

# *Aristomakhou* as a Proper Noun in the Prooimial Priamel of Pindar's *Pythian* 10

Roberto Bongiovanni

Ὀλβία Λακεδαῖμον·  
Μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία· πατρός  
Δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνὸς  
Ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει.  
Τί; κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν;  
Ἀλλά με Πυθῶ τε καὶ τὸ  
Πελinnaῖον ἀπύει  
Ἀλεύα τε παῖδε

*Pythian* 10.1–8 (Heyne)

**T**HUS WERE PRINTED the opening verses of the tenth *Pythian* ode of Pindar in C. G. Heyne's Göttingen edition (1798), of which a very notable feature in the fourth verse, besides the obsolete stichometric arrangement, is that the reader is meant to read Ἀριστομάχου as a proper noun.<sup>1</sup> This is confirmed in the Latin *interpretatio* accompanying the edition: "In utroque uno ex patre Aristomacho Herculis progenies imperat" (II 87). Heyne is following Erasmus

<sup>1</sup> C. Heyne, *Pindari carmina* (Göttingen 1798) I 384–385, III.2 344. There appear to have been two parallel traditions of scholarship. Ἀριστόμαχος appears in the index of proper nouns compiled by Raphael Fiorillus appended to Heine's edition, where there is also a reference to this passage, without further explanation. Likewise in A. Bonavilla, *Dizionario etimologico* (Milan 1819) I 361, and in G. Benseler, *Pape's Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Braunschweig 1911) 113 s.v. However, it is missing in Damm's *Lexicon*: H. Huntingford, *Dammii Lexicon Pindaricum* (London 1814). Later lexica explain the word as an epithet of Heracles: J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Leipzig 1883) 66 s.v.: "optime pugnans, excellens pugnā." Cf. W. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) 71 s.v.: "finest of warriors."

Schmidt's commentary on the odes (1616), a fact that he himself acknowledges in his critical notes, thereby joining the latter in rejection of the scholiastic tradition, which interpreted the word as an epithet of Heracles:

Ἀριστομάχου ἐπιθετικῶς, τοῦ ἀρίστου κατὰ τὰς μάχας iam vetus Grammaticus exposuerat: male, ut etiam Schmid. monuit. Aristomachi, qui unus ex Heraclidis fuit, filii Laconicam sortiti sunt. Ex huius eiusdem Aristomachi posteris Aleuam fuisse, Aleuadarum progenitorem, ex h. l. probabile fit. Aliam auctoritatem adhuc desidero.<sup>2</sup>

Heyne was careful to concede that the “other authority” was in fact missing (“*aliam auctoritatem adhuc desidero*”). There is no known alternate source that can confirm a direct line of descent from Aristomachus to the sons of Aleuas (Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες in Pindar). In the legend of the Return of the Heraclidae,<sup>3</sup> the sons of Aristomachus, great-grandson of Heracles, had reclaimed the Peloponnese as their hereditary possession. But this desideratum has not prevented others from citing the very same Pindaric verses as their sole authority for the connection (“*ex h. l. probabile fit*”), thus promoting an alternative tradition of interpretation.<sup>4</sup> We shall argue that, strictly within

<sup>2</sup> Heyne I 385. Cf. schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 10.1, ἐν γὰρ ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἐνὸς πατρὸς τοῦ γενναίου Ἡρακλέους τὸ γένος βασιλεύει; 10.3, ἀριστομάχου ἐπιθετικῶς, τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τοῦ ἀρίστου κατὰ τὰς μάχας (II 242 Drachmann = Heyne II 639). In agreement with the scholia, see S. Tessing, *De compositis nominibus Aeschyleis et Pindaricis* (Lund 1884) 31; J. Rouman, *Nominal-Compound Epithets in Pindar: A Linguistic Analysis* (diss., U. Wisconsin 1965) 14.

<sup>3</sup> The most synthetic accounts of this legend are Diod. 4.57 and Apollod. 2.167–168. Cf. Paus. 2.18.7, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Τισαμενοῦ τούτου κατῆσαν ἐς Πελοπόννησον Ἡρακλείδαι, Τήμενος μὲν καὶ Κρεσφόντης Ἀριστομάχου, τοῦ τρίτου δὲ Ἀριστοδήμου προτεθνεῶτος εἶποντο οἱ παῖδες; 5.3.5, καὶ ἐπὶ Ἡλείου βασιλεύοντος ἐν Ἡλίδι, ὁ Δωριέων στόλος σὺν τοῖς Ἀριστομάχου παισὶν ἠθροίζετο ἐπὶ καθόδῳ τῇ ἐς Πελοπόννησον.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. Gautier, *Πυθιονικαί, I vincitori pizù di Pindaro* (Rome 1765) 285 n. 2: “Questo Aristomaco fu pronipote di Ercole. Ad Aristodemo di lui figlio, quando gli Eraclidi ricuperarono il Peloponneso, toccò la Laconia; e Aleua, altro discendente di Aristomaco, occupò la Tessaglia. Quindi apparisce il

the formal parameters of the prooimial priamel, and in the greater context of the epinician ode, the reading of Ἀριστόμαχος as a proper noun has the advantage of clarifying and enhancing the rhetorical structure of Pindar's encomium to the Aleuadae.

Let us begin by tracing the nominal interpretation back to its origin, about two centuries before Heyne, in Schmidt's edition of Pindar's odes: "patre vero utrisque ex uno Aristomacho genus Herculis imperat."<sup>5</sup> Convinced of the correctness of his interpretation, Schmidt argued in his commentary against the prevailing view based on the scholion, saying of Pindar:

---

senso di ciò, che dicesi in questa strofe dal nostro Lirico." M. Chabanon, *Les Odes Pythiques de Pindare* (Paris 1772) 304, is aware of the equivocal readings: "On pourroit prendre ce mot pour un nom propre. Hercule eut en effet un Descendant appelé Aristomachus, & de celui-ci descendoit Aleüas, dont Pindare parle dans la première strophe." C. Damm, *Pythische Nemeische und Isthmische Siegeslieder* (Berlin/Leipzig 1774) 134: "Erstlich ist zu bemerken, daß Aristomachos ein Ur-Enkel vom Herkules gewesen, und daß der zwey Söhne gehabt, davon der Eine, Aristodemus, Lakonien auf sein Antheil bekommen: der zweite Alevas aber in Theßalien geblieben, und daselbst die Nachkommenschaft von Fürsten, die in den Geschichten die Alevaden heißen, gestiftet hat." F. Gedike, *Pindars Pythische Siegeshymnen* (Berlin/Leipzig 1779) 228, paraphrasing thus: "in euch beiden herrschet Herkuls Stamm von einem Vater, vom Aristomachus entsprossen," adding this note: "Aristomachus war ein Urenkel des Herkules. Seine Nachkommen herrschten theils in Lakedämon theils in Thessalien." C. Beck, *Pindari carmina et fragmenta graece* (Leipzig 1795) II 215, is inconsistent: the paraphrase accepts the variant reading "in utraque Herculis progenies ab Aristomacho regnat," but oddly the commentary at v. 1 quotes the scholion. More cautious is J. Gurlitt, *Pindars Pythische Siegesgesänge zehnter* (Hamburg 1813) 4 n.1: "Denn dass des Herakliden Aristomachos Söhne Lakonika erhielten, ist bekannt; dass aber Aleuas und seine Söhne, Fürsten Thessalischer Städte, vom Aristomachos stammten, und nicht von einem anderen Herakliden, schliesst man nur aus unserer Stelle, wenn man ἀριστόμαχος als Eigennamen nimmt." W. Vollmer, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch der Mythologie aller Nationen* (Stuttgart 1836) 139, s.v. Alevas: "Ein Nachkömmling des Hercules (von dem Herakliden Aristomachos), den uns Pindar im Anfange der zehnten pythischen Siegeshymne aufführt."

<sup>5</sup> E. Schmidt, *Πινδάρου περίοδος: Pythionicae* (Wittenberg 1616) 351.

Praedicat Lacedaemonem & Thessaliam felices, ob gubernatores praestantes, (quales vere beatas reddunt suas ditiones) & quidem ab uno Patre Aristomacho, pronepote Herculis, hac genealogia: Hercules. – Hyllus. – Cleodeus. – Aristomachus. Huius Aristomachi filius Aristodemus, Laconiam sortitus est, quum Heraclidae Peloponnesum recuperarent: alius vero ἀπόγονος Aristomachi Aleuas, Thessaliam occupavit, cuius posterii Aevadae ab Historicis celebrantur. *Herodot. Polym.*<sup>6</sup>

Schmidt hereby claimed that it was out of ignorance of Book 7 (Polyhymnia) of Herodotus that the scholiast was misled into taking ἀριστομάχου as an adjective, referring ἐπιθετικῶς to Heracles.<sup>7</sup> In the *Histories* Aristomachus, whose genealogy is clearly delineated, is one of the Heraclid ancestors of the Spartan kings.<sup>8</sup> This comparison with the *Histories* has the virtue of explaining the Pindaric collocation of Aristomachus and Lacedaemon as associated terms in the priamel. Schmidt commended Philipp Melanchthon's Latin translation of 1563, which first recognized the proper noun: "Solus *Philippus*, historiarum gnarus, proprium esse recte iudicavit." Furthermore, he insisted that interpretations based on the scholia, viz. Lonicerus, Aretius, and Portus, were essentially erroneous: "omnes decepti ignoracione Historiae, & auctoritate Scholiastae."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Schmidt 360. It is likely, from the omission of the names of the two other sons of Aristomachus—Temenus and Cresphontes—in nearly every exponent of this interpretation since the 18<sup>th</sup> century (see n.4), which collectively mention only Aristodemus in conjunction with Lacedaemon (Laconica) as his allotment, that this passage from Schmidt's *Περίοδος* was the main, if not the only, source for their arguments.

<sup>7</sup> It may be objected, however, that the scholiast might not have bothered to make the point unless he knew of an alternate tradition.

<sup>8</sup> Hdt. 7.204: Λακεδαιμόνιος ἦν Λεωνίδης ὁ Ἀναξανδρίδew ... τοῦ Εὐρυσθένεος τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Ὑλλου τοῦ Ἡρακλέος, κτησάμενος τὴν βασιληίην ἐν Σπάρτῃ ἐξ ἀπροσδοκίτου.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. P. Melanchthon, *Pindari thebani lyricorum veterum principis, Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Wittenberg 1563) 78: "Felix Lacedaemon, et beata Thessalia. Nam in utraque regnat genus Herculis, ex uno patre Aristo-

A certain controversy must have arisen between these two competing interpretations: one, following the scholia, promulgated by Lonicerus, took ἀριστομάχου epithetically, referring to Ἡρακλέος in the same line; the other, first proposed by Melanchthon, took Ἀριστομάχου as a proper noun in apposition to πατρὸς ἐξ ἑνός. The latter understanding was substantiated, according to Schmidt, by Herodotus: Aristomachus is third in line of succession after Heracles, and his sons—Temenus, Aristodemus, and Cresphontes—reclaim their hereditary possessions in the Peloponnese, ruling respectively the kingdoms of Argos, Sparta, and Messenia. Herodotus is very likely transmitting the Spartan king-lists that are thought to have appeared in Hecataeus' *Γενεηλογίαι*.<sup>10</sup> It would not be

---

macho (Aristomachi, ed. 1558).” I. Lonicerus, *Pindari poetae vetustissimi, lyricorumque omnium principis, Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Basel 1528) 48v: “Beata Lacedaemon, felix Thessalia, utrisque ex uno patre bello praestantissimi Herculis genus regnat.” B. Aretius, *Commentarii absolutissimi in Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Bern 1587) 346: “Hercules Ἀριστόμαχος dicitur, quia optimus & fortissimus bellator, & quod certamina sua mortalium generi plurimum profuerint: sustulit enim monstra, oppressos liberavit.” A. Portus, *Pindaricum Lexicum* (Hanover 1606) 100: “In-proeliis-praestantissimus. Pugnator fortissimus.” H. Stephanus, *Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Geneva 1586) 217–218: “Felix Lacedaemon & beata Thessalia: ambarum enim regnum obtinet genus Herculis strenuissimi pugnatoris ex uno patre.” C. Dinner, *Epithetorum graecorum farrago locupletissima* (Frankfurt 1589) 306, lists ἀριστόμαχος as an epithet of Heracles, quoting the Pindaric verse. I. Benedictus, *Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia* (Saumur 1620) 453, paraphrases: “ex uno eodemque patre, nimirum Hercule praestantissimo in pugnis heroë;” commenting ad loc. “ἀριστομάχου. Hoc est, γενναιοτάτου. Est autem ἀριστόμαχος, ὁ ἐν ταῖς μάχαις, seu κατὰ τὰς μάχας ἄριστος. Herculis epitheton meritissimum, siquidem fuit optimus & fortissimus bellator, sustulit monstra, liberavit oppressos, & sic mortalium generi plurimum profuit.” For an exhaustive study of Pindaric epithets and their historic treatment by commentators since the Renaissance see P. Hummel, *L'épithète pindarique: étude historique et philologique* (Brussels 1999) 149–150.

<sup>10</sup> Hdt. 6.52, 7.204, 8.131. The publication of the *Γενεηλογίαι* occurs sometime between ca. 510 and 491 B.C. during the reign of Demaratus; see D. Prakken, “Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists” *TAPA* 71 (1940) 460–472. *Pythian* 10 was composed during this period in 498.

too far fetched to suppose that, if this genealogy was circulated as propaganda before the date of the ode, Pindar would have made use of it, as he generally makes use of local traditions. Here at least was indirect evidence of a contemporary attestation of Ἀριστόμαχος as a proper noun.

Schmidt made a further claim, for which no evidence exists outside of Pindar, if indeed it were the case: “alius vero ἀπόγονος Aristomachi Aleuas.” Nowhere in Herodotus is there mention of the legendary progenitor Aleuas. The Aleuadae that figure prominently in Herodotus for their role during the Persian Wars are the very same sons of a latter-day Aleuas—Thorax, Eurypylus, and Thrasydaeus—named by Pindar as his patrons in *Pythian* 10 (5, 64, 69). In Herodotus (9.59) Mardonius addresses Thorax and his brothers: ὦ παῖδες Ἀλεύεω. These are the same Aleuadae who, according to Herodotus, invited Xerxes into Greece (7.6): οἱ δὲ Ἀλευάδαι οὗτοι ἦσαν Θεσσαλῆς βασιλέες. Schmidt then, having no other source than Pindar and Herodotus,<sup>11</sup> could not have made his inference concerning the Heraclid origins of the Aleuadae unless it was drawn from the text of *Pythian* 10 itself.

The assumption that Pindar was transmitting a genealogical tradition, from which even Herodotus would later draw his information, is rendered plausible by the appearance of a genealogical genre around 500. It is inferred from the text of *Pythian* 10.2–3, πατρός / δ’ ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνός, that the claim to Heraclid ancestry on the part of Thorax and his brothers was an accepted fact at the time.<sup>12</sup> However, it is not clear how the Heracleidae who ruled Lacedaemon were supposed also to have ruled Thessaly. Nor is it known how Aristomachus was

<sup>11</sup> Testimony of a lost work by Euphorion, *Περὶ τῶν Ἀλευαδῶν*, is found in various sources: Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.117, and schol. Theoc. *Id.* 16.34. The *Suda* s.v. Ἐφορος attributes the same or a similar work to the younger Ephorus.

<sup>12</sup> Schol. Dem. 1.151: Ἀλεύας, ἀπόγονός τις τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, Θεσσαλός, ἐτυράνησε Θεσσαλῶν, εἶτα καὶ οἱ τούτου παῖδες; cf. schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 10 *pr.*: ἀμφοτέρα τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὸ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ἐβασιλεύοντο.

supposed to have fathered a line of descendants in Thessaly. The first critical review of the evidence for the Aleuad claim of descent from Aristomachus appeared in August Boeckh's edition of Pindar's odes (1821). In the *explicatio* to *Pythian* 10 he confessed that he too once shared the views of Schmidt and Heyne, but later, when the problem became clear, became unconvinced:<sup>13</sup>

A quo tamen Herculis filio Thessalici Heracleidae originem repetiverint, incertum est; ab Aristomacho Cleodaei, Hylli, Herculis f. Aleuadarum genus repeti cum Schmidio et Heynio in nott. critt. putabam: nunc spreta hac sententia vs. 2. ἄριστομάχου minuscula littera scribo, propterea quod Aristomachi filii omnes et universum Hylli genus in Peloponnesum migrasse secundum veteres videntur, Temenum dico, Cresphontem, Aristodemum.

Therefore, since no source has ever mentioned a son of Aristomachus in Thessaly, Boeckh's *interpretatio* reaffirmed the scholiastic reading ἄριστομάχου as an epithet of Heracles: "patre quippe utrique ex uno fortissimi progenies Herculis imperat."<sup>14</sup> We may conclude from the foregoing that Boeckh denied that there was any evidence supporting the claim of kinship between Thessalian and Spartan royal houses, and it is reasonable to assume further that he did not believe that there was any evidence for the circulation of a story purporting that kinship—not even Pindar's poem. Ultimately, the argument in favor of the epithet is no better founded than the one for the proper name, since both rest on guesses about the 'real' story.

The universal reception of Boeckh's edition ultimately rele-

<sup>13</sup> A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* (Leipzig 1821) II.2 332.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. L. Dissen, *Pindari carmina quae supersunt* (Gotha/Erfurt 1830) II 327: "ex uno enim ambabus patre bellicosi genus Herculis imperat." Boeckh's change of mind is not evident in either his 1811 or 1821 editions, where he still prints Ἀριστομάχου in 4 with an initial majuscule (1821: II.2 69). The change appeared only in Dissen's 1830 edition of Boeckh's recension, from which all current scholarly editions generally derive. Cf. Boeckh I 120 (both editions); Dissen I 125.

gated Heyne's reading (*pace* Schmidt and Melanchthon) to oblivion, and there is scarcely a trace of it in subsequent editions or translations of Pindar.<sup>15</sup> Boeckh argued that, since all

<sup>15</sup> In a few contemporary English translations of Pindar's odes equivocal readings survive: J. Girdlestone, *All the Odes of Pindar* (Norwich 1810) 212: "The victor seems to have been descended from Aristomachus, a descendant of Hercules. This race, branching into two, appears to have given kings to Lacedaemon and Thessaly." G. West, *The Odes of Pindar in English Prose* (Oxford 1824) 222, seems in part to be quoting Schmidt (see n.6 above): "Aristomachus, one of the Heraclidae, was a great grandson of Hercules. His posterity ruled partly in Lacedaemon, and partly in Thessaly. Hercules had Hyllus, whose son was Cleodeus, the father of Aristomachus: when the Heraclidae conquered the Peloponnesus, Aristodemus, a son of Aristomachus, obtained Laconia: another ἀπόγονος of this same Aristomachus ruled in Thessaly, whose posterity, the Aleuadae, are celebrated by historians." C. Wheelwright, *Pindar* (London 1830) 149: "It is doubted by commentators whether the word Ἀριστομαχου be used by Pindar as an epithet to Hercules, or to denote one of the Heraclidae, from whom Aleva derived his origin. The scholiast asserts the former." H. Cary, *Odes of Pindar in English Verse* (London 1833) 121: "Blest Lacedaemon! Happy Thessaly! / Both ruled by race of glorious Hercules, / From Aristomachus, one father, sprung!" A. Mezzanote, *Le odi di Pindaro* (Pisa 1820) II 331, criticized Gautier's use of the proper name (see n.4 above): "L'equivoco sembra imperdonabile; ma ognuno sa come la umana mente è soggetta in lunghi lavori ad errare: e ne abbiamo esempi anche fra i più grandi scrittori." Despite this criticism the proper name continued to appear in the Italian translation of G. Borghi, *Le odi di Pindaro* (Florence 1865) 244: "O diva Sparta, o florida / Tessaglia, ov' ebbe impero / pel famoso Aristomaco / d'Alcide il seme altero!" Both W. Christ, *Pindari carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa* (Leipzig 1896) 217, and O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig 1900) 256, acknowledge the *varia lectio* in their critical apparatus. See also the monograph "Geschlecht der Aleuaden" in P. Buttmann, *Mythologus* (Berlin 1829) II 254, which considers the probability of a descendant of Aristomachus having been left behind in Thessaly after an unsuccessful foray into the Peloponnese and subsequent retreat of the Heraclidae into Thessaly: "Da nun dieser auf einem der verunglückten Versuche gegen den Peloponnes umkam, worauf die Herakliden wieder nach Thessalien zurückkehrten, so wäre es wohl denkbar, dass, als im letzten Zuge dessen bekante drei Söhne, Temenos, Kresphontes, Aristodemos, den Peloponnes eroberten, die Ueberlieferung einen vierten Sohn in Thessalien hätte zurückbleiben lassen, von dem dann der dortige Fürstenstamm herkäme."



of the sons of Aristomachus—in fact, the entire progeny of Hyllus—seem (from ancient report) to have ended up in the Peloponnese, there was no basis for a genealogical connection with the Thessalian Aleuadae. It is certainly implied by Pindar, in the final lines of *Pythian* 10, that the Aleuadae were Heraclidae, since the brothers who are mentioned by name as the sons of Aleuas (Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, 5), whom he praises as sustainers of the Thessalian *koinon* (ὑψοῦ φέροντι νόμον Θεσσαλῶν αὔξοντες, 70–71), and to whose capacity as noblemen the government of the principal cities of Thessaly was entrusted (ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι κείται πατρώϊαι κεδναὶ πολίων κυβερνάσιες, 71–72), must have been none other than the Heraclid kings of Thessaly (γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει, 2–3).<sup>16</sup> If Aristomachus is in fact the Heraclid ancestor of the Aleuadae, as Schmidt and Heyne supposed, then Pindar is certainly alone in making this claim; this is the essential problem with this interpretation. However, Pindar's acknowledgement of such a claim does not need to be consistent with known history; rather, it is only a formal element in the opening priamel of the ode. What a vaunt then to imply that the sons of Aristomachus πατρὸς ἐξ ἐνός—Temenus, Aristodemus, and Cresphontes—are foil for Thorax and his brothers!

Boeckh's attempt at tracing the ancestry of the Aleuadae to the Heraclid Thessalus, mentioned at *Iliad* 2.678–679, is objectively plausible, but it should not represent an exclusive genealogy with general application to the Thessalians, rather only a competing genealogy with special relevance to some Thessalian dynasties. The requirement to trace the Heraclid lineage of the Aleuadae back beyond the mythical progenitor Aleuas Pyrrhus to Thessalus takes its cue at any rate solely from the scholiast to Demosthenes.<sup>17</sup> Boeckh was not aware of what has been called the “discursive dimension of ethnic identity,” i.e. the appeal, motivated by political or military exigencies, to

<sup>16</sup> Boeckh, *Pindari opera* II.2 332.

<sup>17</sup> See n.11 above.

advantageous affinities between individuals or groups based on the belief in a shared descent (*syngeneia*).<sup>18</sup> This explains why various other northern Greek monarchies tried to establish kinships with Dorian kingdoms of the Peloponnese essentially by linking their genealogies to a common Heraclid ancestor. The Molossian royal dynasty traced its descent from the union of Neoptolemos and Leonassa, the sister of Aristomachus and daughter of Cleodaeus, son of Hyllus.<sup>19</sup> Likewise Macedonian monarchs traced their ancestry back to Caranus, founder of the Argive dynasty in Macedonia, or even to Perdicas, the son of Temenus, son of Aristomachus.<sup>20</sup> Thus, despite the lack of a mythological tradition, a purported connection between Aristomachus and the Aleuadae of Thessaly may be understood as analogous to similar declarations of Heraclid affinity, such as those of the neighboring Molossians and Macedonians.<sup>21</sup>

Boeckh, moreover, did not consider the encomiastic context

<sup>18</sup> J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 1997) 36–37. “*Syngeneia* is the regular word for family kinship, though it is important to note that it does not signify an *externally defined* system of cognative relationships between siblings and cousins, but rather the kin relationships that a particular individual might recognise at any one time *by reference to shared ancestors in the lineage*.”

<sup>19</sup> Lysimachus *Νόστοι* *FGrHist* 382 F 10b. Cf. Höfer, “Leonassa,” Roscher, *Lex.* II.2 (1897) 1944.

<sup>20</sup> Hdt. 8.137. Cf. A. Natoli, *The Letter of Speusippus to Philip II* (Stuttgart 2004) 102: ἐπειδὴ τὸ γένος ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἄφ’ Ἡρακλέους.

<sup>21</sup> Alexander’s claim to kinship with the Thessalians was purportedly based on a common descent from Achilles’ son Neoptolemus, tracing the descent of his mother Olympias from Molossus, a son of Neoptolemus by Andromache, and deriving the Aleuadae from another son named Pyrrhus; see M. Sordi, “La dracma di Aleuas e l’origine di un tipo monetario di Alessandro Magno” *AJN* 3 (1956) 9–22. L. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin 2010) 89: “The archaic innovations that find more copious citation in later sources, however, probably served political aetiological purposes as well.” M. Sordi, *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Roma 1958) 68, proposes that ca. 500 Aleuas exploited the myth of Neoptolemus’ connection with Dodona and the union of Aeacidae and Heracleidae.

designed to enhance the glory of the ‘sons of Aleuas’, which would necessarily affect the character of any connection, whether purported or real, between the sons of Aleuas and the mythical Heracleidae. Pindar performed the ode in 498, probably in Pelinna, the victor’s hometown, in the assembled presence of the Aleuadae and other noble houses of Thessaly, on the occasion of the celebration of Hippocleas’ victory in the diaulos in the Pythian games of that year; so much is known from the ode.<sup>22</sup> The *hic et nunc* of the ode must figure into any interpretation of it. Any inquiry into historical or mythological resonances in the prooimion—the Return of the Heracleidae, or the self-promoting mythologizing of the Aleuadae, avatars of a mythical *Urwater* Aleuas<sup>23</sup>—cannot ignore the rhetorical structure of the opening priamel, in which the connection between Aristomachus and the Aleuadae is merely a *topos* of praise.

Bundy recognized the focusing device at work in the prooimion of *Pythian* 10 (1–6), in which “Lakedaimon and Thessaly are foil for Pytho (the place of victory), Pelinna (the victor’s home town), and, mentioned last for effect, the victor himself.”<sup>24</sup> However, what is missing in this trinomial relation is the analogue of the *laudandus*—not only the victor Hippocleas, but especially his patron Thorax, and his brothers. If, however, one reads the genitive in line 3 as a proper noun Ἀριστομάχου, enjambéd in climactic apposition to the genitives in the prepositional phrase πατρὸς ἐξ ἑνός, then the transition to the genitive nominal cap Ἀλεύα in line 5 brings focus to Aleuas, for whom Aristomachus is foil.

More glory accrues to the sons of Aleuas from this comparison with the fabled sons of Aristomachus, not necessarily

<sup>22</sup> L. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London 1932) II 214.

<sup>23</sup> F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich 1979) 206; I. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge 1994) 15; Sordi, *La lega tessala* 56.

<sup>24</sup> E. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* [1962] (digital version 2006: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2g79p68q>) 8.

because descent from one to the other is implied, but because, as Aristodemus, Temenus, and Cresphontes once ruled as kings over their Dorian possessions in the Peloponnese, so too now do the three sons of Aleuas rule together over the νόμον Θεσσαλῶν (70):

Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων,  
 μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία. πατρὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνός  
 Ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει.  
 τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; ἀλλά με Πυθῶ τε καὶ τὸ Πελοπονναῖον  
 ἀπύει

Ἀλεύα τε παῖδες, Ἴπποκλέα θέλοντες  
 ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα. *Pyth.* 10.1–6

Happy is Lacedaemon, blessed is Thessaly! Over both, from one father—Aristomachus, the offspring of Heracles rule as kings. Why do I boast beyond due measure? Rather, Pytho and Pelinna summon me, and the sons of Aleuas, who wish, for Hippocleas' sake, to lead the splendid voice of men in a komos.

The two place-names arranged asyndetically—Λακεδαίμων and Θεσσαλία—introduce a composite term, which by means of ancillary adjectives achieves both transition and amplification: “for, just as the wealth of the Lacedaemonians is proverbial, so too is the blessedness of the Thessalians.”<sup>25</sup> And

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Benedictus, *Pindari Olympica* 452: “Quemadmodum beata es ὁ Lacedaemon, sic etiam tu foelix es ὁ Thessalia.” Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* 52 n.10: “Note that μάκαιρα is an intensification of ὀλβία and rather contrasts than compares Thessalia with Lakedaimon.” See also C. de Heer, *Study of the Semantic Field denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam 1968) 15: “Ὀλβιος is applied to denote the possession of highly prized goods, material wealth, children, a wife who is singularly endowed, possessions which render a man’s life complete or single him out as being above the ordinary.” In Bacchylides fr.14b, a Thessalian family is described as having ὄλβος. Cf. LSJ s.v. μάκαιρα: “blessed, happy, prop. epith. of the gods, as opp. mortal men”; Solon fr.13.3 West: ὄλβον μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε, where the quality of blessedness denoted by μάκαιρα is proper to the gods; also fr.14.1: οὐδὲ μάκαιρα οὐδεὶς πέλεται βροτός. For a fuller treatment of the use of μάκαιρα in Pindar see B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford 2005) 229: “In Pindar it is used (1) of the gods collectively; (2) of individual gods; (3) of

so, by mentioning the victor's homeland, Pindar achieves for one term general relevance to the *laudandus*. The composite term then become minor foil to a third term that unites in common parentage (πατρός ἐξ ἑνός) the glory of both elements (ἀμφοτέραις): "Over both, from one father, (viz.) Aristomachus, the offspring of Heracles rule as kings." A similar use of this parental motif is seen in *Nem.* 6.1–2:

Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος· ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ πνέομεν  
ματρός ἀμφοτέροι·

One thing is the race of men, another that of the gods; but from one mother we both breathe.

Invariably, the third term, utilizing forms of εἷς and ἀμφοτέρος, presents a generalizing category that allows the distinct elements in the composite term to be united.<sup>26</sup> The parental motif πατρός ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνός "over both, from one father" unifies the foil, and achieves further transition and amplification with the name cap Ἀριστομάχου in climactic apposition. But as soon as this minor climax is achieved, it too is in turn rejected as foil in line 4 with the hesitation: τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν; "Why do I boast beyond due measure?"<sup>27</sup> The particle ἀλλά naturally marks the categorical rejection of the prime terms of the foil (Λακεδαίμων, Θεσσαλία, Ἀριστομάχου) for the corresponding terms in the nominal cap (Πυθώ, Περινναῖον, Ἀλεύα). Details from the biography of the victor—the site of victory, that of the celebration, and the patronage-relations—establish relevance to the victor and the Aleuadae, his *hetairoi* in the komastic here and now.

nymphs/cities; (4) of exceptional mortals (living and dead); (5) of the *laudandus*' hearth (ἑστία)."

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Isthm.* 1.1–6. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* 51: "The formal characteristics of this device are a representation of diversity in the foil and the words εἷς or ἀμφοτέρος or both in the climax."

<sup>27</sup> Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* 52: "The foil terms ... are themselves divisible into foil and climax, and ... this minor foil and climax are ... articulated by a contrast between diversity and a unity that depends on common parentage."

We must finally consider the possible motive on the part of the *laudator* for an association of Thessaly and Sparta such as could expect the endorsement of the *laudandi*. The specific historico-political motivation for this association in the years immediately preceding the commencement of the Persian Wars conformed with the policy of Aleuas, son of Simus, the father of Thorax,<sup>28</sup> which was designed to consolidate opposition to Athens through an alliance with Sparta, Thebes, and Aegina, and thus to legitimize Thessalian hegemony over the Delphic amphictyony. This strategy was twofold, depending on a propaganda myth establishing kinship with the Aeacids of Epirus, and forming an alliance with Sparta fortified by a claim to common Heraclid ancestry.<sup>29</sup> This is in no way contradicted, but rather strengthened, by Cleomenes' claim that he was Achaean rather than Dorian,<sup>30</sup> for it is clear from several passages that Pindar also wished to recognize the non-Dorian cohort among the conquerors of the Peloponnese when he distinguished the descendants of Heracles, who was an Argive, and therefore Achaean, from the descendants of Aegimius.<sup>31</sup> It is therefore probable that, by joining Sparta and Thessaly in common Heraclid ancestry, and by alluding especially to the father of that generation that reclaimed the inheritance of Hylus, viz. Aristomachus, Pindar is showing in the opening verses of *Pythian* 10 that he is well acquainted with, and perhaps

<sup>28</sup> J. Molyneux, *Simonides: A Historical Study* (Wauconda 1992) 119, identifies this Aleuas with the patron of Simonides.

<sup>29</sup> B. Gentili, P. A. Bernardini, E. Cingano, and P. Giannini, *Le Pitiche* (Milan 1995) 264. M. Sordi, "Aspetti della propaganda tessala a Delfi. Il culto degli Eacidi nella politica fra il 506 a.C. e il 480 a.C." in *La Thessalie* (Lyon 1979) 157–164.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. 5.72: ἄλλ' οὐ Δωριεύς εἰμι ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Pyth.* 1.62–63: Παμφύλου / καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδῶν ἔκγονοι; *Pyth.* 5.71–72: ἀλκάνετας Ἡρακλέος / ἐκγόνους Αἰγίμιου τε; *Isthm.* 9.2–3: Ὑλλου τε καὶ Αἰγίμιου / Δωριεύς ἐλθὼν στρατός. Also *Tyrtaios* fr.2 West: Ζεὺς Ἡρακλείδαις ἄστῳ δέδωκε τόδε, / οἷσιν ἅμα προλιπόντες Ἐρινεὸν ἠνεμόεντα / εὐρεῖαν Πέλοπος νῆσον ἀφικόμεθα.

shares, or at least appears to share, the policy instituted by Aleuas, son of Simus, and continued by Thorax and his brothers.<sup>32</sup>

*March, 2015*

Graduate Center  
City University of New York  
rbongiovanni@gradcenter.cuny.edu

<sup>32</sup> The author wishes to thank Professor Joel Lidov for reading the initial draft, pointing out inconsistencies, and suggesting overall improvements.