CrossMark

The Classical Quarterly 70.1 10–15 © The Classical Association (2020)
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000427

TWO NOTES ON THE NEW CROESUS EPIGRAM FROM THEBES

In March 2005 a rescue excavation uncovered a spectacular new epigraphic find from Thebes. Now on display in the Archaeological Museum of Thebes, a column drum 0.41 m in height has inscribed on it two identical epigrams, one (the older one) written vertically in Boeotian script and a second (later) Ionian copy written horizontally on the other side. Nikolaos Papazarkadas published the *editio princeps* of the epigram in 2014, using both inscriptions to create a composite text.[1] As Papazarkadas realized, the column drum, which has a chi-shaped orifice at one end meant to hold a stationary object, at one point displayed a 'shining shield' (φαεννὰν | [ἀσπ]ίδα, lines 3–4) that Herodotus had seen in the temple of Apollo Ismenius in Thebes.[2] Moreover, this shield was interpreted by Herodotus (relying on the language of the inscription and likely on the commentary of temple staff) as having been dedicated by the Lydian king Croesus to the hero Amphiaraus,[3] when he was 'testing' the various oracles in Greece in order to decide on a course of action against his rival Cyrus of Persia.[4]

Text (after Papazarkadas [n. 1 above]):

[σοὶ] χάριν ἐνθάδ', Ἄπολο[ν,- - -]
[κὲ]πιστὰς ἰαρῶ στᾶσε κατ[ευχσά]μενος
[μα]ντοσύναις εὑρὸν ὑπὸ TA[….]OIO φαεννὰν
[ἀσπ]ίδα τὰγ Ϙροῖσος κα[λF]ὸν ἄγαλ[μα θέτο?]

[1] N. Papazarkadas, 'Two new epigrams from Thebes', in. N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden and Boston, 2014), 223–51. For early reactions, see L. Porciani, 'Creso, Anfiarao e la nuova iscrizione da Tebe', in S. Struffolino (ed.), Ἡμέτερα γράμματα: *Scritti di epigrafia greca offerti a Teresa Alfieri Tonini* (*Aristonothos: Scritti per il Mediterraneo antico* 12) (Milan, 2016), 101–12; P. Thonemann, 'Croesus and the oracles', *JHS* 136 (2016), 152–67 (discussed in depth below); M. Tentori Montalto, 'Some notes on Croesus' dedication to Amphiaraos at Thebes (*BÉ*, 2015, n. 306)', *ZPE* 204 (2017), 1–9; id., 'Erodoto e due epigrammi di recente scoperta (*BE* 2015, nr. 306; *SEG* 56, 430): la dedica di Creso ad Amphiaraos e la battaglia di Maratona', in F. Camia, L. Del Monaco, M. Nocita (edd.), *Munus Laetitiae. Studi miscellanei offerti a M. Letizia Lazzarini* (Rome, 2018), 125–54; id., 'Die Weihgaben des Kroisos für Amphiaraos: Herodot und *BÉ* 2015, n. 306', in F. Beutler and Th. Pantzer (edd.), *Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike. Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik* (Vienna, 2019), 1–9.

[2] 1.52. For the Greek text, see below.

[3] Amphiaraus' status is actually ambiguous, as he could be labelled both a god and a hero, as a curious document from the first century B.C.E. shows: Sulla declared the lands of Amphiaraus tax exempt but was opposed by tax collectors, who argued that Amphiaraus was not a god but a hero (*Syll.*[3] 747). Post-classical sources say that after his death he was made immortal (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.6.8; Paus. 1.34.4). He thus belongs to a group of limit-cases that includes Asclepius and Heracles. Herodotus does not make clear what he considers Amphiaraus: T. Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000), 160 n. 8. For the sake of the argument below concerning Adrastus, I wish to draw attention to the fact that Amphiaraus could be called a hero as well as a god.

[4] 1.46–55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5 [Ἀμ]φιαρέοι μνᾶμ᾽ἀρετ[ᾶς τε πάθας τε[- - -]
[..]μεν ἃ ἐκλέφθε ΦΟ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[Θε]βαίοισι δὲ θάμβος Ε[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[..]πιδα δαιμονίος ΔΕ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

Translation:

Here as an offer of thanks [to you], Apollo … [Indeed,] the supervisor of the shrine set it, having made a vow, discovering through his prophetic arts … the shining shield, which Croesus [set up?] as a beautiful pleasing gift to Amphiaraus, a memorial of his excellence [and suffering] … which was stolen … and amazement to the Thebans … by divine power.

As we can see immediately, the inscription on the column is not a straightforward dedication: it is actually the work of a temple supervisor ([ἐ]πιστάς, line 2, or, less likely, [θεσ]πιστάς, 'prophet', *per* Thonemann). It seems that the shield, initially set up at Croesus' behest at the Amphiaraion,[5] had been stolen (ἐκλέφθε, line 6), but through consultation of Apollo's oracle the temple official at the Ismenion had been able to recover it. The column thus both rededicates Croesus' original offering and also serves as a thank-offering (χάρις) on the part of the official. This chain of events explains how Croesus' dedication to Amphiaraus in his shrine eventually came to be housed in the Ismenion instead.[6]

The portion of the text crucial for the present argument is the following: the inscription says that Croesus once 'set up' (or maybe 'dedicated', ἀνέθεκεν, line 5 [restored by Thonemann]) the shining shield to Amphiaraus 'as a memorial of his excellence [and suffering (*pathê*)]'.[7] Papazarkadas rightly restored the latter half of the collocation 'excellence and suffering', because this is precisely how Herodotus describes the shield: 'Learning of his excellence and suffering, Croesus dedicated to Amphiaraus a shield made entirely of gold and a solid spear entirely of gold.'[8] Here is striking material evidence for one of Herodotus' claims: the temple official's dedication, probably erected (based on letter-forms) *c*.500 B.C.E., was seen by Herodotus in the mid fifth century and taken as evidence that Croesus honoured the hero Amphiaraus, after having learned of his mythological background, as a brave but tragic figure in the story of the Seven against Thebes.[9]

In a recent, ingenious argument, Peter Thonemann has questioned Herodotus' identification of the shield dedicator with the Lydian king.[10] He posits that it was a different Croesus, known from another epigraphic source, who had the shield set up. Thonemann finds it strange that Croesus would have expressed his admiration for Amphiaraus through the expression 'a memorial of his excellence and suffering'. Typically a 'memorial' (*mnêma*) is of the *dedicator's* virtues and achievements, not of the deity

[5] For a single Amphiareion in Oropos, see A. Schachter, 'Boiotia in the sixth century B.C.', in H. Beister and J. Buckler (edd.), *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer* (Munich, 1989), 72–86, at 76–7.

[6] Papazarkadas (n. 1), 245–6.

[7] Line 5: μνᾶμ᾽ ἀρετ[ᾶς τε πάθας].

[8] 1.52: τῷ δὲ Ἀμφιάρεῳ, πυθόμενος αὐτοῦ τήν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν πάθην, ἀνέθηκε σάκος τε χρύσεον πᾶν ὁμοίως καὶ αἰχμὴν στερεὴν πᾶσαν χρυσέην.

[9] For the importance of the find for our understanding of Herodotus' historiographical methods, particularly those of autopsy and the use of documents, see Papazarkadas (n. 1), 247 (who, however, retains some hesitations about identifying the new epigram with the text cited by Herodotus); Porciani (n. 1), 109–10; Thonemann (n. 1), 159; Tentori Montalto (n. 1 [2017]), 7.

[10] Thonemann (n. 1).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or hero honoured by the dedication.[11] Here Thonemann's argument relies on the assumption that the language of the temple official's dedication as preserved in the inscription relies, ultimately, on an 'original, two-line dedicatory epigram'.[12] In other words, the temple official knew the exact phrasing of Croesus' initial dedication and either reproduces or reformulates it at lines 4–5. Since Thonemann assumes, on this basis, that the memorial is of the dedicator's qualities, he finds it likely that the 'excellence and suffering' mentioned refer to the excellence and suffering experienced by the dedicator, specifically in a military context. The dedicator fought well (his *aretê*) and died in battle (his *pathê*), both of which qualities are celebrated by the epigram and the accompanying shield.

But who, on this reading, is Croesus? He is, Thonemann suggests, the only other such named person known from the Archaic period, from an Attic sepulchral epigram of the mid sixth century.[13] Although, as Thonemann admits (quoting Meiggs and Lewis), 'dead men do not make dedications', he still finds it likely that the Attic Croesus (or, rather, his family) posthumously made the dedication to Amphiaraus after he died in battle.[14] (Thonemann adduces the example of the [dead] polemarch Callimachus' dedication after Marathon.[15]) On this reading, Herodotus passed along a misinterpretation, foisted on him (whether knowingly or not) by the Ismenion temple attendants, who mistook a dead member of the Athenian elite for the famous Lydian king.[16]

Thonemann's reading makes sense of certain idiosyncrasies in the language of the epigram, and it brings together our existing pieces of evidence in one possible (though very complex) reconstruction of Croesus' identity.[17] However, we should consider other factors that eliminate the need to reject the simpler story, namely that Croesus the king dedicated the shield to Amphiaraus.[18] Thonemann's doubts arise because of the language of the inscription that Herodotus directly drew upon, that Croesus learned of Amphiaraus' *aretê* and *pathê*: 'It is hard to see why his "virtue and suffering" should have mattered to Croesus one way or the other.'[19] But we should remember that this explanation for Croesus' dedication was supplied by the temple official when he had

[11] Thonemann (n. 1), 161.

[12] Thonemann (n. 1), 158.

[13] *IG* I^3 1240 (with accompanying statue of a kouros): 'Stand beside and pity the tomb of the dead Croesus, whom once raging Ares destroyed while amongst the forefighters.' Because the eponymous founder of the Alcmaeonid *genos* once visited Croesus the Lydian king (this was, in fact, the source of his wealth, according to Hdt. 6.125), scholars have assumed that this Croesus belonged to the Alcmaeonids and that he was named for the king. A '[Krois]os Alkmeo[ni]des' has therefore been restored at *IG* I^3 597, line 1.

[14] Quotation from R. Meiggs and D.M. Lewis (edd.), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. Revised Edition* (Oxford, 1988), 33.

[15] Thonemann (n. 1), 162–3, discussing *IG* I^3 784 = ML 18.

[16] Thonemann (n. 1), 164–5.

[17] In general, Thonemann's discussion ([n. 1], 159–61, 164–5) of the role of temple staff in influencing ancient historians' understanding of the meaning of inscriptions is invaluable.

[18] Thonemann's thesis has so far not received much support: see the restated arguments of Tentori Montalto (n. 1 [2019]); G. Renberg, *Where Dreams May Come: Incubation Sanctuaries in the Greco-Roman World* (Leiden, 2017), 676; C. Pelling, *Herodotus and the Question Why* (Austin, TX, 2019), 269 n. 28 (although no argument is provided). J. Ma, 'Review of N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden and Boston, 2014)', *BMCRev* 2016.07.11 calls Thonemann's argument 'ingenious', but does not commit himself one way or the other. None of the critics has, to my knowledge, adduced the evidence that follows in order to challenge Thonemann's thesis.

[19] Thonemann (n. 1), 161.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the column inscribed—it need not be the original dedicator's wording. Croesus the king may very well have dedicated the shield to the Boeotian hero because of his 'oracular capacities', as Thonemann says; the temple official, however, was free to interpret (or misinterpret) Croesus' intentions in whatever terms seemed likely to him.

And honouring a hero 'for his suffering' was perfectly normal, as Herodotus himself reveals. In a famous if bemusing digression, the historian describes how Cleisthenes the tyrant of Sicyon altered his home city's hero-cult to Adrastus. Since he was at war with Argos and wanted to do down all things Argive, Cleisthenes sought to eliminate the prestige of the Argive hero. He therefore introduced a new cult, to the Theban Melanippus, and transferred Adrastus' sacrifices and festivals to it. In addition to these honours, Herodotus says, the Sicyonians 'used to celebrate his [Adrastus'] sufferings [*ta pathea autou*] with tragic choruses'.[20]

Herodotus' story about Cleisthenes and the cult of Adrastus remains an enormous puzzle. Historians continue to question almost every element of it: its very historicity; the motivations attributed to Cleisthenes by Herodotus; the political meaning(s) of Cleisthenes' supposed act; the source(s) for the story and the role played by Herodotus' own authorial programme.[21] Nevertheless, what seems certain from the episode is that, whatever the truth of the tale, Herodotus found it unremarkable that a hero (and a hero connected with the 'Seven against Thebes' cycle at that) would be honoured 'for his suffering'. The casual way in which he reports this element constitutes evidence that it was a common conception at the time of what the point of hero-cult was supposed to be. Indeed, as Gregory Nagy has shown, the suffering (*pathos*) of the hero, that which he undergoes (*paschein*), was a central component both of the picture of the hero in poetry and of the ritual practices involved in heroic cult.[22]

A particularly striking piece of evidence for this comes from Herodotus' older contemporary Pindar. In the eighth *Pythian Ode*, the poet has precisely Amphiaraus, in his capacity as seer, foretell the fate of Adrastus just prior to the second assault on Thebes by the epigoni: 'The hero [*hêrôs*] Adrastus, distressed by his earlier suffering [*patha*], now meets with a message from a better bird of omen; but back at home he will fare the opposite.'[23] Pindar has Amphiaraus mention Adrastus' misfortune at the very moment when he is labelled a hero, a poetic choice I do not believe is accidental, especially in the context of the Seven against Thebes.[24]

[20] Hdt. 5.67, with quotation at 5.67.5: οἱ Σικυώνιοι … καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον. Cf. Hdt. 2.171.1 (in an Egyptian context): ἐν δὲ τῇ λίμνῃ ταύτῃ τὰ δείκηλα τῶν παθέων αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς ποιεῦσι, 'At this lake they make exhibitions of his [the god Osiris'] sufferings at night.'

[21] See recently S. Forsdyke, *Slaves Tell Tales, and Other Episodes in the Politics of Popular Culture in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, 2012), 90–116, reviewing previous interpretations and offering her own.

[22] G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, 1979), 114 with n. 3; id., *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore, 1990), 387–8 (both citing the example of Adrastus). Further instances of heroization in Herodotus—and these happening in the *spatium historicum*, not the *mythicum*—which point to the heroic honours as a kind of recompense for suffering, without, however, explicitly mentioning *pathos*, include the cases of Philippus of Croton at Egesta, whose outstanding beauty was considered by the author a great loss and which prompted the locals to propitiate him (5.47.2), and of the Persian Artachaees at Acanthus, also of great physical qualities, who was called on by name by the Acanthians in their rites (7.117).

[23] Lines 49–52: ὁ δὲ καμὼν προτέρᾳ πάθᾳ νῦν ἀρείονος ἐνέχεται ὄρνιχος ἀγγελίᾳ Ἄδραστος ἥρως: τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν ἀντία πράξει.

[24] For more on Pindar and heroes, see B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford, 2005). Note also Pindar's presentation of the hero-cult established for the Rhodian Tlepolemus: 'As a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In fact, there are good reasons for thinking that Pindar himself believed that the golden shield in the Ismenion was dedicated by Croesus the Lydian king. The language of the epigram finds echoes in a passage of Pindar's song and therefore may reflect personal knowledge and autopsy of the monument on the part of the poet.[25] Pindar concludes his first *Pythian Ode* of 470 B.C.E., for the tyrant Hiero, with a contrast between two tyrannical figures, one positive and the other negative: 'The friendly-minded generosity of Croesus does not fade, but everywhere a hateful account covers Phalaris, he who burned people with the bronze bull, pitiless of mind.'[26] In approaching this remark we should begin with the background assumption that, as a Theban, Pindar was familiar with the Ismenion and its contents, including dedications by Croesus. He refers explicitly to the Ismenion in *Pythian* 11 as a 'sacred storehouse of golden tripods', confirming Herodotus' account that, on a separate occasion, Croesus the Lydian king dedicated just such a tripod to Apollo Ismenius.[27] But was the Croesus column published by Papazarkadas also in the Ismenion at the time of the first *Pythian Ode* and, if so, did Pindar consider it the dedication of the Lydian?

On this front, it is striking that Pindar describes Croesus' generosity as 'never fading', οὐ φθίνει: imperishability (being *aphthitos*) is frequently predicated of gold in archaic poetry, and in fact Pindar himself links them elsewhere when he calls the Golden Fleece the 'imperishable coverlet, the fleece radiant with golden tassel'.[28] The solid gold shield dedicated by Croesus (Hdt. 1.52), the 'shining shield' of the epigram, would also have been understood as imperishable. Furthermore, Pindar uses *aretê* to signify Croesus' generosity, a word that appears in the text of the epigram itself.[29] Thus there is a strong possibility that Pindar, whether consciously or not,

sweet recompense for his **pitiable misfortune** there are established for Tlepolemus the leader of the Tirynthians, as for a god, a procession of beasts rich with the smoke of sacrifice and a contest for prizes' (*Ol.* 8.77–80: λύτρον **συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς** γλυκὺ Τλαπολέμῳ ἵσταται Τιρυνθίων ἀρχαγέτᾳ, ὥσπερ θεῷ, μήλων τε κνισσάεσσα πομπὰ καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις). For other, explicit instances of the *pathos* of the hero or of a deified mortal, see Lucian, *Syr. D.* 6 (Adonis); Philostr. *Her.* 9.2, 12.1 (Protesilaus). Note also the case of Oedipus as described by Lysimachus, *FGrHist* 382 F 2: he was denied burial in Thebes because he was considered unholy (*asebês*) owing to his misfortunes (*symphorai*); this decision, however, was a mistake, since Oedipus would later become a kindly hero to the community of Eteonus.

[25] For the relationship between Pindar and his material context, a burgeoning field of scholarship, see R. Neer and L. Kurke, 'Pindar fr. 75 SM and the politics of Athenian space', *GRBS* 54 (2014), 527–79, with the literature cited at n. 1. Two examples: Pindar shows familiarity with the pediment of the Alcmaeonid temple at Delphi, also described as the Athenian family's project by Herodotus and no doubt seen by him (L. Athanassaki, 'Song, politics, and cultural memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid temple of Apollo', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie [edd.], *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* [Berlin and Boston, 2011], 235–68; N. Weiss, 'The choral architecture of Pindar's eighth Paean', *TAPhA* 146 [2016], 237–55; cf. Hdt. 5.62–63.1); and the poet may have known the mast and three gold stars dedicated at Delphi, mentioned at Hdt. 8.122 (L. Kurke, 'Choral lyric as "ritualization": poetic sacrifice and poetic *ego* in Pindar's sixth Paian', *CA* 24 [2005], 81–130, at 116–19).

[26] Lines 94–6: οὐ φθίνει Κροίσου φιλόφρων ἀρετά: τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον ἐχθρὸν Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾷ φάτις. For ἀρετά as 'generosity', see L. Kurke, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton, 1999), 135.

[27] *Pyth.* 11.4–5 χρυσέων … ἄδυτον τριπόδων θησαυρόν; Hdt. 1.92.1 ἐν μὲν γὰρ Θήβῃσι τῇσι Βοιωτῶν τρίπους χρύσεος, τὸν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Ἰσμηνίῳ.

[28] *Pyth.* 4.230–1 ἄφθιτον στρωμνὰν … κῶας αἰγλᾶεν χρυσέῳ θυσάνῳ. For *aphthitos* as a descriptor of gold (which is itself connected with the eternal *kleos* conferred on honorands by poetry), see Hom. *Il.* 5.725, 13.22, 14.238 with Nagy (n. 22 [1979]), 179–80, Nagy (n. 22 [1990]), 278 with n. 21; C. Segal, *Pindar's Mythmaking: The Fourth Pythian Ode* (Princeton, 1986), 112–13.

[29] There the *aretê* referred to is of course that of Amphiaraus, but Pindar may still have associated the word with Croesus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press

drew upon the combination of precious metal and inscribed word, of gold and *aretê*, present in Croesus' *agalma* when he paid tribute to Croesus in *Pythian* 1. This interpretation gains ground when we consider that the point of contrast with Croesus' generosity is precisely a material object, the 'bronze bull' in which the tyrant Phalaris roasted his enemies alive. On the physical level, as often in his poetry, Pindar links the gold of the shield with the everlasting *kleos* that Croesus enjoys, just as Phalaris' bad reputation finds concrete form in the bronze of the bull (a metal inferior in status to gold).[30] Finally, to what exactly does Pindar refer when he mentions the 'kindly-minded generosity' of Croesus? For what act would Pindar admire the Lydian king? As we have already seen, Croesus dedicated a golden tripod to Apollo Ismenius, a gesture of munificence and piety that would likely impress the Theban poet. A dedication to the Boeotian hero Amphiaraus, however, would find just as much favour.[31] In sum, it seems highly likely that the Croesus column, already in place in the Ismenion, informed Pindar's poetic language on the occasion of Hiero's victory.[32]

Of course, this identification on the poet's part does not necessarily constitute evidence for the true identity of the dedicator, since Pindar could have been misled by temple staff no less than Herodotus. However, since Pindar was older than Herodotus, having been born *c*.520, he could plausibly have been a witness of the original dedication, before it was lost, recovered and re-erected *c*.500. If he did not question the identity of the Croesus from the Ismenion pillar after having seen the original, then we would have even less reason to believe that the first version of the monument was not by the Lydian Croesus but by someone else. However, his knowledge of the original dedication to Amphiaraus must remain unknown.[33] It is impossible, though, that before his death some time after 446 Pindar did not know of the column viewed by Herodotus. And it is very unlikely that the column was erected in the generational span between Pindar's composition of the first *Pythian Ode* in 470 and Herodotus' viewing of it.[34] Thus, if the foregoing account is convincing, then it seems that Herodotus, Pindar and the cult personnel of the temple of Apollo Ismenius all believed the golden shield to be a gift of the Mermnad dynast, and we should too.

Arizona State University MATTHEW SIMONTON
matt.simonton@asu.edu

[30] For the contrast between gold and bronze, cf. Kurke (n. 26), 135, who associates Pindar's Croesus with gold using Bacchyl. 3.63–6 (see further below); also D. Fearn, *Pindar's Eyes: Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry* (Oxford, 2017), 225–6. Now, however, we see that Pindar may have had a material gold object of Croesus' in mind.

[31] In addition to the Boeotian aspect of Croesus' generosity, we should consider that the Pythian context is informing Pindar's language. Croesus dedicated many offerings to Delphi (Hdt. 1.50–1), which were subsequently cited by Bacchylides when comparing Croesus' generosity with that of, again, Hiero (3.58–66, for his Olympic victory of 468).

[32] Croesus' act of generosity on display at the Ismenion would also provide a lordly precedent that Hiero had already followed by 470, since around 474 he dedicated thank-offerings to Zeus and Apollo at Olympia and Delphi, respectively, for his victory over the Etruscans at Cyme: R. Osborne and P.J. Rhodes (edd.), *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 478–404 B.C.* (Oxford, 2017), no. 1 with *SIG*^{3} 35. Pindar mentions the victory earlier in the ode of 470, at *Pyth.* 1.71–5. Two years later, in 468, Bacchylides could describe Hiero as having dedicated more gold than any other mortal to Apollo (3.64–7).

[33] The relative dating of the Theban epigram to *c*.500 leaves a lot of space for Pindar never to have seen it.

[34] Although we are ill informed on the development of Boeotian letter forms, the relative dating to *c*.500 makes it unlikely that the column was erected, at the very latest, not in the first third of the fifth century but in the second third.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000427 Published online by Cambridge University Press