of Emmen(id)es. Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 3.38 (68a, I.124 Dr.) and its twin BCDEQ *Ol.* 3.38 (68d, I.124 Dr.) have the series 'Telemachus – Emmen(id)es – Aenesidamus – Theron'; again, schol. BDEGQ Pind. *Pyth.* 5 (5a, II.194 Dr.) quotes Hippostratus, author of *Sicilian Genealogies* (*FGrHist* 568 T 1), for the lineage 'Telemachus – Emmenides' and Hipp. *FGrHist* 568 F 3 (from schol. 15d quoted above) is another source for the historian dealing with Theron.[19] It is interesting to observe that in schol. 15d Hippostratus is juxtaposed with ἔνιοι (Timaeus?). Are we then to consider scholl. 68a and 68d as *compendia* from Hippostratus' *Sicilian Genealogies*? It is conceivable.

In conclusion (caution is in this case necessary). As often happens, a misunderstanding or misinterpretation arose from Pind. *Ol.* 2.43–7 and gave rise to an alternative Emmenid genealogy. Such a mistake may have been corroborated by an incorrect use of ancient external sources by a historian or commentator. It thus seems plausible that the two genealogical versions originated in different contexts, but further hypotheses about them are speculation: different genealogies arranged by different historians and later welcomed by commentators? Scholars criticising the statements of other authors?[20] The scholia involved in this topic (scholl. *Ol.* 2.15a, 15d, 16b, 16c, 29d, 39a, 70f, 82a, 82d + scholl. *Ol.* 3.68a, 68d + schol. *Pyth.* 5.5a) reveal an intricate ὕλη ἱστορίης which is difficult to unravel

17 The story is also recalled in Call. *Ap.* 74–75 and Paus. 3.17.7–8, 15.6, 4.3.4.

18 There is in fact no trace of Therean elements in the Akragantine history, culture and religion. The *theoxenia* of the Dioscuri and Helen in *Olympian* 3 gives no evidence to link Akragas and Thera (scholl. *Pyth.* 5.10a, 124a): the cult could in fact have been imported to Akragas from Argos (*Nem.* 10.49–50, schol. *Ol.* 3.1d, *Pae.* 18 fr. 52s M. = S7 Rutherford) and/or from Rhodes, where Helen was worshipped (Paus. 3.19.10). On the other hand, the cult of Zeus Atabyrios (Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 39 and Polyb. 9.27.7–8) might come from Kameiros and that of Athena from Lindos.

19 See Caserta (2000) 36–42 for Theron's lower lineage: she reconstructs it as 'Telemachus (~ 651 BC) – Chalciopeus (~ 616 BC) – Emmen(id)es (~ 581 BC) – Aenesidamus (~ 546 BC) – Theron (~ 511 BC)'.

20 See, for example, the case of the name 'Emmenids' discussed in Lapini and Luraghi (1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in all its details. Since the evidence at hand is neither complete nor sufficient to offer a valid answer in this regard, let us note some reasonable inferences.

It has been argued that the source(s) of schol. 82d, somehow misunderstanding *Ol.* 2.43–7, considered Thersander to be Theron's progenitor and put together a complete 'Therean' genealogy departing from Polynices (sequence 'Thebes, Sparta, Thera, Sicily/Akragas'), perhaps on the basis of independent mythical material on the Labdacids. By contrast, scholl. 16c ~ 70f relied on a common source and adopted the 'Rhodian' genealogy from Eteocles: the testimonia hand down the sequence 'Thebes, Athens/Argos, Rhodes, Sicily/Akragas' and embrace the provenance of the Emmenids from Rhodes. The crucial parallel with scholl. 15a ~ 15d in addition to that of the sketchy schol. 39a (also transmitting fr. 118 M.) invites the inference that the ultimate authority and common source of scholl. 16c ~ 70f is Timaeus (via Didymus); Timaeus in his turn relied on both poems of Pindar, the *Olympian* 2 and the *Encomium*: if so, the Sicilian historian was able to interpret the former on the basis of the more explicit elements contained in the latter. Scholl. 16c and 29d prove that Aristarchus, too, followed this 'Rhodian' version, supposedly by reference to Timaeus.

Should the formulated hypothesis be correct, schol. 82d would show a parallel yet incorrect exegesis of the poem and could thus be rejected as autoschediastic or, more prudently, external to the Pindaric and Emmenid world. Didymus might have been the intermediary between schol. 82d and its source, if it is the case that he compiled both the 'Therean' and the 'Rhodian' versions in his *Commentary on Pindar*.

At present further conjecture about the source of schol. 82d would lack solid evidence. It is at least worth saying that more than one historian or scholar is quoted in the Pindaric scholia with regard to Theron and his family: among them, Hippostratus (*FGrHist* 568) is defined as ὁ τὰ περὶ Σικελίας γενεαλογῶν, the author 'who wrote Sicilian genealogies', and might tentatively be proposed as the source of the 'Therean' version. We know that he catalogued Theron's more recent ancestry (schol. *Pyth.* 5.5a + scholl. *Ol.* 3.68a and 68d), which is partially similar to that of schol. *Ol.* 2.82d (Chalciopeus is missing from the former, Emmenides from the latter, but this might be due to flawed textual transmission). Whether Hippostratus argued against Timaeus on the 'mythical' section of the genealogy is impossible to ascertain. Furthermore, one has to acknowledge that the name of Hippostratus as a source of schol. 82d is only conjectural. Positions on Theron's recent lineage and the list of its members, in fact, may reveal little about positions on his mythical ancestry.

Other authors involved in this subject – Aristarchus, Artemon, Menecrates and Hippostratus – are too fragmentary to invite speculation. The remains from Menecrates (schol. 16c) and Artemon (schol. 16b) do not relate Theron's genealogy. Moreover, the controversial Geloan stage urged by Artemon poses new difficulties, given that it – logically speaking – also presumes a Rhodian background.[21] As a consequence, there seems to be no good reason to consider Artemon the compiler of the 'Therean' version.

21 Musti (1992) discusses these aspects in more detail.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To conclude conservatively. If what has been proposed for scholl. 15a, 15d, 39a and 70f is correct, Timaeus may well also have been the unnamed authority behind schol. 16c. In this case, his work was quoted to defend Menecrates' view on the Rhodian origins of the Emmenids against Artemon's account of a Geloan period. It is important to note that the discussion in scholl. 16a–c focuses on the addressees of the participle καμόντες (l. 8), and not on Theron's genealogy; the lineage is simply adduced to prove that the Emmenids came directly from Rhodes to Akragas and to exclude a possible Geloan stage in their history, as Artemon stated. An alternative reconstruction is that Timaeus was cited to offer a definitive (in Didymus' eyes?) answer to that matter despite other interpretations. The same happens, for instance, in schol. 29d, where Didymus is said to quote Timaeus as a decisive witness/source on a given topic: Δίδυμος τὸ ἀκριβέστερον τῆς ἱστορίας ἐκτίθεται, μάρτυρα Τίμαιον [*FGrHist* 566 F 93b] τὸν συντάξαντα τὰ περὶ τῆς Σικελίας προφερόμενος, 'Didymos gives a more accurate account of the story quoting as his source Timaeus [*FGrHist* 566 F 93b], the author who arranged the facts about Sicily.'

Whatever the circumstances which gave rise to these genealogical traditions, Pindar offered a coherent history in both poems: he talked about and stressed the Cadmean–Rhodian origins of the Emmenids in the *Encomium to Theron* (fr. 119 M. + scholl. *Ol.* 2.16c and 39a), whereas in the *Olympian* 2 he did not need to retell it at length; rather, a handful of details and echoes were sufficient for the audience (probably the Deinomenid circle) to understand the background – one should admit, however, that it is impossible to date the *Encomium*; Catenacci proposes that it was composed in 476, as were *Olympians* 2 and 3.[22] It has been said that *Olympian* 2 was performed 'in front of a more homogeneous audience, probably in the tyrant's palace and in a context of broad conviviality'.[23] If this was the case, the Rhodian element would have been an important aspect of the song on such an elite occasion. It would be surprising were it to have been neglected in favour of an unmotivated 'Therean' alternative.[24]

Works cited

Baron, Ch. A. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic historiography*, Cambridge.
Braswell, B. K. (2011) 'Didymus on Pindar', in S. Matthaios, F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Ancient scholarship and grammar: archetypes, concepts and contexts*, Berlin and New York, 181–97.
(2013) 'Reading Pindar in antiquity', *MH* 69, 12–28.
(2017) *Didymus of Alexandria: Commentary on Pindar*, 2nd edn, Basel.
Broggiato, M. (2011) 'Artemon of Pergamum (*FGrH* 569): a historian in context', *CQ* 61, 545–52.
(2014) *Filologia e interpretazione a Pergamo. La scuola di Cratete*, Rome.

22 Catenacci in Gentili *et al.* (2013) 46.

23 Catenacci in Gentili *et al.* (2013) 46 (my translation): 'di fronte a un uditorio più omogeneo, probabilmente nel palazzo del principe e in un contesto di convivialità ampia'.

24 As shown above, scholars tried to justify the double genealogy in several ways, all of which are conjectural (see n. 3 above).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Brown, T. S. (1958) *Timaeus of Tauromenium*, Berkeley.
Buongiovanni, A. M. (1985) 'Una tradizione filoemmenide nella fondazione di Acragas', *ASNP* 15, 493–9.
Caserta, C. (1999) *Gli Emmenidi e le tradizioni poetiche e storiografiche su Agrigento arcaica fino alla battaglia di Imera*, Palermo.
(2000) 'Le genealogie mitiche degli Emmenidi negli *Scholia vetera* alla *Olimpica* II di Pindaro', *Hormos* 2, 5–42.
Catenacci, C. (2005) 'Letture pindariche', *QUCC* 81, 25–31.
(2006) 'Pindaro e le corti dei tiranni sicelioti', in M. Vetta and C. Catenacci (eds.), *I luoghi e la poesia nella Grecia antica*, Alessandria, 177–97.
Deas, H. Th. (1931) 'The Scholia vetera to Pindar', *HSPh* 42, 1–78.
Dunbabin, T. J. (1948) *The western Greeks: the history of Sicily and South Italy from the foundation of the Greek colonies to 480* BC, Oxford.
Eckerman, Ch. (2010) 'The ΚΩΜΟΣ of Pindar and Bacchylides and the semantics of celebration', *CQ* 60, 302–12.
Fileni, M. G. (1993) 'Una pagina di storia agrigentina: Pind. frr. 118 e 119 Sn.-Maehl.', in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica*, Rome, 427–40.
Finnerty Cummins, M. (2010) 'Sicilian tyrants and their victorious brothers I: the Emmenids', *CJ* 105, 321–39.
Gauger, B. and Gauger, J.-D. (2015) *Die Fragmente der Historiker: Ephoros von Kyma (FGrHist 70) und Timaios von Tauromenion (FGrHist 566)*, Stuttgart.
Gentili, B. *et al.* (2013) *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*, Milan.
Irigoin, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. (1898) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Volumes I–II, Hannover and Leipzig.
Lapini, W. and Luraghi, N. (1996) 'La genealogia degli Emmenidi nella scoliastica pindarica. Note di lettura a Schol. Pind. Pyth. 6.5a', *PP* 51, 213–20.
van Leeuwen, J. (1964) *Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode*. Volume I, Assen.
Maehler, H. (2000) 'Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch des Satz-Asyndetons bei Bakchylides und Pindar', in M. Cannatà Fera and S. Grandolini (eds.), *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G.A. Privitera*. Volume II, Naples, 421–30.
Miller, M. (1970) *The Sicilian colony date*, New York.
Musti, D. (1992) 'Le tradizioni ecistiche di Agrigento', in L. Braccesi and E. De Miro (eds.), *Agrigento e la Sicilia greca. Atti della settimana di studio (Agrigento, 2–8 maggio 1988)*, Rome, 27–45.
Nünlist, R. (2009) *The ancient critic at work: terms and concepts of literary criticism in Greek scholia*, Cambridge.
Privitera, A. G. (1972) 'Eracle nella prima nemea', *GIF* 3, 28–51.
Race, W. J. (1997) *Pindar*. Volume I, Cambridge, MA and London.
Rose, P. W. (1974) 'The myth of Pindar's First Nemean: sportsmen, poetry, and paideia', *HSPh* 78, 145–75.
Schneider, J. (2000) 'De Cadmos aux Émménides', *Kentron* 16, 65–81.
Schwyzer, E. and Debrunner, A. (2013) *Griechische Grammatik*. Volume II: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, München.
Suárez de la Torre, E. (2006) 'Les mentions généalogique chez Pindare', *Kernos* 19, 97–111.
Vassilaki, E. (2009) 'Aristarque interprète des odes siciliennes de Pindare: explication interne et explication externe', in S. David, C. Daude, E. Geny and C. Muckensturm-Poulle (eds.), *Traduire les scholies de Pindare*. Volume I: *De la traduction au commentaire: problèmes de méthode*, Franche-Comté, 121–45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270518000040 Published online by Cambridge University Press