

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

4-11-2014 12:00 AM

Athletes in Song and Stone: Victory and Identity in Epinician and Epigram

Peter Miller, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. Christopher G. Brown, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Classics

© Peter Miller 2014

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Peter, "Athletes in Song and Stone: Victory and Identity in Epinician and Epigram" (2014). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 1947.

<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1947>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

**ATHLETES IN SONG AND STONE:
VICTORY AND IDENTITY IN EPINICIAN AND EPIGRAM**

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Peter John Miller

Graduate Program in Classical Studies

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

© Peter John Miller 2014

Abstract

Ethnicity, gender, and class define the ancient Olympic athlete; in contemporary sports too, identity is constantly asserted, negotiated, and contested across these socially contingent categories. The importance of difference and identity to the body of literature associated with the ancient Olympics – especially the epinicians of Pindar and the corpus of athletic epigrams found at Olympia – has not, however, been adequately recognized. Moreover, a holistic approach to athletic verse, in which epinician and epigram are conceptually united, is still lacking, despite the clear generic affinities of these different modes of poetry and their shared conceptual space. In order to fill this gap, my dissertation argues for a comprehensive approach to athletic verse, which is founded on my recognition of the centrality of the heraldic proclamation – the *angelia* – to epinician and epigram. Rather than accept a transparently preserved proclamation consisting of athlete's name, father's name, *polis*, age-category (if necessary), and event, I regard the use of the *angelia* in athletic verse as an appropriation of the efficacy of this powerful speech act; that is, epinician and epigram do not have their generic origin in the *angelia* per se, but in the modulation, modification, and representation of the proclamation. My recognition of the heraldic mode of representation at the core of athletic verse opens up these usually discretely categorized genres to a novel analysis based on their modulation of the identity of the victor.

Fully engaged with theoretical work stressing the performative and socially contingent nature of gender, Marxist insights on class and ideology, anthropological and sociological analyses of ethnicity, as well as recent work highlighting the occasionality of ancient Greek poetic genres, I implicitly argue for the relevance of contemporary literary

and cultural theory, while still prioritizing contextual realities in a historical approach to understanding the representation of athletes in the poetry of the ancient Greek world. The core of my project is a series of close readings of pairs of choral and inscribed poems (*CEG* 1.381, 1.383, 1.393, 2.820; *P. O.* 8, 9, 12); this unified method foregrounds the generic commonalities between choral and inscribed athletic poetry, but also points to the representative quality of the heraldic mode, and thus the centrality of identity and the process of identification – whether derived from supposedly essential political, sexual, or socioeconomic characteristics – to the praise of the athlete.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to acknowledge my supervisor, mentor, and friend Dr. Christopher G. Brown for his assistance and diligent work on my behalf during the writing of this dissertation. To the other members of my Supervisory committee, Dr. Bernd Steinbock and Dr. Aara Suksi, I also offer my thanks, especially for their quick responses, even while they were located across the Atlantic. In addition, I would like to thank the members of my Examination committee: Dr. Don Morrow, Dr. Deborah Steiner, and Dr. Charles Stocking.

My dissertation has benefited from the feedback of audiences at the University of Western Ontario, the Atlantic Classical Association annual meeting (2011, 2013), the Classical Association of Canada annual meeting (2012), Feminism and Classics VI (2012), and the Classical Association annual meeting (2013). I would also like to offer particular thanks to Dr. Joseph W. Day for generously commenting on Chapter 6, and to my “Ancient Greek Athletic Culture” students at Mount Allison University for persevering through a class that was based on much of this material. Furthermore, I owe thanks, for intellectual and moral support, to the rest of the Department (both faculty and staff), and, especially, to my fellow graduate students in Classical Studies at the University of Western Ontario.

I have been supported throughout my Ph.D. by the Department of Classical Studies, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and School of Graduate and Postgraduate Studies at the University of Western Ontario. I would also like to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the J.E.A. Crake Foundation (Sackville, New Brunswick) for their substantial financial support.

Finally, I thank my parents, Tom and Sheila Miller, and my belle-mère, Dr. Françoise Mugnier, for unstinting support. I owe the greatest debt to my friend and partner, Carla Manfredi, for innumerable hours of reading and discussion, countless miles of running and revisions, and an incalculable amount of encouragement and support: ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν / καὶ κεῖνα ὅσα χάσματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν / τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναιτο;

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Abbreviations.....	viii
List of Standard Editions	x
Note on Transliterations and Translations.....	xi
Introduction: On Identities, Athletics, and the Olympics	1
Sport and Social Identity.....	1
“Identity Politics” in the Modern Olympic Games.....	5
Representing and Analyzing Ancient Athletic Identifications	18
Chapter 1: Homer’s Athletes.....	23
1.1: Athletics and Social Conduct in the Funeral Games for Patroklos.....	25
1.2: Elite Ideology and Athletics in the Phaiakian Games.....	38
1.3: Minor Competitions: The Beggars’ Fight and the Archery Contest	43
Chapter 2: Proclaiming and Dedicating Victory	51
2.1: The <i>Angelia</i> and the Heraldic Mode	51
2.2: Literal and Metaphoric Dedications	69
2.3: The Special Status of the Olympic Games	78
Chapter 3: Olympic Ideologies and Identities	84
3.1: Identity in the <i>Angelia</i> : Ideological, Performative, Citational.....	86
3.2: Political Identities at the Olympic Games	90
3.3: Sexual Identities at the Olympic Games.....	98
3.4: Socio-Economic Identities at the Olympic Games	112
Chapter 4: Arkadian Identity in Olympic Epigrams	123
4.1: Arkadia: <i>Ethne</i> and <i>Poleis</i>	124
4.2: Dual Identity in Tellon’s Epigram (<i>CEG</i> 1.381).....	129
4.3: The Politics of Identity and Naming in <i>CEG</i> 1.383.....	137
Chapter 5: Genealogy and History: <i>Oikos</i> , <i>Ethnos</i> , and <i>Polis</i> in <i>Olympian</i> 9	147
5.1: Fathers, Family, and City in Pindar’s Odes	148
5.2: Epharmostos and the History of the Lokrians	160

5.3: Epharmostos and the History of the Opountians	167
5.4: Performing Epharmostos' <i>phya</i>	171
Chapter 6: Kyniska and the Masculine Rhetoric of Athletic Verse (<i>CEG</i> 2.820).....	177
6.1: Archaeology and Onomastics	179
6.2: Ancient and Modern Interpretation: the Biographical Approach.....	183
6.3: Dissidence: Unbalanced Fame.....	196
6.4: Dissidence: Unreal Ritual	203
Chapter 7: Truth, Desire, and Masculinity in <i>Olympian</i> 8.....	210
7.1: Nudity, Desire, and Athletics	211
7.2: Visuality and Homoerotic Frontality in Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painting	217
7.3: Testimony, Autopsy, Praise	221
Chapter 8: Status and <i>stasis</i> in Ergoteles' Victory Monuments (<i>O.</i> 12 and <i>CEG</i> 1.393) 233	
8.1: Managing <i>stasis</i> in Political Poetry: Alkaios, Solon, the Theognidea	235
8.2: Ideology at Work in <i>Olympian</i> 12	246
8.3: Ideology and Place: <i>CEG</i> 1.393 and <i>Olympia</i>	261
Conclusion: Reality, Representation, and the Ideology of Athletic Identity.....	268
Bibliography	277
Curriculum Vitae.....	295

List of Abbreviations

Authors and works are cited according to the conventions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*³, with the exception of the odes of Pindar, which I have cited as follows:

O = *Olympian*

P = *Pythian*

N = *Nemean*

I = *Isthmian*

Journals are abbreviated according to the conventions of *l'Année philologique*; other frequently referenced scholarship is cited as follows (full bibliographical information available in bibliography):

AB = *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*

ABV = *Attic Black-Figure Vases Painters*

*ARV*² = *Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters* (Second Edition)

BNP = *Brill's New Pauly*

CEG = *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*

D-K = *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*

Ebert = *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*

EGM = *Early Greek Mythography*

FGE = *Further Greek Epigrams*

FGrH = *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*

FHG = *Fragmenta Historicum Graecorum*

*IEG*² = *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Second Edition)

IG = Inscriptiones Graecae

IvO = Inschriften von Olympia

K-A = Poetae Comici Graeci

LGPN = Lexicon of Greek Personal Names

LSJ = Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon (Ninth Edition with Supplement)

MECW = Marx-Engels Collected Works

Moretti = Olympionikai, i vincitori negli Antichi agoni Olimpici

M-W = Fragmenta Hesiodica

OED = Oxford English Dictionary

PMGF = Poetae Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta

PMG = Poetae Melici Graeci

Rose = Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta

SEG = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum

SH = Supplementum Hellenisticum

SIG = Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum

Slater = Lexicon to Pindar

TrGF = Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta

Voigt = Sappho et Alcaeus

List of Standard Editions

I have consulted the following standard editions for texts cited in this dissertation:

Inscribed epigrams are cited according to the text of the relevant volume of *CEG*, unless otherwise indicated.

Greek lyric, iambic, and elegiac poetry, aside from Pindar and Bacchylides, is cited according to the text of *PMGF*, *PMG*, Voigt, and *IEG*²

The texts of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* are cited according to the text of the most recent revised edition of the Oxford Classical Texts (1963).

Pindar is cited according to the text of the current revised Teubner edition (Snell-Maehler 1987).

Bacchylides is cited according to the text of the current Teubner edition (Maehler 2003).

All other ancient works are cited according to the text of the current edition of the Oxford Classical texts, or to the relevant collection of fragments as indicated.

Note on Transliterations and Translations

All translations of Pindar, unless otherwise stated, come from the Loeb volumes, edited and translated by W.H. Race (1997).

All translations of Homer, whether from the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, are courtesy of *The Chicago Homer*, and are those of R. Lattimore (*Iliad*, 1951) and J. Huddleston (*Odyssey*, 2006).

All other translations, including those from the *CEG*, are mine, unless otherwise stated.

In transliterating Greek names, places, and words, I have followed the common-sense style of Race (1997: *vii*), who maintains Greek forms unless the English form of a name or place has become so common that it would be confusing to readers. While this method has the defect of being inconsistent, I believe that the inconsistency is more than ameliorated by its clarity.

Introduction: On Identities, Athletics, and the Olympics

“Today, representatives of all classes, both genders, and virtually every religion and national community in the world compete in the modern Olympics... But, for most of their history, the de Coubertin Games were far from inclusive or universal. Women, the working classes, and those from most of the developing world were excluded by explicit prohibitions, the economic barriers created by the amateur code, and the strictures of colonialism, and, in other cases, alienated by the ideologies of *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, nation-state competition, and corporate celebration. Alongside the familiar history of the de Coubertin movement is a much less well known history of struggles for integration, resistance, and alternatives.”

(Kidd 2005: 147)

“Often it is assumed that the Olympic Games and the other periodic games were a reflection, an expression as it were, of the Greek spirit which somehow was inherent within the Greek way of life even at the very early date, perhaps in the eighth century B.C., when the games were first founded. But to say this is perhaps once again to project into an earlier period the reality of the fifth century B.C. I believe, on the contrary, that to a very large extent the pan-Hellenic games *were* the prime manifestations of the Greek spirit in those early times.”

(Renfrew 1988: 23; emphasis in original)

Sport and Social Identity

Sport is a “vehicle of identity” (MacClancy 1996: 2), a way of both revealing one’s established identity, and establishing a new identity altogether (MacClancy 1996: 3). In the sporting culture that emerged in the West in the nineteenth-century, and dramatically expanded its scope to include the whole globe by the twenty-first, identity plays a fundamental role; in antiquity, evidenced by the criteria for participation in Olympic and pan-Hellenic competition, which were modeled on personal, familial, civic, ethnic, and socio-economic factors, identity similarly figures centrally.

The fundamental role of identity in athletic participation prefigures its structural importance to the literature associated with athletics in the ancient world, namely, the epinician odes of Pindar and Bacchylides and athletic epigrams. These corpora of poetry

and song, while distinguished by medium and performance context, nonetheless suggestively indicate the social potency of athletic identity in antiquity, and highlight the importance of context to ancient claims of identity and athletic superiority, and to the construction of praise: identities in ancient athletics, and in the literature associated with athletics, were created, conceived, and maintained in their contemporary local, civic, regional, and pan-Hellenic social and political setting.

In both the modern and ancient context, the identity which pertains to sports is a “social identity” (on which, see Jenkins 2004). As Jenkins observes, across its many definitions, “identity” is concerned with similarity and difference (2004: 4; *OED s.v.* “identity”: “who or what a person is; a distinct impression of a single person or thing presented to or perceived by others; a set of characteristics or a description that distinguishes a person or thing from others”); the “social” component is perhaps redundant, since people have identities only insofar as they are part of societies (Jenkins 2004: 4), but nonetheless “social” emphasizes that identity is “about how we construct ourselves in accordance with broader *social* processes through interaction, communication, and negotiation” (Harris and Parker 2009: 3; emphasis in original). The dialectic of social and individual plays out in identity, since it operates reciprocally as an “understanding of who we are and of who other people are and... other people’s understanding of themselves and others (which includes us)” (Jenkins 2004: 4). The complicated intertwining of individual and collective notions of identity indicates that these often distinguished elements are in fact “routinely entangled” (Jenkins 2004: 15); approaches that characterize individual identity as based on “difference” and collective identity on “similarity” (e.g., Jenkins 2004: 16, though he remarks it is only a matter of

degree) fail to account for both affective bonds of attachment and affiliation to groups, whereby individuals stress similarity, and for the boundaries that demarcate groups, wherein collectivities stress differences (Harris and Parker 2009: 3). Thus, any serious understanding of a reciprocal notion of identity must emphasize the dialectic of individual and collective – internal and external – as central components of the way in which individuals and groups come to invest themselves with meaning.

Contingency and process underline this dialectical notion of identity. Theorists of social identity stress that identity is not a reified notion, and hence the term “identification” more carefully underscores the fact that individuals and collectivities mean and are made meaningful in action. As Jenkins puts it:

identity can only be understood as process, as ‘being’ or ‘becoming’. One’s identity – one’s identities, indeed, for who we are is always singular and plural – is never a final or settled matter. Not even death freezes the picture: identity or reputation can be reassessed, and some identities – sainthood or martyrdom, for example – can only be achieved beyond the grave

(Jenkins 2004: 5)

The important distinction between identity and identification must be respected, even when we are dealing with literally (epigrams) or metaphorically (songs) reified notions of identity. Since identities are socially constructed – they have no *a priori* existence – reification of similarity and difference is an illusion created by the act of identification. As such, I regard identity as a noun signifying the finality of this process, while identification reveals the process itself. With regard to ethnic identities, Baumann is apposite: “in social science code, we therefore speak of ‘shifting identity’ or ‘contextual ethnicity’. Ethnic identities are thus nothing more than acts of ethnic identification that are frozen in time” (1999: 21). He remarks on the situational aspect of identification,

since people emphasize different characteristics of themselves at different times; these characteristics vary from clothing style or musical taste, to religious beliefs, cultural norms, and language. What is intriguing about identifications based on political (i.e., civic identity and ethnicity), sexual (i.e., gender and sexuality), and socio-economic characteristics (i.e., class and social status) is that they are valued as if they are inherent, with a real existence outside of their instantiation in behaviours and perceptions (Barth 1969: 17; cf. Jenkins 2004: 94-108).¹ Such a valuation is particularly emphasized in sports, especially in their ancient or modern institutionalized forms, which have often prefigured accessibility, participation, and legitimacy through reified and essentialist notions of identity.

While my dissertation focuses on the importance of identity to Classical athletic verse, I begin with a digression on identity in the modern Olympic Movement. Despite the possible anachronism of starting from modern strictures on the possibilities of athletic identity, the conflicts over participation and the meaning of athleticism surrounding the modern Olympic Movement offer a compelling preface to my study of identity and athletic verse in Classical Greece.² Needless to say, the putative connection between the ancient and modern Olympics makes any understanding of identity in one suggestive for the other; therefore, regardless of the counter-intuitive nature of beginning at the end, as it were, of the story of Olympic identity, I start with a brief narrative of modern sports and the identification of the athlete, as a precursor to my study of identity, praise, poetry, and ideology in the fifth-century.

¹ Jenkins emphasizes the validity of Barth's fundamental work on ethnic identities for identities of all sorts (2004: 106); I follow this assertion in my understanding of how gendered, socio-economic, and political identities gain meaning and function in a given context.

² In support of such a methodology, Christesen 2012 offers a compelling argument for the correlation of ancient Greek and nineteenth-century, especially British, sport.

“Identity Politics” in the Modern Olympic Games

From its beginnings, the history of the modern Olympic Games has been entwined with social identity, and with restrictions, implicitly or explicitly formulated, on the identity of Olympic participants. These restrictions have revolved around the identity of prospective athletes, whether constituted as individual or collective identifications (e.g., gender, class, political identity); despite the apparently immutable aspect of some of these categories (e.g., biologically-constituted sex, descent-based ethnic and national identity), in their manifestation as qualifiers for athletic participation, they are fundamentally contingent parameters. Since restrictions are an instance of power, and the implementation of power, as Foucault famously observes (1990: 95), co-exists with resistance, athletic participation in the modern Games has proceeded along a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion, resistance and power, which has been instantiated in the subject of the athlete.

Kidd relates the understudied and effaced tale of individual and collective resistance to reductive and restrictive understandings of identity (2005). Despite the often obstinate position of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), who have consistently advocated an “essentialist mystification of [their] own history” (Kidd 2005: 144), other persons and groups have worked to circumvent this essentialism, and construct a realization of sport quite different from that of the de Coubertin Games (*ibid.*). Even the IOC’s apparent monopoly on antiquity is challenged by the existence of earlier “Olympic” revivals in France (1796), Montreal (1844), Greece (1859, 1870, 1875), and England (1850-1895).³

³ On all of these revivals, and for further relevant bibliography, see Kidd (2005: 145). On the Greek revivals and their role in the development of the IOC’s Olympics, see Young (1988a).

The most contentious issue for the early Games was the notion of “amateurism”, which was tied, specifically through its condemnation of training and wage-earning (Kidd 2005: 150), to social status and class. Young offers a detailed exposition of the prehistory of amateurism, and its ties to the very birth of the modern Olympic Movement (1984; 1988); its connection to the elite British public school system is well-attested (Young 1988: 70), as is Pierre de Coubertin’s manipulation of the ideology of amateurism, both to garner aristocratic support for his revived Olympics, and as a way to connect (falsely) the modern Games to those of ancient Greece (Young 1988: 65-66).

The case of James Thorpe, the American “athlete of the century” (according to a 1999 poll by ABC’s *Wide World of Sports*) who was stripped of his medals is telling: Thorpe was a phenom at the 1912 Stockholm games, and won gold in the pentathlon and decathlon (Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 249). Soon after, however, it was discovered that he had violated the strict amateur rules of the Olympics by earning two dollars per day as a “professional” baseball player during the two summers prior to the Games (Anderson 1983; Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 249). According to the rules of the IOC, amateurism was strictly enforced: “no amateur can ever profit from athletics in any way” (Young 1988: 66; cf. Cantelon 2005: 93).⁴ While the attempt to institutionalize an even stricter, and explicitly class-based, definition of “amateurism” had faltered (Young 1988: 57),

⁴ It is hard to imagine that Thorpe’s ethnicity (he was a Native American) and poverty did not contribute to the decision of the American Olympic Committee (DeMeyer 2000: 39; cf. Young 1984: 57). As DeMeyer observes, it is ironic, since “it was poverty that put him on the playing field, poverty that had to do with the social, political, and economic disadvantages of being American Indian in America” (2000: 50). Certainly, this was a narrative in the newspaper reports of the time: as the *Philadelphia Times* put it, “there is reason to believe that the AAU [Amateur Athletic Union] knew of many instances [of professionalism] but winked at them” (quoted in DeMeyer 2000: 40). A biographer of Thorpe thought that he was “used as an example... to try and correct the professionalism that was rampant in the collegiate ranks” (DeMeyer 2000: 39).

nonetheless, the exclusion of athletic wage-earners made it easy to exclude those of a lower social status, who felt compelled to monetize their athletic skill as wage-labour. Thorpe was forced to return his medals, and despite the decision of the IOC to return them to his family in 1982 (Anderson 1983; Young 1988: 72), his records remained unrecognized; amateurism and class as a necessary social identity for the modern athlete died a hard death (cf. Cantelon 2005: 89-92).⁵

As Kidd explains, as a result of the early and persistent focus of the IOC on amateurism, and thus an oblique restriction on lower-status athletes generally, workers' groups, especially in the developing socialist political context of 1890s Germany, began organizing athletic competitions that explicitly enunciated a working-class ideology (2005: 150).⁶ Unlike the high-performance athletics of the Olympic Movement, the "International Workers' Games" staged by the Socialist Worker's Sports International in 1921 were designed to emphasize participation and solidarity above victory and competition (Kidd 2005: 150). By 1931, although there was a split in the movement prompted by developments in the Soviet Union (Riordan 1984: 101-102), the event still attracted 80,000 athletes from 26 countries (Kidd 2005: 151), not to mention 250,000 spectators (Riordan 1984: 106); medals were awarded and first place was hotly contested, but the emphasis was on participation (Kidd 2005: 151).⁷ In stark contrast to the IOC's Games, women's participation was actively encouraged, racial divisions were non-

⁵ Social status has perhaps been replaced by wealth, both individual and national: "personal household and national income is far more relevant to performance than hormonal makeup" (Kidd, quoted in Findlay 2012).

⁶ Riordan offers a more complete sketch of the early history of workers' sport, which was established in Germany "in conscious opposition to the nationalistic German Gymnastics Society" (1984: 99; sketch of various movements, 1984: 99-102).

⁷ Workers' sports festivals would be held in Prague in 1921, Frankfurt in 1925, Moscow in 1928, Vienna in 1931, and Antwerp in 1937. There were plans, aborted in both cases by war, for games in Barcelona in 1936 and Helsinki in 1943 (see Riordan 1984: 103-108).

existent (Riordan 1984: 99), a children's sports' festival was included, and the games involved their spectators in mass exercise: "a much more egalitarian vision of sport was realized and celebrated" (Kidd 2005: 151). The most striking deviation from the approach of the IOC was the exclusion of national teams from competition, since the Workers' games, in concert with socialist ideology of the time, emphasized the "interests of international working-class solidarity" (Kidd 2005: 151) at the expense of nationalist (and elite) antagonism.⁸ Despite the great popular appeal of these games, the death of many European socialist leaders at the hands, especially, of the Nazis (see Riordan 1984: 102), and the Soviet decision to "beat the capitalists at their own game" (i.e., to participate in the IOC's Olympics) led to the demise of most Workers' games after World War Two (Kidd 2005: 151).⁹

Although the anti-nationalist Workers' Games declined in the Cold War period, Kidd relates the brief story of another challenge to the inherent nationalism of the IOC's Games, that of the "Games of the New Emerging Forces" (GANEFO) in 1963 (2005: 152). This was supposed to be the athletic complement to the "Bandung" Conference, which had been organized in April 1958, and was predicated on an opposition to colonialism and imperialism (Connolly 2012: 1312). The Games appropriated, at least in their genesis, "Olympic ideals", and the response of the IOC – to threaten to ban any country that participated – demonstrates that they found GANEFO threatening to their preeminent position in world sport (Connolly 2012: 1318); only the active participation

⁸ In fact, the Workers' Olympics of 1925 was staged in Germany so as to oppose the exclusion of German and Austrian athletes from the IOC's Games (Riordan 1984: 102). The national Olympic committees of these countries were excluded as part of the punishment of their national governments for their supposed blame for World War One (*ibid.*).

⁹ Post-war workers' sports organizations remain, though often subsumed into national federations. A strong workers' sports movement continues in Finland, France, and Austria (Riordan 1984: 108-109).

of 1964 Summer Olympics host Japan led them to back down from this threat (Kidd 2005: 152).¹⁰ Nonetheless, the confrontation, and the very fact of the games themselves, indicates the potential problematization of the IOC's celebratory nationalism and patriotism, especially the supposedly anti-septic approach to politics and athletics, which GANEFO sought explicitly to oppose (Connolly 2012: 1312).¹¹

While the Third World slowly found its way back to the Olympic Movement (despite a boycott by 26 African nations on the issue of South African apartheid in 1976; Mason 2007), the problem of the thoroughly Western concept of nationalism at the heart of the IOC's Olympics persists, especially when one considers the contentious issue of indigenesness and sport. As King puts it, "most sports fans are more likely to think of Indians as mascots than as athletes" (2006: 131); the complicated issue of colonial sports and colonized peoples in North America has oscillated between assimilation and appropriation (on this issue through the example of the Navajo, see Anderson 2006).¹² Forsythe and Wamsley connect colonial sport with the destructive assimilation of the residential school system in Canada (2006: 299), and observe the contradictory white appropriation of indigenous sports (e.g., snow-shoeing, lacrosse) and the simultaneous exclusion of indigenous Canadians from participation (2006: 295). They relate the development, in the 1970s, of a particularly indigenous approach to sport in Canada, which conflicted with federal government interest in integrating Native Canadians to "mainstream" culture through sport (2006: 300). The establishment of the North

¹⁰ The organizers of GANEFO went back-and-forth between framing their event as a complement to the Olympics, or an alternative (Connolly 2012: 1313).

¹¹ The initial political element of these Games was downplayed as organization continued and the event neared (see Connolly 2012: 1314-1315).

¹² In one particularly egregious example, at the 1976 Montreal Games, of 500 participants in an "aboriginal" display, it was revealed that 250 were non-aboriginal people who were "dressed and painted to look like Indians" (Forsythe and Wamsley 2006: 302-303).

American Indigenous Games as a precursor to an indigenous alternative to the Olympics (which would be called the World Indigenous Games) demonstrates at once the resilience of indigenous culture in the face of centuries of oppression, as well as the construction of an international sporting structure outside the bounds of competitive Western nationalism (Forsythe and Wamsley 2006: 304).¹³

Even within the scope of populations that cohere with Western and bourgeois concepts of national and class identity, contemporary athletic participation has, since the earliest period, been restricted on the basis of gender. At the first modern Olympic Games in 1896, “245 men and no women competed... overseen by 15 male members of the [IOC]” (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 103). While de Coubertin was a product of his times, and not an arch-conspirator aiming at the exclusion of women (Cantelon 2005: 86), for decades during his tenure as head of the IOC, the modern Games were designed to “celebrate the athletic accomplishments of men” (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 106-112; quotation from 103). As late as 1912, de Coubertin wrote that “the Olympic Games represent the solid manifestation of male sports based on internationalism... and the applause of women as recompense” (quoted in Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 112).¹⁴

Grassroots activism was responsible for the maintenance of women’s sports in the Olympics, once it finally arrived in a relatively large number in 1928 (specifically, in

¹³ A prime example of the inability of Western nationalism to accommodate indigenous identity occurred at the 1998 North American Indigenous Games: the intention of the organizers that the Mohawks of Ontario be part of “Team Ontario” was thwarted at a grassroots level. Instead, Mohawks organized themselves into a cross-border team that disregarded the internal and international borders of colonizers (i.e., Ontario, Quebec, New York) and focused on representing the whole Mohawk nation (Forsythe and Wamsley 2006: 306-307).

¹⁴ Wamsley and Pfister remind us that de Coubertin vehemently opposed female participation in the Olympics up to his death in 1937 (2005: 112). His position can be summarized most easily through his own prolific writing on the topic: e.g., “a woman’s glory... rightfully came through the number and quality of children she produced, and that where sports were concerned, her greatest accomplishment was to encourage her sons to excel...” (quoted in Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 112).

track and field): the IOC argued for a renewed prohibition of women's athletics because of the "horrific catastrophe of the women's 800 metres event" in 1928 (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 113), when women dared to be as fatigued as men (*ibid.*).¹⁵ In the face of this proposal, however, the entire United States' men's track and field team threatened a boycott; the result was the institution of women's events in the Olympics, under the patriarchal scrutiny of international athletics federations and the IOC (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 113-114).

As Kidd reminds us, however, the early exclusion of women from the IOC's Olympics was not representative of a wide-ranging formal prohibition on women's athletics, or, perhaps more importantly, representative of a lack of interest on the part of women (2005: 148). While many observers in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries considered women's sport "against the laws of nature", and contrary to a "moral physiology" that regarded physical exertion in opposition to maternity (Kidd 2005: 148; Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 108-109), feminist activists worked for the inclusion of women in the IOC's Olympics from their inception (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 110, 112).¹⁶ This was explicitly transgressive and subversive, since athletics was promoted as exclusively male, and "if women participated in sport... [the distinction between genders] would become blurred" (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 109).

A few women participated in the Games prior to 1928; since the organization of events was up to individual Olympic committees, not the IOC, for the first five Games,

¹⁵ Lina Radke, the winner of the 800 metres, "left a field of exhausted runners sprawled in various stages of collapse behind her" (Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 271); apparently, to the eyes of the male members of the IOC, fatigue in male runners was acceptable, but "that female athletes should share the same symptoms" was beyond the pale (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 113). For 32 years, women's track and field events were restricted to 400 metres and under, until the 800 metre race was reinstated in 1960, and longer races in 1972 (Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 271).

¹⁶ According to Buchanan and Mallon, a woman ran the Olympic marathon course in 1896, though unofficially (2001: 270).

de Coubertin's disdain for female participants was not prohibitive in and of itself (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 110). In any case, such minimal and restricted participation was, clearly, to female sporting enthusiasts, not sufficient:¹⁷ in 1922, the Fédération Sportive Féminine Internationale (FSFI) formed, and subsequently staged a separate "Women's Olympic Games" in Paris (Kidd 2005: 148); another followed in Sweden in 1926 (*ibid.*).¹⁸ When the IOC guaranteed women more access to their Games in 1928, the FSFI agreed to suspend their staging of Olympic Games (Kidd 2005: 148); this was not without controversy, since the agreed-upon gender equality was not achieved (women competed in only five events in 1928) and the English Women's Amateur Athletic Association boycotted the Games in protest (Kidd 2005: 148).

The writing, however, was on the wall, and as a result of the Great Depression, World War Two, and the increasing commercialization and corporatization of sport (Kidd 2005: 149), the FSFI disintegrated and left women's sports at the international level in the hands of the male-dominated IOC.¹⁹ The results are apparent: while the FSFI had encouraged long-distance running, the IOC did not institute long-distance races for women until 1960; the FSFI had staged women's basketball championships in the 1920s and 1930s, but the IOC did not stage them as part of the Olympics until 1976 (Kidd 2005: 149). Most importantly, as Kidd indicates, the demise of women's sports institutions meant that a collective sporting identity continued to be dominated by male voices,

¹⁷ Nineteen women competed in the 1900 Games, in croquet, golf, sailing, and tennis; in 1904, archery was added; in 1908, figure-skating (as part of the Summer Games) and motor-boating; in 1912, swimming and diving (Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 270-271).

¹⁸ Buchanan and Mallon contend that these events proved the value of women's athletes and led to their inclusion in the IOC's games (2001: 271), but Kidd is more circumspect, and implies that their threat was to the universalizing Olympic monopoly of the IOC (2005: 148-149).

¹⁹ Wamsley and Pfister also point to the massive emphasis on female athletics by the Soviet Union after World War Two (2005: 119-121). Eastern bloc athletes would become stereotyped as "mannish", and even the head of the IOC in 1960, Avery Brundage, publicly complained of "mannish" Soviet athletes (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 119).

championed by advocates of a hegemonic athletic masculinity: “while female participation continues to grow, it does so almost everywhere under male leadership (Kidd 2005: 150; cf. Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 113). Therefore, the individual and collective identities of athletics have merged under a characteristic and pervasive male domination; the growth of professional sports, especially in North America, and the interests of media and advertisers, has contributed greatly to this persistent masculinity (Kidd 2005: 149).

The masculine aspect of sports continues to resonate decades after the relative integration of women’s sports into the Olympic Games.²⁰ Straightforward exclusion of women from participation has become, to some extent, taboo (at least in Western nations), but emerging scientific methods aimed at “gender verification” have become institutionalized and, importantly, are applied only to female athletes.²¹ The IOC’s obsession with scientific approaches to gender and sex effaces the fact that biological approaches are themselves socially constituted (Amy-Chinn 2012: 1294): Butler remarks that the binary that pairs sex and nature as opposite to gender and culture inappropriately assumes the pre-discursive existence of biological science (1999: 11; cf. Hubbard 1990: 2). Her argument implies the culturally constructed character of sex, which does not, as it is made to appear, have any more of an immutable quality than gender (1999: 10). Thus,

²⁰ The legal challenges surrounding the inclusion of women’s ski-jumping at the 2010 Winter Games, however, demonstrate that full and equal integration remains elusive (see Laurendeau and Adams 2010). Women’s ski-jumping will be staged at the 2014 Winter Games, though commentators can still frame this inclusion within a discourse of supposedly “natural” female inferiority (e.g., Wente 2014).

²¹ The restriction of gender testing to female athletes exposes the ideological basis that establishes a hierarchical understanding of sex and athletic prowess, wherein any degree of “maleness” is an advantage for female competitors (Amy-Chinn 2012: 1292). Chromosomal testing replaced observation (on which, see Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 87-89), but the testing remained (and remains) only for females (Cole 2000: 129). Whether this testing can actually prove anything is open to discussion, as Cole remarks, “the scientific methods used by the IOC never simply ‘reveal’ but also shape how sex as well as its ‘threats’ as imagined” (2000: 134). It is a remarkable case of class trumping gender that Princess Anne of Great Britain was excused from gender verification when she competed in the 1976 Olympics (Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 88).

in her view, the use of the body as a medium for the delineation of human beings into discrete categories is not “pre-suppositional” (i.e., it is not a natural phenomenon independent of conceptualization; or, as Amy-Chinn formulates it, “taxonomy preceded ontology”, 2012: 1295), and as such this pre-suppositional area cannot be accorded any authority outside of its existence as a socially-constructed entity.

Some specialists in the area of gender and sport have begun to consider the problem of a strictly schematized sexual distinction, which is a purely social and cultural phenomenon: as Dreger remarks, “nature doesn’t actually have a line between the sexes. If we want a line, we have to draw it *on* nature” (quoted in Amy-Chinn 2012: 1293; emphasis in original). The case of South African sprinter Caster Semenya demonstrates the consequences of a universalization of scientifically conceptualized sexual difference, and its subsequent prioritization as part of athletic participation. Semenya was the subject of intense international scrutiny after her resounding victory at the 2009 World Track and Field Championships (Amy-Chinn 2011: 315-318).²² After competitors complained that “she’s a man” (Italian sprinter Elisa Chusma, quoted in Findlay 2012; cf. Amy-Chinn 2011: 321), International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) officials investigated, and, though the results were kept private, Semenya has since undergone “treatment” of some sort (Findlay 2012; Amy-Chinn 2011: 321 provides details on her subsequent results in track and field events).

Semenya’s case exemplifies the problem with observationally-derived definitions of sex: a conflict can arise when a given female athlete does not *look* like popular notion of a female athlete: “Semenya is breathtakingly butch. Her torso is like the chest plate on a suit of armor. She has a strong jawline, and a build that slides straight from her ribs to

²² This victory, as Amy-Chinn observes, was impressive, but not record-breaking (2011: 316-317).

her hips” (Levy 2009).²³ Assuredly, presumptions about the appropriate appearance of female athletes lie behind Levy’s description; even the modest (by modern standards) outfits of the early Olympics “offered opportunities for spectators to view male and female bodies, relatively exposed, at a time when residual Victorian social values still prevailed” (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 115). As early as the 1920s, reporters focused on the supposedly feminine characteristics of athletes as opposed to their strictly athletic qualities (Wamsley and Pfister 205: 116); the interplay of female athletes, sexuality, and desire is as old as the modern debate on participation by women (on which, see Buchanan and Mallon 2001: 269-275), and was already present in antiquity (see Chapter 3.3).

The developing science of chromosomal testing, however, reveals a serious problem with reified notions of sex and gender as organizing principles for athletic categorization, since testosterone production is not normalized or consistent in each of the supposed sexes; the IAAF recently set a threshold for testosterone production, after which a female athlete would be forced to undergo treatment, or simply prohibited from competition (Findlay 2012).²⁴ Before the London 2012 Olympics, the IOC had approved similar regulations, which, while they are not “intended to make any determination of sex”, are “designed to identify circumstances in which a particular athlete will not be

²³ An appropriate comparison is the description quoted by Wamsley and Pfister from the *Examiner*’s report on the Canadian women’s Olympic team in 1932: “the Canadian girls are undoubtedly the prettiest and most wholesome looking group of girls who have arrived for the competition. They constitute a denial of the general idea that a woman athlete must be built like a baby grand piano and have a face like a hatchet” (Wamsley and Pfister 2005: 117).

²⁴ Another recent case of supposed gender transgression is Indian sprinter Pinki Pramanik, who was accused of being a man and then charged with rape; these charges were dropped, and Pramanik claims that her “masculine” appearance results from testosterone injections forced on her by the Indian athletics officials: “it was called Russian medicine... I was focused on winning and did whatever I was asked to do by my trainers, who knew what was best for me. But after that my voice became deeper and I grew more body hair” (quoted in Mitra 2012).

eligible... to participate in 2012 OG [Olympic Games] Competitions in the female category” (*IOC Regulations on Female Hyperandrogenism*).

While the IOC’s regulations may appear relatively even-handed, they maintain, in their minutiae, a categorical and rigid understanding of the possibilities of gender and athletic identity (e.g. “for men’s 2012 OG Competitions, only men are eligible to compete. For women’s 2012 OG Competitions, only women are eligible to compete”: *IOC Regulations on Female Hyperandrogenism*; surely these are determinations of sex).²⁵ Other organizations and individuals are pushing for far-reaching changes that would challenge the division of athletes based on sex (Chinn 2012: 1300-1301), and destabilize the perceived importance of gender identity to athletic participation.²⁶ At the very least, the improving science behind determining what constitutes sex and gender demonstrates the imprecision of the categorization of human beings into “male” and “female” (Travers 2008: 82-83), especially for the sake of athletic participation, and points to the socially-constructed value of masculinity and femininity in athletics.

While closely tied to gender in contemporary athletics, sexual orientation has, in its own right, been a contentious issue for athletic identity. By 1982, “critical of what he felt as the sexism, racism, nationalism, heterosexism, and elitism of the de Coubertin Games”, Tom Waddell organized the “Gay Games”, which have been staged with great success, and increasing participation, every four years since 1982 (Kidd 2005: 154-

²⁵ In 2010, the IOC attempted to establish global “centres for excellence” that would treat women whose bodies did not conform to their model of “femaleness”; treatment would be required, as Amy-Chinn observes, “*whether or not the alleged ‘abnormality’ confers any advantage to the individual involved*” (2012: 1292; emphasis in original).

²⁶ As Hubbard argues, being raised as a boy or girl has consequences for the physical development of the body, which influences sporting potential and performance (1990: 138). Gender distinction in athletic competition may be as much *productive* as *reflective* of actual biologically-based sexual difference (Amy-Chinn 2012: 1300).

155).²⁷ In fact, homophobia was considered prevalent enough that a CBC Radio documentary on homosexuality and athletics called “The Last Closet” (1993) aired with the voices of the athletes in question changed so as to protect their identities; it was later revealed that two of the athletes interviewed (who later acknowledged their homosexuality) were Olympic silver medalist boxer Mark Leduc, and champion swimmer Mark Tewksbury (Iorfida 2009). A celebrated Olympic champion like American swimmer Bruce Hayes felt unable to be homosexual and an Olympic athlete simultaneously (Krane and Waldron 2000: 156); Greg Louganis “was convinced that to reveal publicly his gay identity would be devastating to his status as an internationally acclaimed diver” (Krane and Waldron 2000: 161).

In response to this perceived heterosexist environment, the Gay Games were specifically organized as “a celebration of freedom” (Tom Waddell, quoted in Krane and Waldron 2000: 149). Rather than a homosexual analogue to the IOC’s Olympics, the Gay Games “turn upside down the whole traditional culture of sports competition. At the Gay Games, the spirit of participation far eclipses the need for winning” (Krane and Waldron 2000: 148); the focus is on inclusion, participation, and community-building, instead of a traditional sports mentality that sees “opponents as enemy, and applause only for the winner” (*ibid.*). The Gay Games’ social and political significance parallels, at least, its athletic importance: the 1994 games, held in New York City, were moved so as to coincide with the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall Riots (Krane and Waldron 2000: 151); in the 1980s, during the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis, the games not only fought the notion that one could not be athletic and HIV-positive, but they successfully contributed

²⁷ The Gay Games have grown from 1350 participants in 1982, to 3400 in 1986, 7500 in 1990 and 10,000 in 1994 (Kidd 2005: 155).

to the lifting of the restrictive visa regulations for HIV-positive individuals entering the United States (Krane and Waldron 2000: 160). As Krane and Waldron observe, the Gay Games are insistent upon an alternative and “queer” vision of sports culture, in which there are same-sex figure-skating partners, athletes compete in drag, and more broadly, where they “do not have to fit the stereotyped image of a traditionally masculine athletic male or a traditionally feminine female” (2000: 153-155, quotation from 155).

The impact of the Games on queer identity has been measurable, and the community-building atmosphere of the Gay Games has been especially important: “the Gay Games define us as a coherent, diverse population of our own, asserting our right to celebrate ourselves” (Anne Northrup, board member of Gay Games IV, quoted in Krane and Waldron 2000: 157). The contribution of Canadian government funding to the 1990 games in Vancouver (Krane and Waldron 2000: 150), and the utilization of facilities built for the 2000 Sydney Olympics for the 2002 Gay Games (Krane and Waldron 2000: 152), demonstrates an increased athletic recognition, and increased political, social, and cultural normalization of both queer identity, and the notion of queer, transgendered, and gay athletes more generally. In this manner, the Gay Games represent a clear example of the interplay of individual and collective identification in the sporting context, as well as the ability of sports to play a constructive and formative role in social change.²⁸

Representing and Analyzing Ancient Athletic Identifications

In the modern sporting context, then, athletics and social identity are deeply intertwined. The analysis of these related concepts is made easier in the modern period

²⁸ The perceived homophobic environment of the 2014 Winter Games demonstrates the continued institutionalization of homophobic tendencies in international sporting bodies and, especially, the IOC; at the same time, however, the collective and grassroots response to this homophobia indicates that to many groups athletic identity and alternative sexuality are able to co-exist (see, for example, Socarides 2014).

because of the abundance of evidence, eye-witness and participant testimony, and intense contemporary scholarly, governmental, and media attention. In the ancient world, however, recovering the dialectical quality of identity and identification is complicated by the normative and idealizing representations of athletes and athletics. Therefore, my project's initial argument is that identity, conceived in the modern understanding, had a role to play in athletic participation and victory in the ancient world, and thus has a role to play in critical analysis of these related phenomena. While this does not mean that I argue for a trans-historical, universalist approach to sports or the history of sports, I do contend that there exists at least one formative continuity between ancient Greek and modern athletics, insofar as both are invested in the use of sports to reveal, produce, and reinforce distinctions among human beings, who are supposedly distributed in reductive and reified categories, which are conceived as essential and unchanging identities.

In order to investigate the phenomenons of identity and identification in the literature associated with ancient Greek athletics, my study prioritizes the identification of the athlete across gendered, class, and ethnic/civic lines; by focusing on the importance of identity from the organization and enunciation of a festival, to participation, and to victory, I offer a novel methodology, and novel conclusions on a number of canonical pieces of Greek poetry (i.e., the odes of Pindar: *O.* 8, 9, 12), lesser-studied inscriptional verse (i.e., epigrams: *CEG* 381, 383, 393, 820), and a fully-realized understanding of *how* the poetics of athletic representation, identity, and praise function in the Classical Greek context.

In Chapter One, I review the place of Homeric athletic representation. I argue for the generic dissimilarity of Homeric athletic verse from the athletic verse of the Archaic

and Classical periods: this dissimilarity stems from the difference in function between epic, and epinician or epigrammatic verse. My analysis concludes that Homeric poetry's most meaningful contribution to later athletic representation is poetic and ideological: first, in the way in which to describe athletes and athletics, and second, in the social identity that characterizes athletics and the representation of historical athletes.

Chapter Two moves to the central focus of my dissertation: epinician and epigrammatic poetry of the late Archaic and Classical periods. I structure my argument around the central role of the herald and the herald's proclamation in athletic participation, praise, and verse, whether oral or inscribed. In contrast to previous discussions, which have identified the heraldic proclamation as a structuring principle for epinician and epigram, I stress the representative quality of the *angelia* that is reproduced in athletic verse. This recognition, along with my stress on the generic continuity of epinician and epigram, and the centrality of identity to athletic representation, prefigures my understanding of the poetics of athletic verse, and thus the analysis of verse dedications of all types.

Following the establishment of identity as the structuring principle of my dissertation, in Chapter Three, I survey current arguments concerning the relationship between ideology and identity and I situate my discussion across three important principles of a supposedly "essential" identity in antiquity, those of political, sexual and gendered, and socio-economic categories. By defining these categories along the lines of contemporary critical and literary theory, I position my research in scholarship, and I also argue implicitly for the value of contemporary theory to the interpretation of ancient poetry.

Chapters Four through Eight form the core of my project: each chapter presents a novel interpretation of a single ode or epigram (with the exception of Chapter Eight, which teams *O.* 12 with *CEG* 393), informed by my identification of the representative quality of the heraldic proclamation, and my focus on the identity of the athlete. Chapters Four and Five highlight political identities, whether those that stem from “ethnic” political formations (Chapter Four, the Arkadian *ethne*: *CEG* 381, 383), or those that derive their authority along civic, familial, and genealogical lines (Chapter Five: *O.* 9). Chapters Six and Seven focus on the sexual and gendered identity of the athlete. In Chapter Six, I concentrate on the impossibility, and thus the subversive quality, of representing a female victor in athletic verse (Kyniska: *CEG* 820); I explain the ramifications of this representation for the genre, and provide an interpretation of the poem that is at odds with the standard biographical and patriarchal reading of Kyniska’s story. In Chapter Seven, I highlight the centrality of a historically specific and culturally restricted notion of desire and sexuality to the development of praise in athletic verse (Alkimedon: *O.* 8). Finally, in Chapter Eight, I combine an analysis of Pindar’s *O.* 12 with an epigram for the same victor, *CEG* 393; this holistic approach reinforces my implicit argument for the generic continuity of epinician and epigram, at the same time as my focus on the socio-economic status of the victory and the workings of class ideology provide a new way to compare and contrast the distinctive, yet connected, encomium of orally-performed epinician, and inscribed and localized epigram.

My project begins from an acknowledgement of the place of athletic verse and praise in the broader Greek poetic tradition, before narrowing its focus to the specific and historicized understanding of athletic praise and representation in the late Archaic and

Classical periods. By acknowledging the common focus on identity, which exists across ancient and modern notions of athletic participation and victory, I bring to bear a battery of contemporary critical theory, conjoined with a rigorous philological apparatus, to a coherent body of poetry associated with the ancient Olympic Games. I put forward novel interpretations and establish new conclusions for a crucial period of Greek social and cultural history; in the tradition of the above history of resistance to reified notions of sports and identity, I also hope to offer my own small contribution to a reconceptualization of the possibilities of human identity, beyond socially-restrictive and reductive alternatives.

Chapter 1: Homer's Athletes

Athletic representation begins with Greek epic (Golden 1998: 88; Scanlon 2002: 299ff). The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* devote sizable portions of their narratives to accounts of athletics, both formal (e.g., the Funeral Games of Patroklos, the games on Scheria) and informal (e.g., the boxing match with Iros, the archery contest). In other early hexameter poetry, athletics also appears: Hesiod seems to have known of athletic contests (*Op.* 646-662), the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield* references the athletic festival ([Hes.] *Sc.* 303-313), as does the *Hymn to Apollo* (3.146-150). Scholars have noticed this ubiquity: some have argued that the representation of athletics was a generic requirement for epic (Willis 1941: 397), while others contend that poets used athletics as a common reference-point for audiences familiar with sports and sporting festivals (Golden 1998: 92; e.g., *Il.* 16.589-592, 22.157-164).

Despite the seemingly generic and formal imbrication of the representation of athletics with epic, I argue in this chapter that there are significant differences between Homeric athletics and athletes, and those of epinician and dedicatory epigram.¹ Aside from the temporal distance between these poems and poets, their distinct literary history and performance context indicate a concrete difference in their representation of athletics and athletes. In the Homeric poems, of course, athletes are heroes, and their feats take place far in the past, whether understood historically or mythically; in contrast, the athletes of epigram and epinician are actual historical personalities, who dedicated oral or written poems, which praised and memorialized their own athletic achievement. While Homeric athletic representation clearly resonates with the ideology of athletics and the

¹ I use "Homeric" and "Homeric poems" throughout this chapter to indicate the text of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we have them. My assumption is that the Homeric poems largely reflect the society of their composition; on the date and compositional background of the Homeric poems, see Kirk (1985: 1-16).

mechanics of how to represent athletics and athletes in poetry, the different relationship with reality and praise in each genre is important: in the Homeric poems, athletics have a narrative utility (i.e., they are a component of the story), which differs from the generic centrality of athletics to epinician and epigram (i.e., athletic victory is the point of the whole song or epigram). If, as has been argued cogently, Archaic Greek genres are “occasional” (Dover 1987 [1963]: 101; Calame 1974: 124), then the generic difference of epic from epinician and epigram is significant: epigram and epinician are generated by athletic victory, whereas for epic, athletes and athletics serve, above all, a narrative purpose.

Homeric epic is, of course, deeply engaged with issues of identity and identification: Helen's appearance on the walls of Troy identifies the major characters early in the epic (*Il.* 3.166-242). Heroes also boast of their home cities and genealogies (most famously in the exchange between Diomedes and Glaucón: *Il.* 6.119-236), and of the great tasks they have previously achieved; the narrator often provides name, father's name, and *polis* even to those minor characters killed on the battlefield (e.g., *Il.* 6.12-15; 7.8-10; 11.221-247; 15.329-342). In the *Odyssey* especially, identity is central (cf. *Od.* 7.237-239-297), since Odysseus' *nostos* is punctuated by claims of false identity (e.g., *Od.* 14.185-359, 24.297-314), a lack of identity (e.g., *Od.* 9.355-367), and finally true identity (first to the Cyclopes: *Od.* 9.502-505; next among the Phaiakians: *Od.* 9.19-21; finally on Ithaka: 16.186-189, 19.474-475, 22.35-41, 23.173-230, 24.321-344). While these issues of identity and identification lie in the background of my analysis, which focuses on the specifically *athletic* representation of heroes in Homeric epic, they are

nonetheless a component of later Pindaric and epigrammatic constructions of “heroic” identity and athletic boasts for their patrons.

In this chapter then, I survey the athletic scenes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and demonstrate the distinctive facets of Homeric athletic representation, especially insofar as it can be distinguished from that of epigram or epinician. I point to the ideological affinities of Homeric athletics and Classical athletic representation, and to the commonalities that can be indicated, despite the wide gulf that separates these genres.

1.1: Athletics and Social Conduct in the Funeral Games for Patroklos

Book 23 of the *Iliad* offers the most elaborate description of athletics to survive from early Greek epic.² The narrative of the Funeral Games of Patroklos (*Il.* 23.257-897) is a detailed and descriptive account of the mechanics of sporting success and failure quite different from the majority of Classical athletic poetry.³ Rather than the elaboration

² Willis suggests that the Homeric references to earlier funeral games (e.g., *Il.* 23.630-642, 679-680) may reflect a tradition of athletic contests in epic (1941: 392). He regards the funeral games for Pelias, which Pausanias describes (5.17.9-11), as the earliest funeral games in mythic chronology (1941: 393); this event seems to have been treated by Steisichoros as well (178-180 *PMGF*). Willis concludes that since deaths of heroes called for funeral games, and epic treats the deaths of heroes, funeral games must have been a part of the epic tradition from an early period (1941: 397). Certainly, Homeric heroes are well aware of other funeral games or the possibility of them (cf. *Il.* 23.274). Kirk claims, as have others, that the Funeral Games for Patroklos were, early on, subject to elaboration and alteration by lesser poets (1962: 222 ff); in this discussion, I do not deal with questions of Homeric composition.

³ Pindar is little interested in the mechanics of victory, though it is difficult to argue that this is a generic feature of epinician. Bacchylides offers some, still restricted, descriptions of the actual victory (e.g., 5.37-49, 9.27-39); perhaps with more than exiguous remains, Simonides' epinicians might clarify this question (cf. fr. 5-6 Poltera = 516-517 *PMG*). The false report of Orestes' death in Sophocles' *Electra* compares well to the Homeric narrative of the chariot race (Soph. *El.* 696-756; in particular, see *El.* 711-12 and *Il.* 23.363-364 (Finglass 2007: 316), *El.* 718-719 and *Il.* 23.379-381 (Finglass 2007: 319-320). In *Electra* too, the chariot race plays a solely narrative role, since as Finglass points out it heightens the *pathos* of Electra's position, because she believes Orestes dead; the dramatic irony reinforces our own sympathy with her, and increases the dramatic tension as well (Finglass 2007: 301). Finglass observes that there is some evidence that athletic success formed part of the traditional story of Orestes (*ibid.*); on the general similarities between the chariot race in *Electra* and the Funeral Games for Patroklos, see Finglass (2007: 301). He remarks on the difficulties of comparing this description and epinician poetry, despite their common athletic milieu: “[epinician] almost always avoids descriptions of the actual equestrian (or athletic) event at issue” (2007: 301). Nonetheless, he argues that Sophocles' description subverts the triumphant tone of epinician, since epinician motifs are recalled (e.g., *El.* 681, 685, 686, etc.) only to emphasize the pain that this contest has caused (Finglass 2007: 302).

of the praise of an individual as a result of athletic achievement, the program of epigram and epinician, Homer's narrative recounts purported athletic activity itself. While one might expect epigram to forego great detail because of a lack of space, even the most celebrated of Pindar's epinicians restrict greatly the specifics of athletic victory (e.g., *O.* 1.20-22; *O.* 2.48-51), in contrast to the celebration of city or victor, from whom, often, the expanded myth develops (e.g., *O.* 1.25 ff).⁴

The bulk of the account of the Funeral Games relates the chariot race, the first event in the Funeral Games' athletic program (*Il.* 23.261-650), and similarly the first event in the Alexandrian organization of Pindar's epinicians (cf. Lowe 2007).⁵ The narrative of the chariot race also prefigures the accounts of the other events, since they follow a similar structure, and thus it serves as a paradigm. The type-scenes are usually the following: the announcement of the event, the display of the prizes, the presentation of the competitors, the preparation for the contest, the description of the contest, and the awarding of the prizes (Scott 1997: 216).⁶

⁴ Even in the mythic narrative of *O.* 1, the description of Tantalos, Pelops' address to Poseidon, and his share of Olympic sacrifices, dwarf the four words given to his chariot victory: ἔλεν δ' Οἰνομάου βίαν ("he defeated mighty Oinomaos", *O.* 1.88). Epigrams can, in fact, support as much athletic description as epinician: *CEG* 1.302, for example, relates the quality of Alkmeonides' horses (1.302.3), and his charioteer's ability in driving them to victory (1.302.4; despite the lacuna in this line). On this epigram, see Nicholson (2005: 52-57).

⁵ For Willis, the order of events is crucial: he argues that the unusual placement of the chariot race signals the antiquity of the games and the alternative models available to poets via early epic (1941: 398); the order contrasts with the ancient Olympics, in which the chariot race came last (cf. Paus. 5.9.3 confirms this order for Olympiads after 472 BC; the order prior to this date is unclear, but the primacy of the footrace appears to be quite ancient: Xenoph. fr. 2.1-7 *IEG*²). Willis compares the Homeric event schedule with the events of Achilles' funeral games narrated in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* (*ibid.*; footrace [Quint. Smyrn. 4.180-214]; wrestling [Quint. Smyrn. 4.215-284]; boxing [Quint. Smyrn. 4.284-404]; archery [Quint. Smyrn. 4.405-435]; weight-toss [Quint. Smyrn. 4.436-464]; long-jump [Quint. Smyrn. 4.465-471]; javelin [Quint. Smyrn. 4.472-478]; pankration [Quint. Smyrn. 4.479-499]; chariot racing [Quint. Smyrn. 4.500-544]; horseback-riding [Quint. Smyrn. 4.545-595]). In contrast, Scott persuasively argues for the relative unimportance of the sequence of events. The narrative of each event is internal to itself, like the individual battles in the battle narratives, and thus the particular order should not be the basis of analysis (1997: 222-223).

⁶ Scott also includes the definition of the terms of the contest, the reaction of the spectators, the settlement of claims of unfairness, and the awarding of special prizes, though these scenes do not appear for every

As the fullest narrative, unsurprisingly, the chariot race includes a full version of these standard scenes: the event begins when Achilles holds back the Achaians after they build the *sema* for Patroklos. He announces the prizes, which, in contrast to later, historically-attested games, are to be awarded to all participants (*Il.* 23.261-270; with the exception of the weight-throwing contest: *Il.* 23.826-835).⁷ Following the presentation of the prizes, Achilles calls forth those who wish to participate (*Il.* 23.285-286), after first withdrawing because of grief for his fallen friend (even his horses are grief-stricken: *Il.* 23.279-284).⁸ Each of the prospective participants steps forward and the poet briefly describes them: Eumelos with only his father's name and a simple epithet (*Il.* 23.288-289); Diomedes' slightly longer description, which alludes to the provenance of the horses that he stole from Aeneas (*Il.* 23.290-293; cf. *Il.* 5.320-327); Menelaus follows the same pattern as Diomedes, but the description of his horses is longer, since their pedigree is connected to the time prior to the Trojan War (*Il.* 23.293-300). Next to be announced is Antilochos, whose description is lengthened by the inclusion of a speech by his father Nestor (*Il.* 23.301-350; Nestor's speech, *Il.* 23.306-348). Nestor advises his son to hang back in the race, until he should come around the turn-post at the far end of the course (*Il.*

contest described in Book 23. He demonstrates the validity of these categories of type-scene by analyzing the weight-throwing event (1997: 217-218).

⁷ Crowther speculates that the *Iliad* may follow the actual practice of funeral games, where the possessions of the dead man were used as prizes (2004: 324); however, this is guess work, as he admits, since only second-place and third-place prizes are attested (2004: 327). Papakonstantinou understands the equality of prize-giving in Patroklos' games as representative of *xenia* and conciliation, rather than any actual athletic practice (2002: 57-59). He regards the prizes, especially the two awarded without any contest at all (to Nestor, *Il.* 23.615-650; to Agamemnon, *Il.* 23.890-894), "as prestigious material objects circulating in a closed circuit of aristocrats" (2002: 60). If this adroit analysis is correct, then even the mechanics of prize-giving point to a significant appropriation and alteration of athletics for literary and narrative purposes.

⁸ Achilles' lack of participation could, were he not to provide a rationale for it, signal that he was not an aristocrat. This potential is evident in Euryalos' taunt of Odysseus on Scheria (*Od.* 8.158-164). There, Odysseus' potential lack of participation would render him socially excluded. We might see in Achilles' call to those who wish to participate an allusion to the historically attested role of the herald at the Olympics, whose job it was to call forth those who were to participate in each event as it was staged (Wolicki 2002: 73-74).

23.331-332),⁹ in contrast to trust in the natural ability of rider and horse (perhaps implicit in Diomedes' and Menelaus' descriptions), Nestor claims that μήτι δ' ἠνίοχος περιγίνεται ἠνίοχοιο (“by *metis* is a charioteer superior to another charioteer”) (*Il.* 23.318). Finally, Meriones also participates, though his perfunctory description perhaps presages his dismal showing in the race (*Il.* 23.351; cf. *Il.* 23.356, 528).

The narrator's interest in delineating characters, while superficially similar to the epinician and epigrammatic concern with the naming of its honorees, nevertheless operates as a narrative device. The Homeric heroes are not named with any consistency: the fathers of Eumelos, Diomedes, Menelaus, and Antilochos are delineated, but Meriones, seemingly an afterthought, receives only his own name.¹⁰ We receive no reminder of their civic or tribal affiliation, aside from the tangential reference to Pylos, when the narrator introduces Nestor prior to his speech (*Il.* 23.303). The point, certainly, is not to positively identify a distinctive person, or replicate a ritual proclamation, the presumptive rationales for Pindar's regular inclusion of father's name (see Chapter 2.1); as Pavlou puts it, for Pindar's clientele, their birth (and thus their patronymic as surety of that birth) constituted their claim to “exclusivity, distinction, and superiority” (2012: 57). The same is true in the majority of athletic epigrams, which usually include the full heraldic proclamation, consisting of victor's name, father's name, and city name (e.g., *CEG* 1.362, 1.380, 1.381, 1.382, 1.383, 1.391, 1.399, etc.; Day 2010: 199-202; see Chapter 2.1). The Homeric narrator, in contrast, is not concerned, obviously, with the

⁹ Nestor refers to this post as the grave mark of someone, or the goal from an earlier race (23.331: ἢ τευ σῆμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος, / ἢ τό γε νύσσα τέτυκτο ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων “either it is the grave-mark of someone who died long ago, / or was set as a racing goal by men who lived before our time”). If the former, he seems to debunk, offhandedly, the *Iliad's* message of ever-lasting heroic glory; if the latter, we again see the casual reference to earlier athletic games, though not necessarily funerary.

¹⁰ The absence is not due to a lack of a father: Meriones is referred to as the son of Molos on another occasion (*Il.* 13.249).

ideological conceits of his fictional (or semi-historical) characters. This is further exemplified by Pindar's own disregard for patronymic, and for ritual accuracy when he relates fictional or semi-historical characters. Of the six victors mentioned in the supposed record of the victors at the first Olympics in *O.* 10, only two have both patronymic and city-name (Likymnios: *O.* 10.65-66; Samos: *O.* 10.70), while two have only city-name (Echemos: *O.* 10.66; Doryklos: *O.* 10.67), and two are, like Meriones, left with only their own name (Phrastor: *O.* 10.71; Nikeus: *O.* 10.72).

Just before the race begins, the charioteers draw lots to determine their lanes (*Il.* 23.352-357) and Achilles sends Phoenix to the turn-post as a *skopos* (*Il.* 23.359), so that he can “bring back a true story” (ἀληθείην ἀποείποι) of the race (*Il.* 23.361).¹¹ The race proper then begins, and the description of the race can be productively compared with the battle descriptions, which take up much of the *Iliad's* narrative (McLeod 1982: 30; Scott 1997: 222): the gods intervene on the side of different heroes (e.g., *Il.* 23.382-387, 388-397); heroes call upon themselves and their horses to do better (e.g., *Il.* 23.402-416, 442-447); boasts and arguments break out between heroes (e.g., *Il.* 23.417-430, 438-551); there are disastrous crashes, which evoke similarly graphic wounds and deaths in the battle scenes (e.g., *Il.* 23.391-397).¹² The fact that these are spectator sports is not ignored

¹¹ Phoenix's role in the *Iliad* is a great scholarly crux; I follow the discussion of Hainsworth (1993: 81-82). Phoenix's placement here as *skopos* continues his characterization as an intimate of Achilles, despite his absence from most of the *Iliad's* narrative. Burgess observes that Phoenix appears already in visual depictions of epic scenes by the sixth century (2001: 85); he also asserts, probably correctly, that since epic is forgiving of doublets, the search for the “original” tutor of Achilles is probably misguided (2001: 86). It is unclear as to how actual chariot races determined lanes, though lots may well have played a role (Miller 2004: 75-78). In Pindar too, the role of chance in the circumstances of athletic victor is sometimes emphasized, though the descriptions are generally oblique (e.g., *O.* 9.89-94; *N.* 11.22-26).

¹² Some lines are formulae from the battle narratives: e.g., *Il.* 23.394=6.42, 23.397=17.696, 23.814=20.159=6.120; the second half of 23.818 is a common line ending (cf. *Il.* 3.347, 356; 5.300; 7.250, etc.). Unsurprisingly, the combat-in arms (23.798-825) is full of vocabulary and parts of lines from the battle narratives (it also alludes to the language of battle throughout: Hinckley 1986: 216; especially the duel between Hector and Ajax, e.g., *Il.* 23.825=7.304; Hinckley 1986: 218). It should be noted, however, that some of the language of the chariot crash description is unique: the verbs περιδρύπτω (23.395) and

either, since the audience is involved in the story, both as they watch the event (*Il.* 23.448-449), and when Idomeneos and the lesser Ajax argue over who is in first place (*Il.* 23.450-498; see Redfield 1975: 209).

It is instructive to emphasize here how little of this type of description finds its way into epinician and epigram. While gods are thanked for their help (e.g., *O.* 4.9, *O.* 6.94-96, 13.14-15), and divine favour is a marked indicator of athletic success (e.g. *O.* 8.67, 9.110), the gods are not thought to have directly intervened, nor are they described as doing so.¹³ Nor, in epinician or epigram, are quoted boasts, except implicitly in the form of “records” (e.g., *P. O.* 13.30-31; *CEG* 1.378; cf. Young 1996), attributed to the dedicators; crashes, deaths, and the other details of the actual competition, while undoubtedly part of the subtext of epinician and epigrammatic praise, are far from the central, or even ancillary, focus.¹⁴ Even the spectators, so important to the Iliadic narrative, fade into the background, or are conflated with civic adoration and celebration at home; the imaginative and fictive performance space of epinician, specifically, makes the details of audience particularly difficult to pin down (Carey 2007).¹⁵ In epigram, the

θρυλίσσω (23.396) are hapaxs. In other events, there are unique verbs as well: ὑπερείπω (23.691) and πτώω (23.697) in the description of the boxing match, and some of the technical vocabulary describing wrestling too (e.g., κώληψ: 23.726; γνάμπτω: 23.731). When the lesser Ajax trips and falls during the footrace, cow-dung (ὄνθος) makes its only three appearances in Homeric epic (*Il.* 23.775, 777, 781). The comparison between athlete and warrior has been often-noted, in their similar celebration at home, the language of boasting, and the ignominy of defeat (Crowther 2004: 313-321).

¹³ The thanking of the gods and divine favour is implicit in epigrams, which often describe themselves as *agalma* to a named deity: e.g., *CEG* 1.302 (to Apollo), 1.362 (to Zeus Kronios), 1.374 (to Karneion Apollo), 1.378 (to Athena), 1.388 (to Hermes).

¹⁴ Race points to the implicit context of Alkimedon (*O.* 8) and Aristomenes' (*P.* 8) victories (1990: 67): they both defeated four other boys, a feat that was unusual enough to be given a particular name (ἄνευ κλήρου “without a lot”), and to appear in epigrams (e.g., *CEG* 2.825, 2.827). In typically Pindaric fashion, however, this special type of victory is left unspecified (*O.* 8.68; *P.* 8.81). Small details find their way into odes, but usually when a special type of athletic victory has occurred, such as the apparently extraordinary number of crashed chariots during one of Arkesilas' victories (*P.* 5.46-53), Herodotos driving his own chariot (*I.* 1), or the reference to Knopidas, who must have been an exceptional charioteer or guest-friend (*CEG* 1.302).

¹⁵ An exception is *P.* 9, when the audience for Telesikrates' victory is emphatically evoked (*P.* 9.97-100).

audience is even more nebulous, since the inscription passively awaits readers – its location fixed – and cannot posit a fictive performance context outside of its locality; the motif of the dialogue with passers-by (e.g., *CEG* 1.13, 1.19, 1.27, etc.) indicates perhaps the anxiety of actualizing a readership for epigrams (see Chapter 2.2).

The chariot race at the Funeral Games finishes with Diomedes triumphantly winning (*Il.* 23.506-513), while Antilochos barely beats Menelaus, who ἀτὰρ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ ἐς δίσκουρα λέλειπτο (“at first... was left behind the length of a discus thrown”) (*Il.* 23.523), and Meriones comes in fourth place (*Il.* 23.528-531), derided by the poet for his poor horses and lack of charioteering skill. Finally, Eumelos, having crashed earlier thanks to the interference of Athena, drags his chariot across the finish line (*Il.* 23.532-533).

The sharp distinction of the Homeric representation of the chariot-race from actual contests is highlighted in this scene, in which Achilles pities Eumelos (*Il.* 23.534) and decides to award him second-prize, despite his inability to finish the race properly (*Il.* 23.536-538).¹⁶ Antilochos argues this point, and in doing so he evokes Achilles' own argument from Book One of the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon took away an already presented and awarded prize (*Il.* 23.539-554; cf. *Il.* 1.101-120, 130-139, 148-187; Golden 1998: 94). Achilles, however, in this scene as in the rest of the Funeral Games, is a conciliator (McLeod 1982: 30; Scott 1997: 216; Papakonstantinou 2002: 57), and he locates a different prize for Eumelos (*Il.* 23.555-562). In turn, Menelaus' complaint against Antilochos, that he used skill rather than natural ability to beat him, is diffused when

¹⁶ Papakonstantinou argues that this episode reflects the fact that athletics in Homer is not solely about victory and competition, but is a representation of the elite world, and therefore the excellence of certain athletes must be recognized, regardless of their actual athletic achievement (2002: 58, 60). A case in point is Nestor, who receives what Papakonstantinou terms a “lifetime achievement award” despite not participating in the games (*Il.* 23.615-650; 2002: 59).

Antilochos offers his prize to Menelaus as an apology, only to have it returned (*Il.* 23.566-611; McLeod 1982: 31). In addition to the absence of second-place and lower prizes at the pan-Hellenic games, Pindaric and epigrammatic athletic verse rarely refer to the defeated at all, let alone by name;¹⁷ second-place and lower victories at other contests may have been important, especially for financial considerations (Crowther 2004: 329), or as a way to attract competitors (Crowther 2004: 325), but no boast of anything but a victory appears in classical athletic epigram or epinician.¹⁸ Since conciliation is the subtext of the Funeral Games, they are far removed from the ethos of historical Greek athletics and, in particular, the highly agonistic atmosphere of Pindar and the athletic epigrams.

The spirit of conciliation and social concord, in fact, permeates the Funeral Games. “In the games”, as Golden writes, “we see conflict resolved time and time again” (1998: 94); this differs significantly from actual athletics, which resolved their conflict mainly in the identification of winners and losers (Golden 1998: 4). Aside from the disagreements during and after the chariot race, any resentment on losing the boxing match is removed when the victor, Epeios, catches the loser, Euryalos, and helps him

¹⁷ Christopher Brown brought to my attention *PMG* 802, by Timotheus, which appears to quote the herald's proclamation, and names the defeated dithyrambist, Phrynīs. Hordern thinks that, aside from the absent patronymic, this faithfully replicates the herald (Hordern 2002: 259), but the name of the defeated is not part of the proclamation and must be used here for some poetic effect. On the content of the herald's proclamation and further discussion, see Chapter 2.1. Crowther too remarks on Pindar's extreme opinion on losers and losing (Crowther 2004: 323-324).

¹⁸ Pindar occasionally provides his victors with counter-factual victories (*N.* 11.22-26), or otherwise alludes to victories that might have been (*N.* 7.62-63). Alcibiades' epinician boasts of placing first, second, and fourth, though this is likely an enhancement to his victory, rather than an actual interest in lower standings (*PMG* 755 = T 91a Kannicht; Crowther 2004: 324). An inscription in Athens (*IG* II² 2311) records second, third, and lower places at the Panathenaia, though this is a public record, rather than an individual's epigram or prose inscription (Crowther 2004: 325); the Panathenaia seems to have ceased awarding anything other than first prize by the second century BC (*ibid.*). Other victor lists from the Asklepieia and some local festivals attest to second prizes (and lower) as early as the fifth century (Crowther 2004: 326), though again, these are public records, rather than epigrams.

back to his friend, Diomedes (*Il.* 23.689-697);¹⁹ potential distress on the part of both audience (*Il.* 23.721) and participants (*Il.* 23.715-718) in wrestling is mitigated by the match being called a draw and the prizes, somehow, being split evenly (*Il.* 23.733-739; cf. Golden 1998: 93); the unusual gladiatorial-style contest between Telamonian Ajax and Diomedes (*Il.* 23.811-823) is also called a draw because of audience concern for Ajax's safety (*Il.* 23.822-823); in archery, prizes are re-distributed because of the great shot of Meriones, who shoots the target bird before it is re-tethered (*Il.* 23.870-881); finally, Achilles himself calls off the spear-throwing contest before it starts, because Agamemnon is, without contest, he says, the best of spearmen (*Il.* 23.884-897).²⁰

Scholars have observed this spirit of reconciliation as more than simply the transition to Book 24, in which Achilles peacefully returns Hector's body: Hammer, for example, argues that the Funeral Games are the definition of a new type of *arete*, and that the games themselves should be considered a depiction of the *polis* in action (1997).²¹ He observes that the *Iliad* as a whole is interested in questions of political authority and legitimacy (1997: 2), especially insofar as it represents dissonant political opinions (*ibid.*). In the Funeral Games, Hammer remarks, there exists an alternative model of command and authority to Agamemnon's blundering, and Achilles' stubborn withdrawal from combat (1997: 13). Hammer sees this alternative as an embodiment the burgeoning

¹⁹ In contrast to some of the fantastic stories we read of apparently real events, in which a competitor was killed in boxing: e.g., Paus. 8.40.4-5.

²⁰ Postlethwaite makes a reasonable argument for interpreting Achilles' treatment of Agamemnon here as ironic and sarcastic, rather than actually conciliatory (1995: 99). Athletes could be crowned without competing, though only if no one chose to compete with them; the story of Milo, whom no one would dare fight, is instructive (*Anth. Pal.* 11.316)

²¹ The status of the *polis* in the Homeric poems is beyond the bounds of this project, though it is a much debated issue: Seaford summarizes the controversial evidence from the poems themselves (1994: 1-3). He concludes that the ambiguous *polis* of the Homeric poems is a result of the depiction of Homeric society, which is both an ideological construct, and a reflection of the actual society of eighth century Greece (1994: 5-7). For more on the *polis* and the Homeric poems, see Raaflaub 1997.

polis, which is perhaps most obviously depicted on the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.483-607; Hammer 1997: 15); the games too, he suggests, also depict the *polis*, especially in the location of the tomb and games in the assembly area (*Il.* 23.258; Hammer 1997: 16), the public distribution of property as prizes (1997: 16), and the formal institutions for the adjudication of disputes (*ibid.*).

Hammer's argument is suggestive, but tenuous, especially with respect to the distribution of prizes. He contends that Achilles uses the "material resources of the community" (1997: 16) and makes the apportionment of prizes a "public activity instead of a private matter" (*ibid.*), but the text of the *Iliad* seems to state otherwise. Achilles certainly acts in a socialized manner, which contrasts to the unsocial behaviour of Agamemnon in Book One that sets the plot of the *Iliad* in motion (McLeod 1982: 32 lists many parallel lines in the two books); this behaviour, however, does not transform and confuse public and private as Hammer proposes. The prizes that Achilles brings forth for the games are explicitly brought forth "out of his ships" (*Il.* 23.259); when an alternative prize is required, Achilles takes οἴκοθεν ἄλλο ("some other thing out of my dwelling") (*Il.* 23.558), a corselet that *he* stripped from a fallen combatant (*Il.* 23.560-562). Hammer also sees the assignment of Phoenix as an "umpire" as indicative of the public nature of the games, though Phoenix too comes from Achilles' own Myrmidons, and is assigned as *skopos* by Achilles himself – the analogy to the arbiter on the Shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.497-508), to which Hammer points, is strained, since the disputants on the Shield seek an impartial voice, whereas here an already existing judge sets a close friend as observer (Hammer 1997: 16; cf. *Il.* 9.437-443, 483-495).

Scott provides a more compelling analysis of Achilles' role in the Funeral Games, and the role of the episode in the *Iliad* as a whole. He suggests, along with other critics, that the games form a "review" of sorts, for the audience, of the main heroes from the bulk of the *Iliad* (1997: 22-23; see also McLeod 1982: 29-32). Furthermore, the games can be structurally compared to the Catalogue of Ships from Book Two: "in both cases an extended picture of the army and its leaders is presented" (Scott 1997: 214). As I have already mentioned, the disastrous conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon from the opening of the *Iliad*, embodied in a reward-system gone awry, is here replayed in a reward system that operates perfectly, even amidst tensions and conflicts (Scott 1997: 215). While this comparison has been acknowledged (e.g., Donlan 1979: 63), and Achilles' role as the embodiment of "collegial cooperation" has been recognized (*ibid.*), Scott contends that the scheme, which allows this cooperation to take positive effect, is a preexisting social code, "an etiquette of games" (1997: 215).

The etiquette is most obviously demonstrated in the ability of epic audiences to understand, for example, the rules to footraces, chariot races, armed combats, etc., without the poet expending time on the rules for each contest; Scott argues for analogous social codes throughout the poem, in, for example, the rules of *xenia*, arming for battle, and feasting (Scott 1997: 216, 221). The preexistence of this social code, and the audience's expectation and understanding of it, permits the poet to spend time fitting heroes to their context in the games, rather than outlining procedure: "Nestor is predictably long-winded" (*Il.* 23.306-348, 626-650; Scott 1997: 218), Odysseus relies on Athena (*Il.* 23.725-732, 768-783; Scott 1997: 218; Golden 1998: 93). The athletic events bring us back to earlier scenes in the *Iliad* and are an integrated part of the poem, rather

than a special type of athletic representation; the athletic events are not generated from the occasion of athletic victory – they are narrative, not encomium. Scott observes that the use of type-scenes and the reliance on audience expectation points to the fact that the Homeric poet is “not much interested in athletic techniques *per se*”, but rather how they enact or contribute to the presentation of a well-ordered system of rules and procedures (Scott 1997: 219). The use of athletic events permits the poet to present the answers to hypothetical questions about how well-ordered events should take place, how disputes can be resolved (Scott 1997: 220-221 uses the boxing match as an example).

The allusion to social codes and the use of narrative to present this “etiquette” of games crafts a thematic unity for Book 23, which would otherwise be lacking (Scott 1997: 222). Scott remarks that the Funeral Games’ importance lies in its presentation of another social code of importance to elite audiences (1997: 222-223). Instead of as an ideal political leader, Scott sees Achilles as the embodiment of the perfect arbiter of the pre-existing heroic code (1997: 226), especially among athletic competitors, which are on the verge of breaking out into violence (e.g., *Il.* 23.450-498; 23.566-585; 23.773-784; 23.820-823). The function of the Funeral Games then, is not to represent athleticism, sports, or, to praise victors, but rather, as with respect to other aspects of the social code of heroes found throughout epic, to explicate the codes and regulations that permit the society to function.

In both Hammer’s and Scott’s interpretations, the narrative function of the Funeral Games far outweighs their role as a representation of athletics; this is strikingly different from the central *generic* function of athletics to the epinician and epigram. While the poetic program of these occasional genres can encompass a host of functions, whether

ideological, social, or political, the central function of epinician and epigram is encomiastic (Bundy 1962: 3).²² Regardless of the pervasive influence of Homer on, for example, epinician language and imagery (cf. Sotiriou 1998), athletic victory itself remains the *sine qua non* for the dedication of an epigram or the commissioning of an athletic epinician; thus, I argue for a significant generic and poetic difference between the representation of athletics and athletes in the Homeric poems and their representation in epinician and epigram.

Scott's focus on the social etiquette of games indicates the continuing ideological resonance of the Iliadic representation of athletics, which is one of the primary influences of epic athletic representation on epinician and epigram, as well as actual Classical athletic practice. As Papakonstantinou puts it in *The Homer Encyclopedia*, "in Homer, sport articulates, consolidates, and perpetuates social hierarchies" (2011: 821); the restriction of athletics to the elite heroes of the *Iliad* indicates this social and hierarchical aspect. While we hear of how Achilles' Myrmidons, δίσκοισιν τέρποντο καὶ αἰγανέησιν ἰέντες / τόξοισίν θ' ("amused themselves with discs and with light spears for throwing / and bows") (*Il.* 2.774-775), the institutionalized and properly agonistic games are restricted to the heroic figures of the *Iliad*, themselves kings or sons of kings.

The only possible exception is Epeios, who wins the boxing match after deriding his own martial abilities (*Il.* 23.669-670). Golden regards Epeios as a craftsman, because he is, in the *Odyssey*, identified as the builder of the Trojan Horse (1998: 89; *Od.* 8.492-493, 11.23).²³ Howland too sees Epeios as a craftsman, but does not regard his self-

²² On Bundy and Pindaric scholarship since him, see Chapter 2.1.

²³ Epeios appears in a fragment of the *Little Iliad* (West 2013: 193), and seems to be referenced in a fragment of Steisichoros as well (*PMGF* 200); in the latter, he is a water-carrier whom Athena pitied. West

effacing admission of martial inadequacy as indicative of his laughable status (1954-55: 15); his generosity to his defeated opponent may indicate his noble character (1954-55: 16; *Il.* 23.694-695). Papakonstantinou considers whether Epeios is a member of the Homeric elite as well (2002:52), and while he agrees his representation is ambiguous, he points to the poet's description of him as "the best" (23.669), "god-like" (23.689, 839), and "great-hearted" (23.694). These descriptions are appropriate only for "the most prominent heroes" (Papakonstantinou 2002: 52 n3). Even when Epeios fails at the weight toss, Howland argues (1954-55: 16), the Achaian spectators likely laugh at his inappropriate technique (Epeios throws as if the weight is a discus: ἤκε δὲ δινῆσας "whirled and threw it"; *Il.* 23.840), rather than anything intrinsically base.²⁴ In fact, a base quality of any sort would be out of keeping with the representation of athletics in the *Iliad*, which "reproduce[s] the discourse of social domination by the elite and legitimize[s] in the eyes of both participants and spectators alike the existing conditions of social and political inequality" (Papakonstantinou 2002: 62). It is in this aspect, rather than in the rhetoric of praise or in any true generic affinity, that the representation of athletics in the Funeral Games of Patroklos exerts its greatest influence on epinician and athletic epigram of the Classical period.

1.2: Elite Ideology and Athletics in the Phaiakian Games

assumes that we are missing some significant event in the epic tradition, which made sense of the fact that the otherwise-unknown Epeios built the horse (2013: 194).

²⁴ If we are to read Book 23 and Book 2 as structural parallels, the one wonders at a comparison of Epeios and Thersites, "the ugliest man who came beneath Ilion" (*Il.* 2.216). Both are laughed at (cf. *Il.* 2.270 and 23.840), although Thersites' behavior and appearance are indicative of his lower-status. Epeios may be, then, a representation of the appropriate behaviour of someone who is terrible at battle; that is, he admits his short-coming but finds other ways to excel. Laughter alone, after all, cannot signal the man's low status, since the lesser Ajax too is mocked when he falls amidst dung after Athena trips him up during the footrace (*Il.* 23.784). Laughter here, diffused by the spirit of competition, is markedly different than the fearful laughter that accompanies the rebuke of Thersites; again, we see the Achaian army properly able to socialize, fail, and laugh, without the accompanying disaster of the beginning of the *Iliad*.

The connection between elite ideology and athletics is more frequent and more explicit in athletic depictions in the *Odyssey*. Despite the lack of a long extended sequence, athletics occurs in the narrative on three separate occasions: the Phaiakian games on Scheria (*Od.* 8.97-255), the boxing match between Odysseus and Iros on Ithaka (*Od.* 18.1-107), and the archery competition on Ithaka (*Od.* 21.404-423). The games on Scheria are the only formal competition, though the other two instances have affinities with the Phaiakian games, as well as the Funeral Games of Patroklos. In all three cases, just as with the Iliadic representation of athletics, sport exists for ideological and narrative purposes: the Phaiakian games, the boxing match with Iros, and the archery contest function in order to comment on the social status of Odysseus, even in his various guises, and to foreshadow the plot of the poem. Again, this narrative function differs from the generic function of athletics (as the occasion for the commissioning of the poem itself) in epinician and epigram.

In contrast to the games in the *Iliad*, the Phaiakian games are restricted to the youths of the city, though they are, similarly, announced by their organizer, in this case, Alkinoös (*Od.* 8.105-119). Another contrast is the lack of prizes, which were, as I have demonstrated above, essential to the function of the games in the *Iliad*. Chariot racing is absent on Scheria, and instead the Phaiakian youths compete in a footrace (*Od.* 8.118-125), wrestling (*Od.* 8.126-127), jumping (*Od.* 8.128), discus (*Od.* 8.129), and boxing (*Od.* 8.130). The descriptions are not as elaborate as those in the *Iliad*, and are a relatively perfunctory record of victory, which likely results from their significantly different narrative function. In the *Iliad*, the athletic events serve, at a minimum, to reintroduce or review characters who have been absent since Achilles' return; the point of the Phaiakian

games, on the other hand, becomes clear only after their completion, when Laodamas wonders if Odysseus himself is an athlete, since *φυήν γε μὲν οὐ κακός ἐστι, / μηρούς τε κνήμας τε καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρας ὑπερθεν / αὐχένα τε στιβαρὸν μέγα τε σθένος* (“in physique he’s not that bad / in thighs, in calves, and up top in both arms, / sturdy neck, and greatness of strength”) (*Od.* 8.134-136). Odysseus demurs on account of his troubles (*Od.* 8.152-157), but Alkinoös’ other son, Euryalos, taunts him and claims that he is likely not an athlete, but rather,

ἀλλὰ τῶ, ὅς θ' ἅμα νηὶ πολυκλήϊδι θαμίζων,
 ἀρχὸς ναυτῶν οἷ τε πρηκτῆρες ἔασι,
 φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἦσιν ὁδαίων
 κερδέων θ' ἀρπαλέων· οὐδ' ἀθλητῆρι ἔοικας.

one who is accustomed to a ship with many oarlocks,
 a captain of sailors who are traders,
 you're mindful of cargo and an overseer of freight
 and greedy gains, but you don't seem like an athlete.

(*Od.* 8.161-164)

Euryalos threatens that Odysseus is not part of the leisured elite, but a mercantile man, whose thoughts turn to profit and trade, rather than athletics and warfare (Stanford 1947: 336; Thalmann 1998: 149).²⁵ Odysseus’ response to this taunt is intriguing, since he first debunks the correlation between a man’s appearance and his worth (*Od.* 8.167-177),²⁶ before staking his own claim to athletic prowess: *ἐγὼ δ' οὐ νῆϊς ἀέθλων, / ὡς σὺ γε μυθεῖαι, ἀλλ' ἐν πρώτοισιν οἴω / ἔμμεναι* (“I’m not ignorant of games / as you

²⁵ This distinction recurs in Book 18, when Odysseus (dressed as a beggar) wishes to take part in the archery contest; Eurymachos scolds him with an offer of manual labour (*Od.* 18.356-364). Thalmann regards this as part of the same ideology to which Pindar refers in *I.* 1.47-51, when shepherds, animal trappers, and sailors are set in contrast to athletic glory (1998: 135).

²⁶ Thalmann argues against those who read Odysseus’ words as an attack on aristocratic ideology (1998: 150 n93). In fact, Odysseus himself is beautiful (divinely so: *Od.* 8.22-23), a fact which has been recognized by other characters (e.g., Laodamas, *Od.* 8.134-137). Odysseus’ words should be read as merely remarking that exterior appearance is not a certain guide to internal abilities or status; the identity of the two, of which Odysseus himself stands as proof, is clearly still the ideal.

purport, on the contrary, I think I used to be among / the first") (*Od.* 8.179-181).²⁷

Immediately upon finishing his retort, Odysseus launches a much larger discus (*Od.* 8.187-188), farther than any Phaiakian; this settled, he challenges them to boxing, wrestling, running matches (*Od.* 8.206), archery (*Od.* 8.215-222), or spear-throwing (*Od.* 8.229) – only in the footrace does he dare speak of losing, and then only because he has spent so much time at sea (*Od.* 8.231-233).²⁸ Needless to say, the Phaiakian youths are rendered silent by the display and boasts, and Alkinoös calls the games to an end (*Od.* 8.254-255), but not before observing that the Phaiakians are not, after all, skilled in athletics, but in feasting, singing, dancing, and bathing (*Od.* 8.246-249; Thalmann 1998: 152).²⁹

Certainly, the tension involved in commodity exchange, trade, and economic activities, among the leisured elite, and between other social classes, is a component of the encomium in Pindar's epinicians and in dedicatory epigram (cf. Kurke 1991,

²⁷ If, as often, the *Odyssey* seems to be aware of the *Iliad* (Heubeck 1988: 12-13), then this could be an intertextual reference to the Funeral Games for Patroklos, in which Odysseus wins one event, namely, the footrace.

²⁸ Braswell argues that Demodokos' song about Aphodrite and Ares (*Od.* 8.266-366), which follows this boasting and bickering, relates directly to the Euryalos' and Odysseus' interaction (1982: 131). He suggests that Odysseus compares well with Hephaistos, who captures the physically-superior Ares by wits and skill (1982: 132-133); in particular, the lameness and slowness of Hephaistos mirrors the decision by Odysseus to not compete, alone of all events, in the footrace (Braswell 1982: 134). Brown contends, following Braswell, that the laughter of the gods in the song of Demodokos is not mirthful – at the situation generally – but mocking, at Ares and Aphrodite in particular (1989: 284). The public shame, then, might be similarly transferred to Euryalos, for his inappropriate boast, especially once Odysseus has chastised, and bested, the younger man.

²⁹ In this last observation, in which the Phaiakian king cedes all athletic prowess to Odysseus, Dickie argues that the poet establishes the Phaiakians as a "soft" people, whose prowess at the fine arts signals their lack of military experience or skill (1983: 267). He concludes that the Phaiakian athletic contest establishes a connection between martial and sporting prowess, which is signaled only implicitly in the Funeral Games of Patroklos. Odysseus' skill at one, athletics, implies his skill at the other, warfare (1983: 252); both of these arts are, of course, the proper reserve of a socially exclusive group of males, to which, thus, the Phaiakian youths do not belong (Dickie 1983: 248). Indeed, the Phaiakians later become a byword for luxury in the ancient world (Dickie 1983: 244), and in epic, Priam too correlates dancing and poor martial ability, when he bemoans that the sons surviving to him are only *aristoi* at dancing (*Il.* 24.252-262; Dickie 1983: 267). In this, Dickie concludes that the social and ideological quality of athletics in the Classical period is alive in its epic rendition too: "athletics has in Homer very much the same meaning as it has for Pindar and Aristophanes. It is a field of endeavor in which a young man may realize his innate *arete*, and have that *arete* affirmed in the *kleos* that he wins from others" (Dickie 1983: 269).

Nicholson 2005).³⁰ This tension, however, in athletic verse, provides an implicit social context for the commissioning of the poem, the restricted participants in the games themselves, and the involvement of trainers, doctors, and other professionals in the obtaining of victory (on trainers, see Nicholson 2005: 199-210; on doctors, see Nicholson 2009). In the *Odyssey*, in contrast, Thalmann suggestively interprets the Phaiakian games as demonstrative of a tension inherent to elite ideology, and important to the plot of the poem: the contradiction between the competitive ethic and the standards of hospitality (1998: 141).

Despite the seemingly peaceful character of the Phaiakian games, just as in the Funeral Games for Patroklos, violence and discord lurk just below the surface. Alkinoös' proclamation, while formally excluding Odysseus because of his status as a spectator, is still competitive with other communities: ὥς χ' ὁ ξείνος ἐνίσπη οἴσι φίλοισιν / οἴκαδε νοστήσας, ὅσσον περιγινόμεθ' ἄλλων / πύξ τε παλαιμοσύνη τε καὶ ἄλμασιν ἠδὲ πόδεσσιν ("so that this guest may tell to his family / when he returns home, how much we surpass others / in boxing, wrestling, leaping and footracing") (*Od.* 8.102-103; Thalmann 1998: 148). Odysseus' position as suppliant seemingly dismisses any potential equality to the Phaiakians, since he does not participate in the games; Laodamas' offer, while dismissed brusquely by Odysseus (*Od.* 8.152-157), could be interpreted as an attempt to give Odysseus the opportunity to remove himself from his inferior position (*Od.* 8. 133-139, 152-157; Thalmann 1998: 148). In contrast, Euryalos' taunt ("quarrelsome", according to the narrator: *Od.* 8.158) exposes the violence that is the standard relationship between strangers, or between *oikoi* and communities (Thalmann 1998: 149). Odysseus' social status is explicitly connected to his athletic ability and, as

³⁰ I discuss this in more detail in Chapter 2.2 and Chapter 3.4.

Thalman persuasively suggests, the entire episode of the Phaiakian games demonstrates the interdependence of status and competition: “roughly equal social standing is a precondition for, and is demonstrated by, competition, and superior standing the result of success” (1998: 149).

1.3: Minor Competitions: The Beggars' Fight and the Archery Contest

The Phaiakian games are the only formal set of athletic competitions in the *Odyssey*, but Odysseus' fight with the beggar Iros can be read as a boxing match (*Od.* 18.1-107), while the archery contest (*Od.* 21.404-423) recalls the Funeral Games for Patroklos and the Phaiakian games. Both of these informal athletic contests continue the poem's use of athletics as a device for reflection on class and ideology, as well as a narrative device through which the poet can foreshadow the end of the poem, and draw contrasts between characters and events.

Book 18 begins with the introduction of Iros, who is explicitly non-heroic, a stark contrast to the introduction of athletes in the Phaiakian games and in Patroklos' Funeral Games, and to the characterization of athletic victors (and others) in epinician and epigram: he is not identified with a homeland (he simply begs “throughout the town of Ithaka”: *Od.* 18.1-2), and only his mother is named (*Od.* 18.5).³¹ He taunts Odysseus and, alert to the encouragement of the suitors, is eager to beat the hero until he leaves (*Od.* 18.11-12); Odysseus in turn tries to avoid combat (as he initially tried to avoid

³¹ The non-heroic presentation of Iros compares well with that of Thersites, who is also not given a patronymic or homeland (*Il.* 2.212; Thalman 1988: 1; Steiner 2010: 154). Steiner remarks on the contrast with Odysseus: while Iros is given multiple names, Odysseus remains entirely incognito (2010: 156). The reference to Iros' mother has been much debated, since *πότνια μήτηρ* “lady mother”, a very common formula, seems inappropriate to Iros' lineage (Steiner 2010: 156). A variant reading replaces *πότνια* with *δειλή* “wretched”, though this is likely an Alexandrian attempt at correction, rather than a better reading; another manuscript gives *οἴ ποτε* (Steiner 2010: 156), but this similarly skirts, rather than solves, the issue. Steiner remarks that *πότνια* “belongs to the class of epithets denoting a regular attribute of a phenomenon that may be absent in particular instances of the genus” (2010: 156).

competition on Scheria), but adds a boast that he will beat him violently should he persist. Iros retorts with a claim similar to that of Epeios prior to the boxing match in the Funeral Games for Patroklos (*Od.* 18.28-29; cf. *Il.* 23.673).

Thalman explicitly connects this match to heroic duels in the *Iliad*, and reads the boxing match as a reduction of the same structure to the lowest possible status: the fight with Iros, he remarks, follows all of the conventions of heroic duels (1998: 101). In contrast to the boxing match during the Funeral Games, here the exhibition of two apparent beggars beating each other is enough to raise a laugh from the suitors, whose leader, Antinoös, sees this as a great source of amusement (*Od.* 18.36-39). In a gross approximation of an athletic event, Antinoös sets the rules and prizes for the match (*Od.* 18.43-49; Steiner 2010: 162).³² After this, Odysseus reveals his body as he girds his loincloth for the match, and Athena improves his form, so that the suitors are suddenly amazed, and Iros loses his earlier confidence (*Od.* 18.67-77).³³ The hint to Odysseus' true nature as a member of the athletic elite, one which the Phaiakians noticed after he threw the discus, is ignored by the suitors (Steiner 2009: 73), perhaps partly because Odysseus himself holds back his strength, specifically so as not to raise an alarm (*Od.* 18.94), but also partly because of the suitors' own ineptitude.

While the match with Iros is traditionally interpreted as a moment of comic relief (Hewitt 1926: 648; see Levine 1982: 200 n1), Levine argues that Iros serves an important narrative function, since the behavior of the beggar mirrors that of the suitors, and “when

³² By Lelièvre's definition, the match between Odysseus and Iros is an example of ancient parody: “[parody] reproduces a passage, large or small, from an author, but changes it in part, so that it is made to apply to a humbler subject, or is used in less serious circumstances than the original author intended” (1954: 66). Certainly, the similarities between the Iros-Odysseus match and the boxing event in the Funeral Games for Patroklos point to such a parodic effect.

³³ In epinician and epigram too, the body acts as a signifier of athletic potential: e.g., *O.* 8.19, *O.* 9.110-111, *O.* 10.109-105, *P.* 10.55-60; Ebert no. 12; see Chapter 7. On one occasion, the body is, however, not indicative of athletic prowess (*I.* 4.49-54b).

the suitors laugh at his fall, they are showing that they have no premonition that a similar fate awaits them” (Levine 1982: 200). Steiner has recently built on this analysis, and demonstrated the affinity between the characterization of Iros and iambic invective in later iambographers (Steiner 2009: 90). In both scholars’ estimation then, the Iros-Odysseus conflict is, as are the Funeral Games, about social codes and the narrative of the *Odyssey*, rather than athletics *per se*. Just as in the Phaiakian episode, the suitors and Iros mistake Odysseus’ appearance as indicative of his status, though in the former, Alkinoös’ admission of athletic inferiority diffuses the situation (Thalmann 1998: 141), and Odysseus’ demonstration reinforces the ideal correlation between exterior and interior; in this episode, however, Iros’ treatment at the hands of Odysseus serves to foreshadow the similar, though even more violent treatment, which the suitors will soon suffer.³⁴ That they cannot recognize this, despite the hint provided by their glimpse of Odysseus’ true form, affords ironic humor to the audience, at the same time as it continues the characterization of the suitors as ignorant and foolish (Levine 1982: 204).

Considering the mendicant status of Iros, we might read this episode as a contrast between statuses, with Odysseus’ true nature, despite his disguise, emblemized in athletic victory (as on Scheria). Needless to say, in the aristocratic milieu of epinician and epigram, competition between individuals of different statuses is impossible, thanks to the ideology of the genres, as well as the high cost of dedicating (whether commissioning a poem, inscription, or statue) anything at all.³⁵ Rose argues that the narrative of the

³⁴ Thalmann remarks on the potential violence on Scheria, which is prevented thanks to Odysseus’ and Alkinoös’ ability to play properly the role of guest and host respectively (1998: 153). In contrast, we might read the behaviour of the suitors during the boxing match with Iros and the archery contest as indicative of their complete inability to be proper hosts, and thus, even to be aristocrats at all.

³⁵ On the aristocratic nature of dedications, see Chapter 2.2. The status of trainers and charioteers is unclear, though they do appear in epinician and epigram (cf. Nicholson 2005). Jockeys are strikingly absent, though racehorses are mentioned with some frequency (Nicholson 2005: 95-116).

beggar fight, a sadistic display of violence, which is openly risible to the internal aristocratic audience, should be read as an opening for criticism of the hierarchical structure of Homeric society (1992: 111-112). In contrast, Thalmann also structures the beggar fight in class discourse, but he sees it as affirming, rather than questioning, the implicit social structure (1998: 101, 104). The beggar's true nature is base, while Odysseus' position as a beggar is belied through the partial revelation of his body, which is merely veiled by rags (Thalmann 1998: 105). Iros is certainly a low-status figure, and his ability to speak for a relatively lengthy period posits the possibility, at least, that we gain access to a legitimate alternative perspective. His fate, however, as Suter points out (1993: 6-7), connects him to the Iliadic Thersites, who similarly attempts to rebuke his social superiors, only to feel physical and verbal assault as a consequence (cf. *Il.* 2.246-277).³⁶ The beggar, however, is not the only victim, and just as this episode looks forward to the suitors' defeat on a narratological level, the ideological plane similarly presages Odysseus' fight with the suitors: "the fight with Iros plays out on a lower social level his quarrel with the suitors" (Thalmann 1998: 103).

The final athletic event in the *Odyssey* is the archery contest, which is to decide who will marry Penelope (*Od.* 21.1 ff). Penelope herself plays the role of judge and prize (*Od.* 21.68-79); she frames the potential marriage, explicitly, as an *athlon* (*Od.* 21.73).³⁷ While the motif of the bride as a prize is common cross-culturally (West 2007: 433-436), and appears in both well-known (e.g., *O.* 1; West 2007: 433) and lesser-known (e.g., *P.* 9.103-125; West 2007: 434) athletic myths in Pindar, the function of the traditional

³⁶ In both instances, it is Odysseus who rebukes these lower-status upstarts: cf. *Il.* 2.245 and *Od.* 18.14 (Suter 1993: 6).

³⁷ At *Od.* 21.106-110, Telemachos praises the prize of marrying his mother, in a way that brings to mind similarly extended descriptions of contest prizes (e.g., *Il.* 23.559-562, 740-749).

element differs significantly in epinician and epic. In the former, the bride-as-prize motif is a component of the mythic narrative, through which Pindar not only praises his victor by analogy, by also eternalizes the otherwise ephemeral athletic victory (see Kurke 1991: 95-118). In the *Odyssey*, the bride-as-prize motif is, obviously, a crucial component of both the archery contest (itself a traditional element, see West 2007: 433) and the larger plot of the poem (West 2007: 438-440). Again, the striking difference is that the *Odyssey's* use of athletics is for their narrative potential, and the traditional motif is generically important, whereas in epinician, athletic victory provides the generic occasion, and the traditional motif supplements the praise of the victor and fills in the narrative.

The suitors try their hand at stringing the bow, though they fail (*Od.* 21.140-174) and give up the contest for the day (*Od.* 21.245-268). Before they can go to their feast, however, Odysseus begs an opportunity to try (*Od.* 21.275-284), feigning the type of weakness that earlier, among the Phaiakians, he claimed not to have suffered (*Od.* 21.282-283). Despite the suitors' rebuke of the apparent beggar (*Od.* 21.288-310), Telemachos permits Odysseus to try the bow (*Od.* 21.369-379). A last taunt from an anonymous suitor prefaces Odysseus' attempt (*Od.* 21.401-403); he rapidly grabs the bow, strings it, and shoots an arrow immediately, clean through the axe-heads (*Od.* 21.404-423). Following this, Odysseus calls the suitors to feast, before the next book opens, and the slaughter begins (*Od.* 22.15-16).

In this contest too, we see athletics used for narrative effect, and for its ideological content. The archery contest can be read as the final configuration of athletics in the poem, which has been used throughout to prefigure the confrontation with the suitors. In

antiquity, commentators had already connected the Phaiakian games and the contest of the bow, especially through Odysseus' boast on Scheria:

εὖ μὲν τόξον οἶδα εὐξοὸν ἀμπαφάασθαι·
 πρῶτός κ' ἄνδρα βάλοιμι οἷστεύσας ἐν ὀμίλῳ
 ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων, εἰ καὶ μάλα πολλοὶ ἑταῖροι
 ἄγχι παρασταῖεν καὶ τοξαζοῖατο φωτῶν.

I know well how to handle a finely-polished bow,
 And I'd be first to shoot an arrow and strike a man
 in a throng of hostile men, even if very many comrades
 stood close by and shot the bow at men

(*Od.* 8.215-218).³⁸

Another intertext may lie in the simile that describes Odysseus' stringing of the bow, which he does as if it were a lyre, one of the skills to which Alkinoös can still lay claim after the athletic display of his guest (*Od.* 21.406-409); the last tie of the bow-string ἢ δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄεισε, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη αὐδὴν (“sang beautifully under him, with a sound like a sparrow”) (*Od.* 21.411) – Odysseus' athletic prowess appropriates the so-called “soft” skills of the Phaiakians, even as he prepares death for the suitors. In both narratives, Thalmann remarks, Odysseus is first a spectator and then a competitor; in both, he suggests, the concept of contest sits uneasily in a setting of hospitality (1998: 141). While the Phaiakian games end without discord thanks to the appropriate role-playing of Odysseus and Alkinoös, the archery contest provides a distorted mirror of how competition and *xenia* could be accommodated.

As in the boxing match with Iros and the Phaiakian games, Odysseus' outward disguise is enough to make the suitors angry at his suggestion that he should string the bow (*Od.* 21.275-284, 288-310); this anger, it seems, is based on the potential loss of

³⁸ Krischer sees the connection through the bows as one of many times when the events on Scheria prefigure those on Ithaka (1985: 19).

status they would suffer were a beggar such as Odysseus able to string a bow, and complete an athletic action that they themselves could not (e.g., *Od.* 21.320-329). The fear and mockery exhibits their continued inability to recognize Odysseus' elite pedigree because of his costume and disguise; in his actions, however, status is revealed. The rapidity of the narrative reflects on the speed and skillfulness of Odysseus' action – only nineteen lines pass from grabbing the bow, to firing it cleanly through the axe-heads (in the *Iliad*, the archery contest lasts 33 lines); the poet is explicit that Odysseus completes the entire action “effortlessly” (*Od.* 21.409: ἄτερ σπουδῆς) and his shooting of the bow contrasts with the lengthy description of the bow and its backstory, as well as the suitors' vain attempts at stringing it.³⁹

As this survey of Homeric athletics makes clear, the representation of athletes and athletics in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* intersects only broadly with the historical representation of real athletes in epinician and epigram. While it must be admitted that athletic representation in extant Greek literature begins in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the differences between epic and the athletic genre, the different engagement with history, and the lack of a dedicatory setting, indicate a distinctive form of athletic representation in epinician and epigram. Homeric representation, Homeric myth, Homeric style, all significantly influence the style, diction, and content of epinician and epigram (cf. Gentili 1988: 60; Sotiriou 1998; Gutzwiller 2010), but whereas Homeric athletes serve the larger poetic

³⁹ We might see here, in retrospect, a difference from the standard epinician conceit that victory requires *great* effort; the most succinct evocation of this conceit is *N.* 7.14-16: ἔργοις δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον ἴσαμεν ἐνὶ σὺν τρόπῳ, / εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἕκατι λιπαράμπυκος / εὕρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἄοιδαῖς (“we know of a mirror for noble deeds in only one way, / if, by the grace of Mnemosyne with the shining crown, / one finds recompense for his labours in poetry's famous songs”) (other examples, see: *O.* 8.7, *O.* 10.93, *N.* 5.48, *N.* 7.15-16). Epinician is, naturally to Pindar, the appropriate reward for this toil (Kurke 1991: 110-111)

agenda of their respective poems, athletes in epinician and epigram are the entire reason for the existence of the poem: athletic success in the Homeric poems can help to characterize a hero as aristocratic, or point to an ideological concern, but in epinician and epigram, athletic success *is the occasion of the poem*.⁴⁰

In the following two chapters then, I argue for a cohesive genre of athletic poetry, defined not by its content or athletic representation alone, but by its generation from athletic success. The primary announcement of athletic success, the heraldic proclamation or *angelia*, situates athletic success and the genre itself squarely in the action of sport; in this, more than anything else, the generic distinction between epinician/epigram and epic is most evident. While Homeric representations of athletes and athletics might masquerade as history, the generic function of epinician and epigram – athletic verse – is in large part to generate that same history. Through an elaboration of the identity-driven proclamation of the herald to a full program of praise, the subjects of Pindar's epinician and dedicatory epigram aim to situate themselves as subjects fit for song; in this sense then, the desire for *kleos*, which is the foundation of epic song and Greek poetry, Homeric representation, athletic or otherwise, persists, as Laodamas claims in the *Odyssey*, οὐ μὲν γὰρ μεῖζον κλέος ἀνέρος ὄφρα κεν ἦσιν, / ἢ ὅ τι ποσσίν τε ῥέξῃ καὶ χερσίν ἐῆσιν (“while he's alive, a man's fame is no greater / than what he does with his own hands and feet”) (*Od.* 8.147-148).⁴¹

⁴⁰ As I mentioned at this chapter's outset, I have focused on the *athletic* representation of heroes in Homeric epic. The particular way in which heroes boldly announce themselves or boast of their deeds resonates as part of the genesis of the *angelia*, and the way in which Pindaric and epigrammatic representation develops.

⁴¹ I observe that Helen herself unpacks the connection between individual identity and song, when she remarks on the lot of her and Paris: ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω / ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' αἰδίμοι ἐσσομένοισι (“so that hereafter / we shall be made into subjects of song for the men of the future”) (*Il.* 6.357-358; Lattimore modified).

Chapter 2: Proclaiming and Dedicating Victory

Δρῦμος παῖς Θεοδώρου Ὀλυμπικὸν ἐνθάδ' ἀγῶνα
ἦνγελ' αὐθῆμαρ δρομέων θεοῦ εἰς κλυτὸν ἄλσος,
ἀνδρείας παράδειγμα· πατρὶς δέ μοι ἵππιον Ἄργος.

Drymos, son of Theodoros, proclaimed here, on that very day,
an Olympic victory, running into the famous grove of the god,
an example of manliness; equine Argos is my homeland.

(CEG 2.815)

Οὐκ ἀνδριανοποιός εἰμ', ὥστ' ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
ζεσθαι ἀγάλατ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
ἔσταότ'· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
ὀλκάδος ἐν τ' ἀκάτω, γλυκεῖ' ἀοιδά,
στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ', ὅτι
Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς
νίκη Νεμείους παγκρατίου στέφανον,
οὔπω γένυσι φαίνων τέρειναν
ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν

“I am not a sculptor, so as to fashion stationary statues that stand on their same
base.

Rather, on board every ship and in every boat, sweet song,
go forth from Aigina and spread the news that
Lampon's mighty son Pytheas
has won the crown for the pankration in Nemea's games,
not yet showing on his cheeks late summer, the mother of the grape's soft bloom”

(Pind. *N.* 5.1-6)

2.1: The *Angelia* and the Heraldic Mode

The final element of victory in an athletic event in ancient Greece was the proclamation by the herald appointed to the task (Wolicki 2002: 74; on the duties of heralds, see Crowther 2004: 191-193). While the proclamation itself was ephemeral, and some of the details unclear to us (e.g., when the proclamation was announced: see Wolicki 2002: 74), we can reconstruct the standard content through inscribed, painted, and orally-performed victory memorials: the victor's name, his father's name, *polis*, the

name of the event (and possibly the festival), age category (if not an adult), and a suitable form of the verb νικάω (Wolicki 2002: 75; Nash 1990: 25-26; Day 1994: 64). The proclamation actualized the victory, which became a great deed only through its verbalization: “a momentous deed is one that is talked about (or worth talking about). A man exists thanks to what he has achieved, and a widespread knowledge of his deeds constitutes his fame – *kleos*” (Wolicki 2002: 76).¹ Wolicki suggestively considers the herald almost a bard, whose powerful voice initiated, if only in inchoate form, the spread of an athlete’s fame and glory (2002: 76).²

In both of the athletic texts with which I began this chapter – one inscribed, one orally performed – the herald’s proclamation, the *angelia*, stands out: *CEG* 2.815 provides the reader with victor’s name (2.815.1), father’s name (2.815.1), event (2.815.2), homeland (2.815.3), and festival (2.815.1), all announced as if the victor himself were the herald; Pindar too records the salient features of the victor’s achievement and identity. Neither text, even the short epigram, prosaically recalls the details of the proclamation: Drymos’ epigram describes his victory rather neatly, and adds the flourish of his recognition as a *paradeigma* of manly virtue (2.815.3);³ in *N.* 5, most of the details of the *angelia* are set amidst an agonistic memorializing atmosphere, where Pindar’s song becomes the proclamation (5.3), which announces the identifying details of

¹ On *kleos* as an oral/aural concept, see Ford (2002: 58, 98-99). Svenbro regards *kleos* as intimately connected to the circulation of fame through *spoken* words: “*kleos* belongs entirely to the world of sounds” (1993: 14).

² Crowther lists the ancient criteria for a good herald, which are remarkably similar to those of oral poets and singers, who would have to, like the herald, speak over the din of noise at any festival occasion (2004: 188-189). In epic, heralds are described as λιγύφογγοι (“clear-voiced”: e.g., *Il.* 2.50, 2.442, 9.10; *Od.* 2.6) and as having loud voices (e.g., *Il.* 7.384). According to later tradition, Themistokles’ response to whether he wanted to be Achilles or Homer was “would you rather be the victor at the Olympic Games or the herald?” (Plut. *Mor.* 185a).

³ The epigram leaves the exact event in which Drymos was successful somewhat vague. *CEG* offers no information, except for guessing at the date of the inscription, ca. 350-300.

victory (5.4-5), and a flourish ends the strophe with a metaphorical description of the victor's age category (5.6).⁴

Regardless of the reconfiguration of the details of the proclamation, even if it is repeated rather dryly (e.g., *CEG* 1.381; *CEG* 1.399; *P.* 9.1-5), at its most basic level, the *angelia* identifies the athlete: it signals to an audience, whether reading or listening, the details that permit victory to be properly attributed (Nash 1990: 9-10). Thus, victory is intertwined tightly with identity. This identity, however, is constructed according to a set of unchanging criteria: fathers and cities, not mothers, broader ethnic identities, demes, occupations, or any number of other elements, circumscribe the identity of the athlete.⁵ In this way, the *angelia* is an ideological and discursive production, which favours certain elements as indicative of a supposedly essential identity, by which an unique victor can be signaled.⁶ I argue that we should consider the *angelia* the reification of a creative act, rather than the recognition of an essential and pre-existing identity: that is, the *angelia* itself contributes to the production of the very identity, which it purports to simply reveal.

Even in epinicians (e.g., *O.* 2.5-7; *P.* 6.1-18; *P.* 8.15-20) or epigrams (e.g., *CEG* 1.346, 1.362, 1.372) where verbs of announcing or proclaiming are absent, the details of

⁴ In contrast, Day observes that prose inscriptions rarely reflect the proclamation, and when they do, it is in the barest details (1994: 66).

⁵ Consider the identities we find in non-athletic epigrams, which record simply the name of the individual (e.g., *CEG* 1.49, 1.51, 1.69, 1.77, 1.84), occupations (*CEG* 1.62, 1.87, 1.191, 1.193, 1.217, 1.243, 1.396, 1.572), family names (*CEG* 1.207?), other family members (*CEG* 1.223?, 1.273, 1.275?, 1.323, 1.336, 1.403), female relations (*CEG* 1.413), whole family groupings (*CEG* 1.225?, 1.269, 1.407), other ethnic identifiers (*CEG* 1.209), or citizen class (*CEG* 1.269) as ways of identifying their dedicators. Despite their absence from the *angelia* or representation of the *angelia*, brothers (*O.* 2.49; *P.* 10.69), uncles (*N.* 4.80, 5.43; *I.* 6.60-61, 7.23-25), and mothers (*O.* 6.77-79; *N.* 10.37-38; cf. *N.* 1.33-59) were sometimes mentioned in epinician; we have some anecdotes, for instance, about mothers having an especial interest in the athletic careers of their children (e.g., Paus. 8.53). To be sure, some non-athletic dedications mention father's name as well (e.g., *CEG* 1.194, 1.195, 1.201, 1.221, 1.237, 1.251, 1.280, 1.293, 1.320, 1.322, 1.417, 1.418). The point is that there is a variety of identifications possible in non-athletic dedications, whereas athletic dedications tend to restrict themselves to the categories of the *angelia*.

⁶ In contrast, Nash considers the details of the *angelia* as objective (1990: 7) and conventional (1990: 12).

the *angelia* continue to provide the kernel of the genre (Day 1994: 64-65).⁷ This generic kernel, however, exists only allusively in epinician and epigram, since they reconfigure and modulate the *angelia*. Instead of only regarding the *angelia* as “a common source of formal language for both poet and epigram” (Day 1994: 64), I argue that the epinician and epigram are representative of the *angelia*. I suggest that we should recognize epinician and athletic epigram as utilizing a “heraldic mode of representation”, in which the allusive borrowing of the *angelia* offers much rhetorical, ideological, and formal power.⁸ Thus, it is the heraldic mode of representation, not the historically proclaimed *angelia*, which is the common generic kernel of epinician and epigram. Rather than a proclamation that transparently sits in the heart of athletic poetry, we are instead dealing with a representative mode, which, while deeply intertwined with the reality of victory, is itself discursive and malleable.

The discursive quality should be considered in tandem with the narrative potential of the *angelia*. Even in the act of proclaiming, the *angelia* is a speech-act which, in Bowie’s terms (2010: 313), narrates past events; it creates history.⁹ While Bowie argues that narration develops most fully in funerary epigrams, he acknowledges that the likely

⁷ This contrasts with non-athletic dedications, which represent the dedicatory act in the text: e.g., *CEG* 1.333, “Marphon dedicated me here to Apollo Ptoios; *CEG* 1.338, “[*nomen dedicatoris*] dedicated me to Apollo the far-shooter”. This is even the case in slightly more complex non-athletic epigrams: e.g., *CEG* 1.349, “Who dedicated this *agalma*, Philostratos is his name; his father’s name is Damophōn”. To be sure, there are some athletic epigrams that do not preserve the elements of the *angelia* (e.g., *CEG* 1.378), though their number is few.

⁸ The traditional connection of heralds and divinity would surely add to the persuasive force of heraldic imitation: heralds mix wine and precede the swearing of oaths and the performance of sacrifice throughout epic (*Il.* 3.245, 9.174; *Od.* 3.338, 20.276, 21.270); heralds were sacrosanct and connected to the gods (*Il.* 1.334, 4.192, 7.279, 8.517, 10.315); the herald, like the poet, was an intermediary between gods and mortals (cf. Pind. fr. 150; Brown 1984: 42).

⁹ Bowie argues that narration should be distinguished from imperatival addresses to passers-by (e.g., *CEG* 1.34; Bowie 2010: 315), ownership statements (*CEG* 1.454), or descriptions of the dedicated object (*CEG* 1.72). He defines narration as when “a sequence of words is used to say of some person or thing that it did something or something happened to it” (2010: 313); this is, essentially, identical to the Aristotelian definition of τὰ γενόμενα (*Poet.* 1451 a36-b11), although Bowie distinguishes his definition, since Aristotle does not include fictions in the statements made by historians.

source for narration in short verse inscriptions is the “dedicatory habit”, which was an essential component of the inscription: “it should be explicit and clear to all... that the dedicating person had actually made the dedication” (2010: 317). In this analysis, Bowie does not mention the narrative quality of the *angelia*: athletic verse is, at its heart, based on an occasion, the athletic victory, the structure of which dictates that the poetic celebration of this victory, even in its simplest form, will include past narrative.¹⁰ Past narrative is not as simple as recalling a vow, which only implies the past event of the dedication; in the case of athletic verse, the text, whether inscribed or oral, long or short, generates a past history for the dedicator himself, outside of the strictly dedicatory context.¹¹ This quality distinguishes athletic dedications from funerary epigrams, on which Bowie concentrates his analysis (2010: 335-339; 355-377). While funerary epigram sometimes places the dead honoree in a political or familial context after death (Bowie 2010: 318), athletic verse narrates the history of a living individual, the dedicator, and marks him as worthy as a subject of song, whether inscribed or orally-performed. The historical perspective is implicit in the act of athletic victory itself, since the proclamation of the herald is, already, a narration of past events; the elaboration of the *angelia* in verse simply expands this already existing past narration

In *CEG* 1.355, for example, one of the earliest athletic epigrams (ca. 600-550), $\nu\kappa\acute{\alpha}[\sigma\alpha\varsigma]$ (“having won”) in line one functions as a narrative of past events; this is

¹⁰ Bowie only remarks on the ease by which athletic dedications can expand themselves with lists of victories (2010: 329). Throughout his analysis, Bowie’s focus is on longer narration, not narration *per se*, which privileges funerary epigrams, since they expand in size earlier than athletic epigrams (see Bowie’s conclusion at 2010: 377, and his chart on the following seven pages).

¹¹ Nash remarks on the epinician poet’s focus on reality, despite prevalence of myth in Pindar’s corpus: “while poetry transforms a victor into an ideal character on one level, linking him to universal values and principles, the epinician never totally escapes the boundaries of historical fact” (1990: 15). Indeed, the frequent appearance of family victory catalogues in epinician indicates the interest of poet, patron, and audience in a historical narrative (Nash 1990: 22).

expanded in the following line, which adds the fact that the dedicator also won twice in wrestling (1.355.2: [καὶ δὲ παλ]αίον δφίς “and twice in wrestling”).¹² *CEG* 1.302 offers a more expansive, but still early (ca. 540), example:

[Φοί]βο μὲν εἰμ' ἄγαλ[μα Λ]ατ[ο]ίδα καλ[ό]ν· |
 [ho δ' Ἀ]λκμέονος ἠνίς Ἀλκμεονίδες |
 [h]ίποισι νικέ[σας ἔ]θεκέ μ' [ὀκέαις], |
 ἡὰς Κνοπι[άδα]ς ἔλαυν' ho [- x - ~ -] |
 ἡότ' ἔν Ἀθάναις Παλάδος πανέ[γυρις].¹³

I am the beautiful *agalma* of Phoibos the son of Leto;
 me, which, Alkmeonides, the son of Alkmeon
 set up, after he won with swift horses,
 which Knopi[da]s drove ...
 when the assembly of Pallas was in Athens.

In this epigram, Alkmeonides' victory is figured into the past narrative of the speaking-object, a beautiful dedication belonging to Apollo.¹⁴ Most of the elements of the *angelia* are present (1.302.2: name of victor, name of father; 1.302.3: event; 1.302.3: place of event), and just as in later elaborations, the composer of the epigram uses a relative pronoun (1.302.2) to move from the present act of dedicating, to the past when the object was won.¹⁵ This epigram is also remarkable for its second act of narrative elaboration, since it expands upon the horses which were used for the victory (1.302.2), and includes

¹² I follow the restoration of Ebert (*CEG* 1.355 = Ebert no. 1). Even without restoration, however, we can see the narrative potential, since some form of νικάω appears on the stone (cf. *CEG ad loc.*); the appearance of δφίς (1.355.2) demonstrates that even at an early date, the expansion from the *angelia* to include other victories existed. Bowie examines *CEG* 1.355 briefly as well (2010: 329-330), though he follows the reconstruction of Hansen (*CEG ad loc.*). Aside from its inscription, *CEG* 1.355 indicates that the dedicated object can play a role in constructing a past narrative as well: the object is a fragment of a stone *halter*, which was probably used in the successful pentathlon. Bowie acknowledges the potential for the object to generate narration (2010: 325), but even in inscriptions where the object is not mentioned, such as *CEG* 1.355, the *halter* adds to the veracity of the victory claim, since it is a piece of past narration by virtue of its existence.

¹³ I follow the reconstruction of Hansen (*CEG ad loc.*). Bowie describes how the narration is elaborated, via a relative clause to the charioteer and a relative clause of description for the object itself (2010: 341). This epigram is discussed at length by Nicholson (2005: 52-57).

¹⁴ Wachter most recently argues that the dedicatory context is the origin of the mode of “speaking object” (2010: 259).

¹⁵ The use of the relative in Pindar is indebted to the hymnic style (see Race 1990: 85-86).

the name of the charioteer (1.302.4); it moves far outside the dedicatory context and generates a past history of athletic achievement, which is perhaps coupled with family associations and political alliances (cf. Nicholson 2005: 55).

Since this narrative quality is constructed by the occasion of the poetry – the athletic victory – and structured by the initial celebration of the victory – the herald’s proclamation – we should consider the narration of history a generic component of athletic verse from its earliest stages. Bowie wonders whether Archaic genres follow conventions, and whether there is anything more to Archaic genre than occasion (2010: 313); in the case of athletic verse, there does exist a tight connection between occasion and narrative, even in inchoate form, in the *angelia*.¹⁶ Both orally-performed and inscribed verse, regardless of the level of elaboration, derive their authority from a representation of the herald’s proclamation, a narrative speech-act connected to athletic victory; any investigation of genre, unbiased by medium, must acknowledge a generic affinity across all forms of athletic verse, characterized by the narrativity of the heraldic mode.¹⁷

The importance of the *angelia* to athletic poetry has, of course, been recognized by earlier critics (e.g., Schadewaldt 1966: 16 [274]; Nash 1990: 15).¹⁸ Nash studies how

¹⁶ It is unclear what Bowie’s conclusion is on this question. He finishes his discussion by speculating on the connection between narrative elegy and funerary epigram (2010: 377), but his earlier conclusion, that funerary epigram probably borrows its narrative quality from dedicatory epigram, belies any fundamental connection between the funerary genre and narration (2010: 317). Bowie’s argument, rather, seems to be about the length and elaboration of narrative, rather than narration *per se* (cf. 2010: 318).

¹⁷ My identification of a generic affinity between epinician and epigram should not be read as an interpretive or analytical straitjacket. There are, of course, myriad ways to categorize the vast corpus of oral and written poetry from Archaic and early Classical Greece (Budermann 2009: 10-13), and my approach should be regarded as another mode of analysis, rather than an “arid desire for neat classification” (Budermann 2009: 10).

¹⁸ Hamilton calls the identification of the victor part of Pindar’s “Naming Complex” (1974: 15); he argues that only victor and victory are constantly part of this complex. Though he regards the *angelia* as formally present (see 1974: 22 n16), he does not attach any importance to it. Schadewaldt, in contrast, saw the metaphor of the message as one of the cores upon which Pindar builds his epinician poem (1966: 16 [274]).

the *angelia* contributes to the formal structure of Pindar's corpus (1990: 17). She keenly identifies the way in which Pindar uses the heraldic form to indicate qualities that were not elements of the actual proclamation (e.g., epic epithets, etc.; 1990: 28-31), and her study is important for the fact that she highlights, and illuminates, the importance of the *angelia* to the elementary structure of Pindar's epinicians (especially with respect to father and son identity, 1990: 73-103).¹⁹ She is interested throughout in the heraldic motif as part of the poet's *persona loquens* (e.g., 1990: 4-7, 65 ff), and this quasi-biographical approach runs contrary to my focus on the nexus of praise, representation, and ideology across both epinician and epigram.²⁰

While she grounds herself in Bundy's formalism, which she regards as the foundation for serious work on Pindar (1991: 9),²¹ Kurke historically contextualizes the "grammar" of choral lyric: "just as genre depends on performance, poetics depends upon the broader social context, for given its setting, we must believe that such poetry fulfilled

¹⁹ She argues for an attention to the "factual" and "poetic" sides of the *angelia*, though these are left somewhat undefined (1990: 16-17).

²⁰ Her study remains focused on Pindar, with the exception of one footnote on epigram (1990: 185 n13).

²¹ Bundy disregarded, and derided, the idea of "willful irrelevance" (1962: 3) and "outbursts" (1962: 12-13) as explanations, and rather, his dense publications explicated the fundamental precept with which Pindar (and thus epinician lyric generally) concerned himself: "to enhance the glory of a particular patron" (1962: 3). The centrality of this assertion to Bundy's short manifesto lead many to acclaim the death of historically and contextually minded scholarship, though as Lloyd-Jones had pointed out as early as 1973, the centrality of praise to epinician is an "Ariadne's clue" to the purpose of the ode (1973: 117); it is not, however, an excuse to circumvent history. Pindar's allusive (and elusive) style, encyclopedic myth-making, vague performance context, and unclear (in the extreme) biography made his poetry, especially, a candidate for an inventive historical methodology. Lloyd-Jones has remarked on the service of Bundy in discrediting biographical invention as a serious method for solving difficulties of interpretation (1973: 117). Additionally, Bundy stridently criticizes his predecessors for their failure to recognize the fundamental distinction between Pindar the historical personage and "Pindar", the persona of the poem, which he calls the *laudator* (1962: 32); Bundy's stress on the conventionality of the *laudator* led some to seek a key to epinician interpretation in convention and formulae (e.g., Slater 1969; cf. Lloyd-Jones 1973: 117), though this is certainly not what Bundy is arguing (cf. Currie 2005: 13). Rather, he dislocates Pindar from modern scholarship's Romantic perspective, and re-situates him in his social and historical context, what Gentili refers to as the "public ownership" of choral poetry (1988: 3). This public context, by definition social and historical, has been the catalyst for scholarship on Pindar, especially since the earlier 1990s.

a *social function*” (1991: 1; emphasis in original).²² For Kurke, the social character of epinician appears in a series of concentric social circles into which athletics and victory were integrated, notably individual, family, and city (1991: 5); this is most obviously “emblemized in the victory announcement, which traditionally heralded the victor’s name, his patronymic and his city” (*ibid.*). Therefore, Kurke traces a discourse of ideology and tension in these three circles, which, although intertwined in the victory announcement, were often in conflict: Pindar’s poetry has a social function, she aggressively asserts, the reintegration of the victor into the three audiences of the poem: house, class, community (1991: 6).²³ The re-integrative function, argues Kurke, contrasts epinician with the poetry of the Attic stage, for example, which dramatized conflict as a way to bypass it; in epinician, the very notion of its poetics is embedded in social cohesion (*ibid.*).

Day also elucidates the indebtedness of epinician and epigram to the heraldic proclamation as part of an inquiry into the ritual background of athletic dedication.²⁴

Athletic dedications are early and prominent, Day argues, because of the “attractive,

²² The New Historicist interest in socially contextualizing literature is highlighted in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, the result of a 1990 conference at Wesleyan College. Kurke (along with her co-editor Dougherty) unabashedly declares the focus of the book, its New Historicist allegiance, even as it helps to define the very term (1993: 5). The introduction to the work is full of cogent programmatic statements for a cultural study of poetry: the need to break down disciplinary boundaries (1993: 2), the danger of homogenizing a historical culture (1993: 4), the deep implication of power and representation (1993: 5). In short, they stress our “entrapment in textuality”, as a basis for the prioritization of the study of representation in all its form (1993: 5). The articles within, which run the gamut from theoretical studies on archaeology (e.g., Morris 1993) to examinations of athletic *kudos* (Kurke 1993), to the use of the Archaic period by Classical historians (Szegedy-Maszak 1993), point to the broad spectrum of evidence assembled by New Historicists. Kurke and Dougherty observe this in their introduction, when they stress the need to “read and use everything we have” (1993: 6); such an injunction is of crucial importance in the study of epinician and Pindar, in which epinician’s claim to literary pedigree has obstructed the inclusion of other genres of athletic praise, whether as contextual or comparative texts.

²³ This has been challenged recently by Hammer (2004), and in a slightly more specific way, especially Kurke’s emphasis on *megaloprepeia*, by Fearn (2009). Their challenges focus on Kurke’s understanding of ideology, rather than the specific importance of family and city to the encomiastic program of epinician.

²⁴ For Day, the similarity of epinician praise to funerary praise in epigram points to a common function for these types of poetry, which is to praise the subject of the poem, and a common generic origin, which is funerary ritual (1989: 22-27).

religiously and socially effective ritual models for celebrating individual achievement in ways that could trigger a kind of performance, or re-performance, in reading and viewing” (2010: 199).²⁵ He argues that epigrams and their inscribed monuments assume a double audience: the *mnema* function is aimed at humans, while the *agalma* function is aimed at bridging the space between dedicator and divinity (2010: 7).²⁶ Day argues for a three-tiered meaning to epigrams, which operate across all three levels of semiotic signification: they are indexical, since they refer to an actual act of dedication; they are iconic, even though they rarely depict dedication itself; they are symbolic, since they call to mind the characteristics and qualities associated with Greek dedication, especially *charis* (2010: 10). Day’s thesis is that epigrams do not represent dedication, but re-present it: they “presented the act of offering in ways that generated its continual re-performance in people’s responses to them” (2010: 14).²⁷ For Day, approximating readers’ response is a crucial component of his argument; in this project, I do not follow Day’s interest in reader response and authorial/dedicatory intent. Rather, I read the effect of epigram in its cultural context without any presupposition about the mindset of the dedicator; that is, I approach my texts first and foremost as texts.

²⁵ Day’s thesis is a formalist origin for athletic epigram; he does not address the ideological content and context of inscribed verse. It is surely not coincidence that an activity which embodies elite values was the premier activity to be enshrined and memorialized on beautiful objects. While he acknowledges the social value of athletic victory (2010: 199), and his thesis can explain how the reification of athletic achievement works in epigrams, he does not tackle the important, to my mind, question of why athletic achievement was particularly valued in the first place.

²⁶ In this regard, Day adopts the vocabulary of Keesling (2003); he argues against earlier views, which read a narrative of a decline in “dedicatory piety” as divinities disappeared from dedications (Day 2010: 182). Day remarks that a consensus of scholars now agree that the *agalma* and *mnema* functions are present in all dedications, and that these two functions, distinguished in modern interpretation, are not separate for the Greek dedicator (Day 2010: 185).

²⁷ Day refers to epigram as a “fossil”, in that it preserves part of the lived experience of actual ritual (2010: 16). While he acknowledges the potential pitfalls of an interpretation focused on the responses of myriad readers and viewers, Day tends toward the intent of authors, composers, and dedicators (2010: 17). As he remarks (*ibid.*), this is highly problematic, since it presupposes knowledge of the author, dedicator, and audience’s mindset; nonetheless, despite the problem of intentionality, Day does an admirable job in restricting his conclusions to those that seem to come from the text itself.

Key to the re-presentation of ritual, for athletic dedications, is the centrality of the herald's announcement and its encompassing of the identifying marks of Greek males (2010: 202). Day argues persuasively that athletic epigrams and epinician use the *angelia* as a core on which to build their poetic programs (2010: 203; 2000: 64). At one point, Day suggests a cultural rationale for the memorialization of victory, when he remarks that "victors required memorialization that extended the celebratory moment in space and time" (2010: 200). The particular quality of this memorial or its ideological aspects are left unexplored, but, nonetheless, Day is correct that formally, athletics lends itself to memorialization because of the framing effect that repetition of the heraldic ritual allowed: "it was imperative to reproduce an entire [*angelia*] to accompany the narrative of the dedicatory act, because... readings had to reenact a ritual moment, not merely present an athletic record" (2010: 206). By reading aloud the epigram readers became, in vocalizing, the herald: the victory was again announced and the accrued glory of victory, closeness to divinity, and memorial were re-activated. Day's thesis permits not only an explanation of the prominence and power of athletic epigram, but it sets in place the necessary formal structure for understanding epigram's social and cultural potency, since the impetus to re-present a ritual implies a strong desire to re-activate the glory of victory that cannot be left uninterrogated. This understanding has much to contribute to my analysis of representation, since the identity of the athlete is at the core, generically and conceptually, of epigram and epinician: a pronouncement of *who* the athlete is, across gendered, ethnic, and class lines, implicitly figures in the heraldic *angelia* and prefigures the entire genre of athletic poetry. As such, the herald and the *angelia* take on a central,

and ideologically potent role, not only in the original realization of victory, but, through ventriloquist readers, in its re-performance.

Furthermore, both Kurke (1993: 137-141) and Day (1994: 63-66) recognize that epinician and epigram refer obliquely to rituals that signaled the end of an athletic event. Aside from the *angelia*, this included the coronation of the successful athlete, an action that may have been performed by the same herald who announced his victor (Crowther 2004: 187-188; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.8), and the *phyllobolia*.²⁸ Day remarks that epigrammatic and epinician poets “often conflate these events [i.e., the *angelia*, and *phyllobolia*] with slightly later rituals like a victor’s dedication of his crowns or the votive sacrifice” (1994: 64; Kurke 1993: 145). As early as the Archaic period, monumental sculpture may preserve the conflation of proclamation and coronation (Day 1994: 65).²⁹ Common to all these rituals is the presence of the herald, whose voice announced the athletes, actualized victory, and whose hands crowned the victor himself as a crowd of onlookers served as witnesses.³⁰

While Kurke and Day recognize the *angelia* and other athletic rituals as centrally important to epinician and epigrammatic genre, neither interrogates the implicit connection between the *angelia* and the identification and identity of athletes. They write

²⁸ The importance of the herald’s voice to the actualization of victory may be demonstrated in Cicero’s remark that once a competition for herald’s was instituted (perhaps in 396 BC at the Olympics; see Wolicki 2002: 80-93), another herald announced the winner of the heraldic competition, *ne sua voce ipsi se victores esse praedicent* (“lest they announce with their own voice that they themselves were victors”; Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.8). On the *phyllobolia*, see *P.* 4.240 (cf. *Schol. ad.* 4.427b; and Braswell 1988: 327-328), 8.58, 9.123-124; *Bacc.* 11.18. Kefalidou covers the ancient evidence for *phyllobolia* (1999: 102-105).

²⁹ This presumes an athletic context for Archaic *kouroi*, which is debatable (cf. Osbourne 1997: 510). The Delphic Charioteer is certainly, as Day suggests (1994: 65), filleted and parading to the place where he will, properly speaking, receive his crown.

³⁰ Wolicki suggests that the announcement should be considered a “spoken commentary” to victory, and as such it is not surprising that the announcement would become the prize itself (2002: 80; cf. Xen. *Symp.* 8.37). Lewis remarks that the announcement of the name was the key to recognizing victory, rather than the actual sporting prowess evidenced in the competition (1996: 70). Epinician and epigrams could point to this moment when the victor was the sole point of focus for the crowd: e.g., *P.* 9.97-103; Ebert no. 12 (= *Anth. Pal.* 16.2; on the latter, see Kurke 1993: 137-139).

as if the *angelia* is transparently preserved for us in epinician and epigram, yet from its beginning (by naming chariot owner, instead of charioteer; horse owner instead of jockey, etc.), the herald's proclamation is a representation, modulated and configured by athletic ideology. In the form the *angelia* reaches us in epigram and epinician, this representative and contingent aspect is emphasized. Since we have no record of heraldic proclamations – no *leukomata* (“white boards”) of victors survive from antiquity – it is inaccurate to assume that the discursive form in which the *angelia* reaches us is the uncomplicated revelation of an identity; rather, it is an *identification* in the heraldic mode – that is, an ideological act of creating the athlete's identity through epinician or epigram.³¹

Herodotus provides one of the earliest attested *angeliai*.³² He reports that Kimon, when he won his second Olympic victory of 532, and cognizant of the political value of winning, παραδίδοι Πεισιστράτῳ ἀνακηρυχθῆναι (“permitted Peisistratos to be proclaimed victor”) in the four-horse chariot race, so that he might be allowed to return to Athens from exile with his property intact (Hdt. 6.103.2). This anecdote not only proves the multifarious utility of victory for Archaic aristocrats, but signals the contingency of the proclamation; it demonstrates that the *angelia*, even outside of its allusively poetic form, is an identification, which need not, despite its reified textual and inscribed existence, reflect any reality – Peisistratos did not win the chariot race, yet the herald's proclamation announced that he did.³³ The story of Kimon demonstrates that the form,

³¹ On the *leukomata* generally, see Wilhelm (1909: 239-257) and Rhodes (2001: 4).

³² That *angelia* existed prior to Herodotus' writing is confirmed through the evocation of the *angelia* by Pindar. Homer mentions heralds (e.g., *Il.* 23.566-569, 896-896), but they do not announce the victors or athletes, even in the Funeral Games for Patroklos, or the descriptions of athletic competition in the *Odyssey*.

³³ I leave aside, for the moment, Nicholson's point that chariot victors were not usually the drivers of the chariot (2005: 25-118). Nicholson analyzes the odd appearance of charioteers such as Karrhotos (2005: 42-52; *P.* 5), Knopidias (2005: 52-57; *CEG* 1.302), and Nichomachos (2005: 64-81; *I.* 2). He concludes that Karrhotos had to be accommodated because of his familial connection to the victor (2005: 46), while

rather than the content, was certain; victors (or patrons, heralds, or the festival authorities) exercised, it seemed, some degree of latitude over how the various elements of the *angelia* were filled out.³⁴

Pindar's epinicians demonstrate the potential for reconfiguration as well.³⁵ In *P.* 1, for example, Hieron was proclaimed not as the tyrant or ruler of Syracuse (*O.* 1. 9-13; *Bacc.* 4.1-3, 5.1-5), but as the "illustrious founder" of the new city of Aitna; Pindar's language specifies that Hieron's civic identity was modulated through the proclamation of the herald:

εἶη, Ζεῦ, τὴν εἶη ἀνδάνειν,
 ὃς τοῦτ' ἐφέπεις ὄρος, εὐκάρπιοιο γαί-
 ας μέτωπον, τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν
 κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν
 γείτονα, Πυθιάδος δ' ἐν δρόμῳ κά-
 ρυξ ἀνείπε νιν ἀγγέλ-
 λων Ἰέρωνος ὑπὲρ καλλινίκου
 ἄρμασι.

Knopidas, supported by the find spot of the inscription, was probably a potentate of some importance in Boeotia (2005: 55). In contrast, Nichomachos is accommodated, not for any aristocratic pretensions, but because of his impressive victory record – he simply could not be ignored (2005: 76-77). The vast majority of charioteers (2005: 25-41) and all jockeys (2005: 95-96) were excluded from the *angelia* (2005: 103). At the very genesis of the proclamation then, ideology structures the identification of the victor.

³⁴ Pausanias (6.13.1) reports a similar occurrence (6.13.1): he writes that Astylos, a native of Kroton, had himself proclaimed as a Syracusan in order to please Hieron (see too, Wolicki 2002: 78). The source for his information is entirely unclear, though it is possible that Pausanias or his source inferred it from the different political affiliations of Astylos on statues at Olympia. In *P. Oxy* II 222, Astylos is recorded as Syracusan for his victory in the *hoplitodromos* of 480 (col. i, line 4) and again for his victory in the same event in 476 (col. i, line 17; Grenfell and Hunt (1899: 91) on emending the text from [αστ]υρος to [αστ]υλος; Jacoby concurs, *FGrH* 415 F 1). The ability of a victor to, in some way, name his own place of origin permitted Lichas, a Spartan, to participate in the Olympics even while Spartans were banned from the games (Thuc. 5.50.4; Wolicki 2002: 79). Plutarch observes that a victor could have proclaimed Lysander as his father (*Lys.* 18.5; Wolicki 2002: 79 n36). Lewis suggests that victors could append more information to the proclamation, such as when Kleisthenes used his chariot victory to also announce the contest for the marriage of his daughter (1996: 70; cf. Hdt. 6.126.2).

³⁵ Pindar's odes have a broad, fictional dimension, in which performance venue (Carey 2007: 199) participants (the argument about choral or monodic performance is voluminous; see especially Lefkowitz 1988; Carey 1989a; Heath and Lefkowitz 1991; Morgan 1993), as well as the nature of the poet-patron relationship (Pelliccia 2009; Bowie 2012), are obscure to us; Carey (2007: 199) suggests that such an obscure performance context aided in the re-performance of Pindaric odes and thus helped to effect their claim to pan-Hellenic glory (cf. Currie 2004, Hubbard 2004). Carey refers to the supposedly improvised nature of Pindar's poems as an "oral subterfuge" (1981: 5), through which the poet makes his poem seem like a spontaneous celebration of a patron, rather than a complex and calculated encomiastic work.

“Grant, O Zeus, grant that I may please you,
 you who rule that mountain, the brow of a fruitful land, whose neighboring city
 that bears
 its name was honored by its illustrious founder,
 when at the racecourse of the Pythian festival *the herald proclaimed it in*
 announcing Hieron’s splendid victory
 with the chariot.

(P. 1.29-33; emphasis added)

Pindar comes close to saying that Hieron named himself a citizen of Aitna, solely because of the honour that would accrue to the new *polis*; this smacks of propaganda.³⁶ What is, of course, entirely obscure to us, is whether the herald’s proclamation at Delphi actually reported the civic identity that Hieron desired; the ephemeral *angelia* was surely important, but through their appropriation of a heraldic form of representation, Pindar and inscribed epigram couch the identification and representation of athletes in an authoritative speech-act that may or may not have taken place.³⁷ Thus, the *angelia* is a crucial generic kernel for athletic poetry, but the identification that the poem or inscription presents is a contingent one, which can be subject to not only modulation for poetic, but also ideological and political effect.

³⁶ Hubbard regards Pindar’s emphasis on the artificial synchronicity of the Battle of Himera with either Thermopylai or Plataia as purposely serving “Hieron’s propagandistic agenda” (2001: 395). The need for Sicilian oligarchs to prove their Hellenic pedigree after having refused to participate in the common defense of Greece is a compelling lens through which to view this portion of the poem (see Hdt. 7.157-158 on Gelon’s refusal to help the Greeks; on potential Sicilian medizing, see Hdt. 7.163).

³⁷ Though my study investigates Pindar’s epinicians, the extant verse of Bacchylides demonstrates the same manipulation of the represented *angelia*. In Bacc. 2.1 and 10.1, φῆμα (“report”) begins the song, which accords quite well with Pindar’s use of *angeliai*; Bacc. 2 is even more explicit, since the φῆμα is then described as a χαριτώσῃ[ος] ἀγγελία (“message of gracious import”, 2.2-3). Manipulation and discursive identity is evinced in Bacchylides’ odes for Kean victors; he calls Lakon a Kean (6.5), though there is no evidence for a Kean political organization at this point (though, cf. CEG 1.198, which similarly identifies the maker of the dedication as a Kean). Other odes for Keans may refer to them likewise, though the state of the papyrus prevents certainty (perhaps 2.2: ἐς Κ[έον]; 7.14: [. .]ηνος ἐν Κ[έω]. It is possible that Bacchylides’ own predilections are at work here, since he was a Kean himself. Also possibly relevant is the early recording of Kean victors, on the island, as a group: IG XII 5 608 is a list of Kean victors, which dates to the fourth-century BC (cf. Christesen 2007: 139-141).

The pervasive influence of the representative *angelia* can also be demonstrated through the early evidence for Olympic victor lists, which do not formally reflect the complete proclamation. In the largest extant victors' list, *P. Oxy* II 222, only victor's name, event name, and *polis* are recorded; father's name, crucial to the identity of victors in the *angelia*, seems to have been left out of early prose catalogues. Christesen investigates the relationship of this list to earlier victors' lists, which probably started with Hippias of Elis (2007; Plut. *Vit. Num.* 1 = *FGrH* 6 F 2): he concludes that Hippias likely compiled and published the first Olympic victor list ca. 400 (2007: 142), though there are manifold issues with respect to his sources and the possibility of him reconstructing three hundred years of Olympic festivals (2007: 73-74).³⁸ The first inscriptions at Olympia date to the mid-sixth century and papyrus records or other perishable materials from prior to this period seem highly unlikely (Christesen 2007: 87). Hippias probably relied on oral tradition and early dedicatory inscriptions, as well as his understanding of early history as evidenced in other (still historically problematic) eponym lists such as the Spartan ephors, king-list, and Athenian archon list (2007: 142).

The ephemeral *angelia* was initially recorded on perishable *leukomata*, wooden boards painted white (Christesen 2007: 126-127). Since these boards were washed clean frequently, any early Olympic chronicler would not have been able to make use of them in his compilation and thus his ability to reconstruct even the Olympic victors of the early fifth-century would have been restricted mainly to the available evidence, namely,

³⁸ Plutarch remarks on the lack of any substantial authority to Hippias' list (*Vit. Num.* 1). Ste. Croix very much doubts the credibility of Hippias' list, and suggests that Aristotle's list of Pythian victors was the first such list (1981: 69).

epigrams, inscriptions, and epinicians.³⁹ Therefore, the potential that inaccurate information, whether purposely or accidentally, would be included in this catalogue is quite high. The editors of *P. Oxy* II 222, however, remain optimistic about the veracity of the document, since the existence of this complete list at a remote location like Oxyrhynchos demonstrates that “invention... would be ridiculous. People do not invent when not only are they able to tell the truth, but failure to do so can easily be recognized” (Grenfell and Hunt 1899: 87). This supposition is surely true, but only for the period after the canonization of a list of Olympic victors, likely beginning with Hippias (on the rapid standardization of Olympic victory catalogues, see Christesen 2007: 161-227). Since early Olympic chronographers were restricted, largely, to inscriptions, preserved oral poetry, or family traditions for their information, the early inclusion of information derived from the heraldic form is likely. That is, the epigrammatic and epinician presentation of information *as if derived* directly from the *angelia* crucially presents this information as verifiable, as a re-presentation of the herald’s proclamation; this seemingly true presentation ensured the propagation of the discursively produced heraldic representation even into genres, such as the Olympic Victory Catalogue, which did not purport to represent the *angelia*.⁴⁰

³⁹ Christesen thinks that Hippias’ main problem would have been athletic victories before the fifth-century, but I think he is too optimistic with respect to oral traditions. The gap between Hippias’ writing (ca. 400) and the early odes of Pindar (perhaps 498) is substantial. In fact, since it is Hippias’ work that establishes the recording of time through Olympiads, there was no common reckoning of time in which earlier victories could be chronologically situated. Hippias may have had access to, for example, the descendants of Hieron, but placing a victory at a specific festival would have been exceedingly trying.

⁴⁰ There were many competing victor lists in antiquity, such as those of Aristotle (*FHG* 182-184 F261-264a; Christesen 2007: 170-173), Eratosthenes (*FGrH* 241 F4-8, F11a-b, F14-15b, F44; Christesen 2007: 173-178), Eusebius (see Christesen and Torlone 2006 for most up-to-date edition), and Phlegon (*FGrH* 257 F1-34; Christesen 2007: 326-334). Christesen has a full list of victors’ lists (2007: 161-227), competing Olympic chronologies (2007: 228-295), and chronicles of Olympic events (2007: 296-347). The vast array of authors, competing accounts, and great temporal and spatial distance between the authors and the events they purport to document made the Olympic victory lists, even in antiquity, notoriously untrustworthy.

The centrality of the herald and *angelia* to actual victory, and the representation of that same victory in song, lead to Pindar's frequent metaphorical usage of the herald and *angelia*: at times the poet takes on the role of the herald (e.g., *O.* 7.20, 9.25-29; *P.* 9.1-4; *N.* 4.73-75, 6.57-61; cf. fr. 70b.23-25), the song is an *angelia* itself (e.g., *P.* 2.3-4; cf. *P.* 2.67) or describes the initial proclamation or the reception of the *angelia* (e.g., *O.* 4.3-5, 13.100; *P.* 1.30-33), or the victor is the herald (*O.* 5.8; *I.* 3.11-13); at other times, a personified *Angelìa* or *Echo* transmits the represented proclamation across the boundaries of mortal life (*O.* 8.81-84, 14.21-24; cf. Segal 1985). Other objects can figuratively broadcast the *angelia* to the wider world, whether a poetically constructed treasure house (*P.* 6.5-18), or, in an abject objectification, the chorus-master of the epinician becomes an embodiment of the *angelia* (*O.* 6.87-91).⁴¹

In several of these examples, the representation of the *angelia* is modified to include categories that were not part of any actual victory proclamation. At *O.* 13.98-100, Pindar, in a transparent use of the heraldic proclamation, evokes the sixty times that the herald at Isthmia and Nemea announced the victories of the Oligaitidai, the clan of his patron Xenophon. The veracity of the herald's proclamation is brought to bear, since Pindar regards the ἀδύγλωσσος βοά ("sweet-tongued shout") as analogous to a witness ἔξορκος ("witness under oath"). Similarly, when at *N.* 4.73-79 Pindar takes on the role of the herald himself, though one συνθέμενος ("contracted") to the clan of his patron, rather than a pan-Hellenic sanctuary, the evocation of the herald operates to bring to mind the many victories of the Theandridai. In both of these examples, the other victories of the

⁴¹ Aineas is first a ἄγγελος ὀρθός ("true messenger", *O.* 6.90) and then a ἠυκόμων σκυτάλα Μοισῶν ("a message stick of the fair-haired Muses", *O.* 6.91). The scholia regard Aineas as the chorus-master (*schol. ad. O.* 6.148a), although there is no strong evidence for this outside of the text of the poem. On the self-referentiality of the poet here, see Too 1991,

clan were unlikely to be present in the actual proclamation of Timasarchos' victory at Nemea. In all these appropriations of the figure of the herald and *angelia*, Pindar's poetry demonstrates the vast utility of the *angelia*, not only insofar as it provides a convenient metaphor for the work of the epinician poet, but also inasmuch as the herald or *angelia* (described or personified) carries with it the authority of an efficacious speech-act, and an office at the nexus of athletics, victory, and praise.

The *angelia* is the fundamental component of athletic verse since it is, at its onset, implicated in both athletic participation and athletic victory. The identity that the *angelia* presents is a contingent one, which is defined by cultural, political, and ideological structures; the *angelia* is by definition a speech-act that generates a past narrative, since the herald's proclamation follows the athletic victory and recapitulates it. The inscribed and oral poetry of athletics appropriates the *angelia*'s potency as a rhetorical and ideological strategy. The contingent identification of the *angelia*, constructed on a series of ideological identifications, is represented in epigram and epinician, as if it were an unchanging, uncomplicated, and essential identity; that is, athletic verse appropriates the authority of the herald's proclamation as a representative strategy and the narrative potential of the *angelia* becomes the beginning of extensive programs of elaboration. Thus, epigram and epinician utilize the heraldic mode of representing athletes, in order to configure their representation of athletes in the context of an authoritative and powerful speech-act, which was intertwined in a complex way with the very fact of athletic participation and victory.

2.2: Literal and Metaphoric Dedications

Reification of the heraldic mode of representation took the shape of dedicatory objects, both actual (inscriptions, statues) and metaphorical (epigrams, epinician odes).⁴² Dedications, and the accompanying dedicatory act are intrinsic to the understanding and interpretation of representation in the heraldic mode. While epinician and material dedications have traditionally been studied separately, some scholars have begun to recognize them as part of a continuum: Nicholson observes that physical and poetic dedications are initiated by the same aristocratic tensions (2005: 3-15); Thomas too remarks that epinician was “by no means the only way to flaunt victory” (2007: 143); Ford recognizes that material dedications changed significantly and perhaps in concert with the development of praise poetry (2002: 99 ff); Gentili, finally, observed years ago that “song and sculpture were most obviously linked... as two skills for memorializing outstanding human achievement” (1988: 163).⁴³

This recognition, however, has been in opposition to the majority perspective that epigrams are historical documents, first and foremost, while epinician is literary and artistic: “early Greek epigrams have been widely neglected by classicists and, if studied at all, have rarely been analyzed as literary texts, but rather for the historical information they convey” (Baumbach, et al. 2010: 1).⁴⁴ Even Hansen’s *CEG* reflects this tendency,

⁴² Epigrams straddle this line, because they have both a real existence as an inscribed text, and a metaphorical existence, since they are more than simply inscribed letters; they can access the same symbolic universe as epinician, through a potent poetic language (see Raubitschek 1968: 3). Therefore, I use the term inscription to refer to the physical text, and epigram to refer to the text as poem.

⁴³ The sub-disciplinary boundary between literary (e.g. Pindar, Bacchylides) and epigraphic (e.g., epigrams) studies has exacerbated this situation.

⁴⁴ Much early scholarship on epigrams dismisses them as inscriptions with functions, in contrast to the privileged genres of art such as epinician, tragedy, and lyric poetry. An epigram, however, while undoubtedly different than an oral poem (Baumbach, et al. 2010: 4), is also different than an inscription: it exists “as an important part of the object” (Baumbach, et al. 2010: 4), rather than a simple additional piece of information. The distinction between poetry and epigram, however, inappropriately privileges one poetic construct over another as a work of art, rather than an integrated cultural and social production. Indeed, epinician, as much as epigram, is a poem suited to its occasion and crafted with a purpose in mind (Day 2000: 43; see also, Day 2007: 30-32), and scholarship is beginning to realize that these two modes of praise

since it concentrates on establishing conventions and formulae; epigraphic criticism locates the similarities in epigrams, not their differences (Baumbach et al. 2010: 5). Golden, in his introduction to the evidence for ancient athletics (1998: 46-73), points to the artificiality of separating epigram from epinician: “one very important source of evidence, dedicatory epigrams, are literary texts... Though commonly studied as isolated documents, they are best treated in the contexts of the objects they accompanied and the locations where these objects were displayed” (1998: 47).⁴⁵

The idea that epigrams are documents flows from an uncritical understanding of an epigram’s relationship to truth. Perhaps because of their inscribed and usually straightforward content, epigrams have been treated as though they offer unobstructed access to objective facts. Petrovic, however, has recently pointed to the fallacious nature of such claims. He argues for a more sophisticated account of the relationship between epigram and “truth”, and though he specifically discusses “historical truth” in public inscriptions, his analysis implicitly encompasses private epigrams as well (2010: 204). He suggests that epigram’s narrative could function to fashion the past for the future

operated in the same conceptual space. Bettenworth provides an important corrective to the traditional perspective, at least for the Hellenistic period, since he emphasizes the interdependence and mutual influence of inscribed and “literary” epigram even after the development of the “literary” genre (2007).

⁴⁵ In this recognition, Golden anticipates Baumbach et al., who emphasize two concomitant characteristics of epigram throughout their volume: “contextualization and literarization” (2010: 6). The question of whether epigrams were read in antiquity has been a contentious issue. Somehow, the onus has been put on scholars who argue that epigrams *were read*, rather than the other way around: Bing, for example, remarks on the “numbingly conventional” aspect of epigram as a reason for it *not* to be read in antiquity (2007: 47). In contrast, Day (2010: 28-33) argues persuasively for a readership of ancient epigrams, and for full or partial readings, readings aloud, and interpretations by tour guides, travelling companions, etc. He points to the very conventionality of many epigrams as part of a rhetorical strategy to attract and aid their readers; the existence of formulae and epithets indicates “that epigrams were constructed out of a widespread poetic formulary with which poetically competent readers would be familiar” (Day, 2010: 39; cf. Schmitz 2010: 40). Some sub-genres of epigram also point to their conceiving of a readership: e.g., the “passer-by” (Tueller 2010: 44).

(2010: 204).⁴⁶ The rationale behind group dedications and the possible reasons for a poet to offer his services to such a group are, for Petrovic, part of his titular “true lies” of epigrams: “the relationship between poets and truth is notoriously complex, but engaging a poet can be of great benefit to a community: it may not result in plain factual truths, but it can certainly be a means of obtaining useful ones” (2010: 204-08, quotation from 204).

Petrovic demonstrates the powerful influence that epigrams can have on what is perceived as truth (2010: 209-210). This truth, he argues, is complicated by the epigrammatic use of temporal adverbs such as *ποτέ*: by purposely setting an indeterminate distance between the event itself and the inscription in honour of the event, epigrams posit a time during which the event was known by oral transmission: “we are dealing, therefore, with a cunning persuasive strategy. What the epigram has to report is bound to be held true already in the moment of the epigram’s incision” (2010: 212).⁴⁷ That is, epigrams present their truths as if they were commonly held, rather than enacted by the inscription itself. Since I understand athletic epigrams as implicitly embedding the heraldic mode of representation, this discord between objective reality and representation is crucially important. While historians have privileged epigrams as documentary evidence for, among other things, Greek chronological reckoning (i.e., based on

⁴⁶ Gehrke discusses the social use of the past as fundamental “for the way a society interprets and understands itself, and therefore for its inner coherence and ultimately is collective identity” (2001: 286). Myth and history were entwined for the Greeks (Gehrke 2001: 297): Gehrke calls this use of myth and history for contemporary purposes “intentional history” (cf. Gehrke 1994). Epigrams, which sit on the boundary of public and private (and thus force the contingency of those categories), are deeply embedded in the social knowledge of the past, both as a way to access that past, and as an active part of the construction of past history. As Gehrke puts it, when something novel was asserted, it offered the possibility of adding to the received narrative of the past: “every innovation, however, became another binding fact, as long as it was received, or ‘believed’” (2001: 301). It is instructive that Gehrke uses the example of an inscribed account of Magnesian history as his example (2001: 287-297); the fixity of inscriptions surely underlines their ability to participate in “international history”.

⁴⁷ Young recognizes “inscriptional *pote*” in Pindar too (e.g., *P.* 3.74; 1983: 36). He argues that *pote* in this case means “once upon a time” from the perspective of future audiences of the poem or inscription (1983: 36-40)

Olympiads), we are actually dealing with a fundamentally discursive mode of writing. Epigrams are thus, in their entirety, no more connected to any objective truth than an ostensibly poetic genre such as epinician.

Epinician uses physical dedications, sometimes as foil to the praise that the poet offers (e.g., *N.* 5.1-5), or to evoke the dedicatory act (e.g., *O.* 5.7-8). Steiner proposes that Pindar's odes frequently utilize material dedications to modulate and configure their praise (1993: 159; 2001: 260). She begins from the famous opening of *Nemean* 5, and the accompanying scholion, which relates a fanciful story about the parents of the victor not wanting to pay Pindar's fee (ca. 3000 drachmae); the scholiast tells us that when they finally decided to have Pindar celebrate their son's victory, he wrote the ode's beginning as a sort of wry humour (*schol. ad N.* 5.1). Steiner in no way takes this scholion seriously as a historical source, but she observes that, at least in the eyes of the scholiast, "victory statues and victory songs fulfill similar roles" (1993: 159; 2001: 251-252). Contrary to the suggestion of the scholiast's story, that Pindar was inimical to statues, Steiner contends that Pindar accommodates statues in his poetic program (that they can be "partners in a single enterprise", 2001: 253), that their design as well as iconographical and representational content play a critical role in his poetry (1993: 160-161; 2001: 261); she argues that statues are sometimes the honoree of the ode itself and in any case they are often evoked in the ritual fiction of epinician poetry (1993: 161; 2001: 264-265).

Steiner closely reads several of the Aiginetan odes to reveal the ways in which Pindar appropriates statuary into his odes. Aside from the explicit appearance of statues in the opening to *N.* 5, she argues for allusions to statues in the language of supplication in *N.* 8.13-16 (1993: 164; 2001: 262); in the erection of Pindar's own monument near the

end of the same ode (*N.* 8.44-48; 1993: 165; 2001: 265); the foundation on which the praise of Timodemos lies in *N.* 2 (6-8; 1993: 166; 2001: 261); in *N.* 3, she argues, the members of the *komos* are called *tektones*, in order that the result of their and Pindar's effort – the song – can adorn the *agora* like a victor's statue (2001: 260). More than just allusions to physical dedications, Steiner identifies several instances when Pindar includes "inscribed elements, replicating the contents, form and design of the agonistic epigrams" (1993: 167; 2001: 262). The opening of *P.* 6, for example, the glorious treasure-house, simultaneously evokes the actual treasuries at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries as well as acts like an inscribed statue base (and metaphorical herald) that announces the glory of Xenocrates and his family (*P.* 6.1-15; Steiner 1993: 170; on *N.* 2, and *P.* 7, see Steiner 2001: 261). The beginning of *O.* 10 also explicitly evokes the existence of epigrams when Pindar demands that someone ἀνάγνωτε ("read") the name of the victor (*O.* 10.1; Steiner 1993: 177). Like statues, epigrams and physical monuments of all kinds, Steiner argues that Pindar uses dedicatory language and allusion to activate the same audience response as physical dedications: "they additionally move internal audiences in the songs to take up, continue and complete the victor's tale" (1993: 174; 2001: 262-263). By Steiner's estimation, the correlation of material and metaphorical monuments in Pindar allows the odes to escape their ephemeral nature, and to offer a model for their continued performance (2001: 265).

The discursive potential of both modes of athletic representation points to their generic continuity. While she is not the first to consider that the competitive environment to which Pindar and Bacchylides so often allude was in fact a competition with statue makers, Thomas' study convincingly argues for the need for concomitant research into

epinician and epigram/statuary (2007). She is willing to see a dialectical tension between epigram/statuary and other forms of victory memorial as generative for the burgeoning genre of epinician.⁴⁸ Thomas sees the language of craftsmanship not as a metaphor, but as a living language of competition, “which reflects the reality that stone statues and monuments were to be seen crowding every shrine, every public place, and that they too claimed to confer fame and memory” (2007: 150).⁴⁹ While critics often point to the sixth-century as the point when epinician and athletic praise poetry began (e.g., Nicholson 2005: 15-17; Barron 1984; Jenner 1986), Thomas argues that the late Archaic period heralds a novel movement in all types of memorialization: dedicatory statues became athletes, rather than gods; inscriptions became an expected addition to statuary; stone replaced wood as the medium of sculpture (2007: 153-154), to be soon partnered with bronze as another possible medium (2007: 156). With these developments in mind, epinician seems to actually trail a material revolution in physical memorials: “epinician was adding the element of elaborate performance to a tradition already under way of ostentatious dedications and spectacular display of the victor’s achievement” (2007: 157; *contra* Nash 1990: 9).⁵⁰ Instead of a narrative that reads epinician’s rise and fall as connected to the supposed decline of Greek aristocrats (*contra* Nicholson 2005: 14-15, 214), Thomas convincingly argues that a holistic view of athletic memorial does not

⁴⁸ She starts, as Steiner, from the beginning of *N. 5*; most recently, on this poem, see Pavlou 2010.

⁴⁹ Simonides, Ford argues, is already embroiled in a complicated competitive dialectic with physical memorials (2002: 93). In his vision of song, fame is not achieved through physically inscribing your achievement, but by the “ever-flowing” oral tradition, which he links to the Homeric epithet for fame, *aphthiton* (2002: 109).

⁵⁰ By the middle of the fifth-century, athletes and statues are fully integrated; the phenomenon of stories of magical powers being assigned to victory statues seems to highlight this integration (Steiner 2001: 8; on statues’ “magical” powers, see Currie 2005: 143-148).

intersect in any way with the Athenocentric narrative of democracy, oligarchy, and aristocracy (2007: 143).⁵¹

Smith, who discusses this revolution in material dedication, which provides the pre-history and context to my own interest in literal and metaphorical dedicatory objects, argues for the mutual relevance of epinician and dedications; he calls Pindar's poetry "a key-text for the whole phenomenon" of statuary (2007: 83).⁵² The Greek statue "habit" is, as Smith points out, anomalous; statues are by no means common cross-culturally, and our own familiarity with them should not blind us to the strangeness of human-scale, life-like sculpture (2007: 83). As Smith remarks, statue densities at sites such as Delphi were tremendous: by the third and second centuries BC there were likely 90 statues just on the *dromos* leading to the temple of Apollo at Delphi (2007: 84).⁵³ Statues were conceived not as bleached white *objets d'art* for display in museums – indeed, the modern tendency to refer to Olympia or Delphi as open-air museums is inaccurate – but as substitute (and, of course, painted) people: "a primary ancient response to statues was as real persons" (2007: 85; cf. Steiner 1998: 124).⁵⁴ Epigrams furthered this identification, and together

⁵¹ As Christesen argues (2007: 128), the history behind the change in memorialization probably has much to do with the proliferation of athletic festivals in the sixth century. Hubbard makes a suggestive case for epinician's connection to the necessity for medizing aristocrats, in the post-Persian Wars period, to rehabilitate their reputations (2001: 390). This is a compelling, if only partially argued theory; if anything, it suggests a rationale for the highpoint of epinician, rather than its origins – after all, the early odes of Simonides and the probable epinicians of Ibykos cannot be related to these "problematized elites" (Hubbard 2001: 390).

⁵² Smith's chapter is, unfortunately, marred by teleological claims that victor was "special for Pindar's generation" (2007: 83; as if it were not for victors at the beginning of the sixth or the end of the fifth century), or that "the last generation of Archaic privilege" had some particular resonance for Pindar and statue-makers (2007: 83); indeed, the claim that there even was a "last generation of Archaic privilege" is itself highly questionable, especially outside of Athens. Despite my unease with these premises, Smith is sensitive to the reciprocal relationship between Pindar and statuary, and his explication of the development of victory statuary is useful for a broader understanding of victory dedications in all media.

⁵³ The number of sixth and fifth century statuary dedications on the Acropolis at Athens is instructive too: while the vast majority of inscriptions are on columns, pillars or stone bowls, 118 are low statue bases for marble or bronze statues (Raubitschek 59-177).

⁵⁴ Steiner points to the punishments doled out to athletic statues as an indication that statue was a symbolic representation of the "absent original" (2001: 9). She remarks that the victory statue replicates the social

these elements “combine to make the subject of the monument present in the viewer’s own space” (Steiner 2001: 19). In this way, as with poetry, statuary, especially dedicatory monuments, was embroiled in the dialectic of representation and reality.

Victory statues appear first in the middle of the sixth century (Paus. 6.18.7: Rhexibios of Opous, Praxidamas of Aigina). What is important, especially for those narratives that imply some special quality to victory in the fifth century, or an increasing disassociation of victory from glory after the Classical period, is that victory statues continue to be erected almost to the end of antiquity: festivals and sanctuaries are largely shuttered by the fourth century AD, and statues are erected at least to the third century AD (Smith 2007: 87). Athletic statues remained a large proportion of overall dedications into later antiquity: Smith points to Aphrodisias in Caria where, during the Roman period, 10% of the erected statues are still for athletic victors (2007: 87).

Beyond the fifth century, despite the apparent end of epinician poetry, epigrams too continue to exist, and expand (Golden 1998: 85).⁵⁵ *CEG* 2.758, for example, an epigram for the victories of two brothers, connects with epinician rhetoric of family victory, and ends with a demonstrative boast: “they indicated the power of their hands” (2.758.3). In *CEG* 2.773, an unnamed victor considers the relationship of his victory to divinity (2.773.2), the demos (2.773.3), and his father (2.773.3), three typically Pindaric motifs. Finally, *CEG* 2.795 is an enormous dedication chronicling several generations of

status and role of the victor (2001: 17), and embodies the network of reciprocal *charis* (from victor to deity, from city to victor) that was intrinsic to the celebration of athletic success (2001: 18).

⁵⁵ Golden suggests that elite weariness with integrating their individual success to the public good resulted in the end of epinician (1998: 85). The continuance of statuary is explained, in this scenario, by the fact that statues and their accompanying epigrams were situated in a place of elite competition itself, a pan-Hellenic sanctuary, and thus did not have to speak to the same concerns as publicly performed epinician (1998: 86). Golden’s speculative suggestion, however, does not take into account disagreements about where and when epinician itself was performed; the survival of epinician in the increasingly egalitarian Attic symposium (as *skolia*) in the fifth and fourth centuries, after all, points to some relevance and continued interest in this praise poetry.

a family's athletic and political successes: the first four sections list victories in a typically epinician catalogue form, capped with a boast of the singularity of their successes. The next sections move to other family matters, not connected with athletic victories; it is likely that the dedicator is the descendant of these athletic victors (*CEG ad loc.*).

Thus, despite the end of the metaphorical dedication of an oral poem such as an epinician ode, dedicating and dedications continue to be a component of athletic success throughout antiquity. The reification of the heraldic proclamation, and the utilization of the heraldic mode, persists, even as epigrams expand, cultures change, and the nature of athletic participation alters dramatically.⁵⁶

2.3: The Special Status of the Olympic Games

My study focuses on dedicatory material from Olympia, and poetry in honour of victory at the Olympics, for three reasons. First, the dedicatory and epinician material is great enough that restricting my study to the Olympic Games provides a way to control the material. Secondly, the Olympic Games held, and continue to hold, a special place in the sports context; our knowledge of Olympia and the Olympics is far greater than that of any other athletic contest in antiquity, and the modern staging of an Olympics points to the relevance of the Olympics into the modern world. Thirdly, and most importantly, from an early stage, the Olympic Games were entwined with identity: at no other athletic

⁵⁶ How and whether athletics became professional or more democratic is a thorny issue: the traditional narrative reflects an increasing professionalization, which is coupled with an increasing debasement of sport (Gardiner 1955: 2-3). More recent scholarship observes that prizes were always part of Greek athletics, and thus it is difficult to argue for a trend of increasing professionalization (Young 2004: 92-101). In any case, the scope and breadth of athletics altered fundamentally with Alexander's conquest of the East and the transformation of *polis* culture (Young 2004: 122-129; cf. Miller 2004: 210-215). The question of the relationship of athletics and democracy in ancient Athens has been recently taken up by Pritchard (2013); a broader approach to the relationship of athletics and democracy transhistorically is the focus of Christesen (2012).

festival was there an early prohibition against the participation of foreigners (Hdt. 5.22.2) or the attendance of women (Paus. 5.6.7; cf. Hall 2002: 154-167), nor a thirty-day training period, which may have acted to restrict participation to the upper classes (Golden 1998: 16).⁵⁷ Since I consider the *angelia* a discursive and contingent identification, the early and attested connection of identity and the Olympic Games, in the very act of athletic participation, provides a strong rationale for the restriction of my research to, broadly, Olympic materials.

Olympia seems to have had a special quality as an athletic festival more generally. Golden observes that Olympia is unique in antiquity, especially for its timeless emphasis on athletics (1998: 34); the Olympic Games could even be used as a shorthand reference to the Crown games more generally (Arist. *Rh.* 1.1357 a19; Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 27.2; cf. Wolicki 2002: 72). As has been persuasively demonstrated, the Olympics not only heads lists of prose inscriptions of victories, but also tends to be listed first in verse catalogues, whether inscribed or oral (Hamilton 1974: 104; cf. Race 1990: 20 n21).⁵⁸ Needless to say, the emphasis given to Olympia by Pausanias has prefigured our own emphasis on the Olympic Games, but it is a reasonable assumption that Pausanias' attention is borne from contemporary interest in the site; his long list of victor's statues seems to imply that there was something special about Olympic victor in particular – Plato certainly seems to have thought so, since his class of guardians in the *Republic* live a life, which τοῦ γε τῶν

⁵⁷ Golden acknowledges social class and wealth as active differentiating discourses as well: “in theory they [elites] competed against all-comers: in fact, the pool of opponents was very limited, the chance of success correspondingly high, the probability of losing to a social inferior negligible” (1998: 5). In this quotation, Golden is specifically referring to equestrian events, but I broaden his conclusion to apply to all athletic events, particularly those such as Olympia which were located far from Greek urban centres.

⁵⁸ Gerber lists 22 examples of catalogues from inscriptions, and in the twelve lists in which Olympia is present, it appears first in eight of them. He concludes that the traditional order (Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian, Nemean) is not maintained as assiduously in inscriptions as in epinician (2002: 78), but nonetheless, Olympic victories still have a prominent place in catalogues most of the time.

Ὀλυμπιονικῶν πολὺ τε καλλίων καὶ ἀμείνων φαίνεται, (“appears to be fairer and better than the life of an Olympic victor”) (*Resp.* 5.466a).

Dedications figure early in the history of Olympia: until the sixth century, victors had simply dedicated objects related to athletics, such as discuses or jumping weights (Rausa 1994: 79-80: nos. 15-16); in the later sixth century and into the fifth, Olympic victory dedications change and become a mix of elaborate victory odes and ostentatious statuary (Smith 2007: 95). Olympia seems to have been special in this regard, since even the other pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, dense with dedications, did not reach the numbers evidenced at Olympia: “for the symbolic capital realized by a victor, Olympia was the central bank” (Smith 2007: 95). Thanks to Pausanias’ long discussion of Olympic victory statues in his description of the site (two-thirds of his sixth book; Smith 2007: 95), we are unusually well-informed about Olympia – at any rate, a visit to Olympia, with its still surviving dense scattering of statue bases is demonstrative of the enormity of Olympian victory dedications in antiquity. Smith, while describing Pausanias’ route through the sanctuary, makes the important observation that the incredible sameness of Greek statuary, when viewed in a catalogue or museum, would be fundamentally different in the appropriate situation: “statues... had a setting in space and time and a changing relationship to other and new statues that gave each one the appearance of an individual monument” (2007: 98).⁵⁹

The antiquity of the Olympic Games is part of their allure in the contemporary world, and this ancient pedigree was already important in the Classical period. In contrast to the Pythian (ca. 586; *BNP* “The Pythian Games at Delphi”), Isthmian (ca. 582; *BNP* “Isthmia”), and Nemean games (ca. 573; *BNP* “Nemea”), all supposedly founded in the

⁵⁹ The most up-to-date rendering of Pausanias’ route is Hermann 1988.

sixth century, Olympia's traditional foundation was dated to 776. The historicity of this foundation, already doubted in antiquity (Str. 8.3.30), is the subject of many modern studies (on which, see Christesen 2007). Morgan covers the evidence for the early history of Olympia from an archaeological perspective (1990: 26-47), and argues in particular for an increase in dedicatory activity in the eighth century (1990: 35). This increase coincides with a resettlement of Elis (1990: 50-51), as well as a general foundation or re-foundation of many extra-urban sanctuary sites in the early Iron Age (1990: 57). Morgan surveys possible early visitors to Olympia (1990: 61-89), and she concludes that we should consider early Olympia an "isolated cult place to which Messenian, Arkadian and Argive craftsman came... and to which visitors from Messenia, and, from the eighth century, the Argolid brought monumental tripods" (1990: 89).

Christesen concludes that Hippias arrived at 776 from the *a priori* belief in Lykourgos' role in the organization of the Olympics (cf. Christesen 2007: 491-504 on alternative possibilities), and a comparative use of the Spartan king list and Greek tradition concerning the so-called First Messenian War (2007: 146-155).⁶⁰ Hippias' date is, as Christesen puts it, "at best approximate" (2007: 158). Lee is much less skeptical, and regards an Olympics that dates to even before 776 as perfectly plausible (1988: 114); he also thinks that Pausanias' evolutionary model of an Olympics that originally had only a *stadion* race before expanding into a full festival is reasonable (Paus. 5.8.6-11; 1988: 115). The evolutionary model of events has been much discussed, and doubted as early as Gardiner (1910: 52); the ancient evidence is, however, inconclusive (Christesen 2007: 475-481).

⁶⁰ Morgan suspects Hippias' chronology, and prefers Pausanias' conjecture that 776 represents a re-organization of the festival (1990: 47-49).

These ancient and modern discussions of the historicity of the early Olympics point to Olympia and the Olympics as an example of the impossibility of distinguishing history and myth: even in the oldest testimony for Olympic origins, found in Pindar, there are competing stories about the foundation of the games (e.g., *O.* 1., *O.* 10.24-85; cf., Str. 8.3.30; Golden 1998: 12-17; Instone 2007). Scanlon concludes that the only common element in the mythic traditions is a reorganization of the games in the eighth century (2002: 32-33), which coincides with archaeological findings that demonstrate that the sanctuary fell into disuse from 1100-800, but seems to have come back into use in the eighth century (2002: 34). Despite the myriad difficulties for modern scholars in piecing together early Olympic history, there is probably some truth to the notion that the Olympics, or at least the site of Olympia, were an ancient foundation. Most importantly, the site and games maintained this apparent longevity through antiquity, and thus were the most conservative of athletic festivals; for my study, the contemporary (in the fifth century) understanding of Olympia *as ancient* is more important than the archaeological record.

In this chapter, I have stressed that the *angelia* implicates athletic participation, and especially victory, in a discourse on identity. This discursive identity, however, while a fundamental component of the dedicatory practice of athletes, is not an unproblematic identification. In fact, difference and distinction are central to heraldic identification: the traditional interpretation states that athletics provided the Greeks with much-needed unity, but, if true, this seems to have occurred at the cost of marking off others quite

stringently (Golden 1998: 4) – in particular, ethnically non-Hellenic peoples, women, and, largely, the poor.⁶¹

Difference-making, identification, and identity collide in the real access to and participation in athletics. Wolicki argues that even in the Archaic and Classical periods, heralds likely announced not only the winners, but also the individual competitors and competitions (2002: 73). Crowther remarks that at Olympia, after the thirty-day training period, the heralds called forth the crowd to decide on the worthiness of athletes (2004: 193).⁶² As such, the *angelia* proper, with a form of the verb νικάω, connects to the actualization of victory, but the heraldic form of representation is implicated in the very act of athletic participation: from arrival at Olympia, to the moments before competition, to the result of the event, and its memorialization, victors and their identities, modulated through the *angelia* and the heraldic mode, were intertwined.⁶³

In the case of the Olympic Games, where participation was contingent on appropriate identity, prohibitions and exclusions fundamentally shape literary and inscribed victory monuments. In the following chapter, I turn to the characteristics of identity embodied in Olympic restrictions on athletic participation: I address contemporary formulations and theoretical understandings of identity, and situate them in the athletic and literary context of late Archaic and Classical Greece.

⁶¹ Golden observes the Olympic prohibitions against foreigners, women, and, implicitly, lower-classes, as fundamental to the way in which sports can act creatively in the production of difference and identity; his study also investigates the way in which sports distinguished age categories (1998: 104-123), and the basic difference-making ability enshrined in “winners” and “losers” (briefly, 1998: 4; in some detail, 1998: 74-103). In a subsequent publication, Golden pursues the difference-making potential of sport to define free and slave as well (2008); I do not pursue this theme in my project.

⁶² The evidence for this is quite late: John Chrysostom, *In Principium Actorum* 51.6.5-10. There is Classical evidence of the herald’s announcement prior to competition, such as in Pl. *Leg.* 833a and in a fragment of Gorgias (fr. 8 D-K). Krause collects other Roman and late antique evidence (1838: 138 n30).

⁶³ Another heraldic duty, the *epangelia*, announced the festival itself (Perlmann 2000); so, heralds, even when they were not involved in the representation of the athlete, were integral to the beginnings of the athlete opportunity itself.

Chapter 3: Olympic Ideologies and Identities

In the last chapter, I outlined the central role played by the *angelia* in athletic verse: both epinician and epigram allusively appropriate the *angelia* as part of a mode of representing the athlete (Chapter 2.1). Thus, heraldic representation, predominant in epinician and athletic epigram, starts from the identity of the athlete, and implicitly includes the obfuscated process of identification. This poetic mode is joined, at the site of the Olympic Games, with an early and exclusionary process, through which particular facets of identity legitimized participation and participants. In short, the literature celebrating victory in the Olympic Games is doubly engaged with identity, both in the poetic mode of representation, and the notion that particular identities are implicated with the very fact of athletic participation.

In this study, I observe that the heraldic form (victor's name, father's name, *polis* name) embeds the exclusionary practices of the Olympics, because patrilineal descent and political status (i.e., being a citizen of a *polis*, thus Greek), and an implicitly male sex, are part of the proclamation.¹ The necessity to travel to Olympia, the thirty-day training period, and the wealth of any athletic dedicator, points to the presence of social status and class as part of the politics of identity at Olympia. These categories are not artificial divisions for the sake of scholarly analysis, but they are already present in the content and form of the *angelia*, and the prohibitory practice at Olympia: different forms of identification are embedded in Olympic discourse, which in turn relates to identity, since discourse defines and constitutes the individual subject, his relation to society, as well as the very meaning of the body (Weedon 1997: 105-108). I take my understanding

¹ Hansen observes that the full name of a Greek citizen usually consisted of personal name, patronymic, and *polis* (1996: 170), and thus the *angelia* embeds personal name among athletic signifiers.

of discourse from Foucault, who argues that discourse must be studied in a historically specific manner; he also recognizes the inherent instability of even the most institutionalized and naturalized discursive practices (1990: 101-104).

This chapter revolves around political, sexual, and socio-economic identities (ethnic and civic origin, sex and gender, and class and status); they are organized purposely, so as to move from the most explicit restriction, the necessity to be a Greek citizen of a *polis*, to the implicit presence of gender in the *angelia* along with the explicit prohibition against female participation at Olympia, to class and status, which exist, however powerfully, on the margins of these exclusionary practices. Through an analysis that takes into account ancient and modern arguments on the meaning of these social and political identities, I argue for the relevance of social theory to athletic representation and I contextualize athletic identities in the Archaic and early Classical milieu.

In order to establish the terms of my argument properly, I begin with a discussion of the concept of ideology and its relationship with identity. My argument derives from the centrality of the athlete's identity in athletic verse; in both the *angelia* and at Olympia, identity and identification emerge as problematic concepts. My analysis consciously privileges the athletic context of epinician and epigram as a way to understand how they represent the athlete, and in turn, how the identity of athletes is discursively constituted.²

² This contrasts with traditional approaches, especially to Pindar, which have privileged the figure of the poet over his patrons. I instead understand the represented athlete and the athletic context as central to the understanding of epinician and epigrammatic poetics.

3.1: Identity in the *Angelia*: Ideological, Performative, Citational

In the preceding chapter, I have referred to the *angelia* as “ideological” (Chapter 2.1). By using the terms ideological and ideology, my project aligns with much work in philosophical, social, and literary theory, which has endeavoured to understand how such fundamental concepts as the self, subjectivity, and identity, are prefigured and configured by social and historical context – that is, how identity is a discursive site.³ My understanding of ideology is based on the work of Althusser, who defines ideology as the representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to the real conditions of existence (1971: 153).⁴ “Real conditions”, according to Althusser, are inaccessible through language; in this, Althusser is indebted to Lacan, who influentially defined “the Real” as the stage of childhood development before the acquisition of language (i.e., the Symbolic Order), “an anatomical, ‘natural’ order, a pure plenitude or fullness” (Grosz 1990: 34), uncoupled from the idea of selfhood.⁵ Thus, the imaginary is constituted through language, and, in part, by our conceiving of the essentiality of subjectivity and the unity of selfhood; the identification with the subject position, which is in actuality an ideological effect (*the* ideological effect for Althusser: 1971: 161), is emotionally and

³ Discourse and ideology are often substituted for one another in poststructuralist writing (Weedon 1997: 31). In particular, discourse should generally be understood to encompass the material basis for ideology, which Althusser outlines, and which is taken up by later critics.

⁴ Althusser distinguishes between ideologies (e.g., religions, philosophies), which have a history and context, and should be analyzed as such, and ideology, which is ahistorical (1971: 150). These historically-existing ideologies align with the traditional Marxist interpretation of ideology as “false consciousness” (Engels, Letter to Mehring, 1893): for example, the relations of production and the workers’ role in them, according to Marxist analysis, are hidden, by the ideology of capital, which makes it appear as though the capitalist is the essential and productive force.

⁵ Lacan distinguishes between reality and the Real; the former being the imaginary world to which we assign the value “real”, and the latter being the materiality of existence that persists outside of language, and thus, the ineffable. The Real has its roots in childhood development, as the child does not perceive a unified subjectivity in its early stages, and “its body is an uncoordinated *aggregate*, a series of parts... rather than an integrated totality” (Grosz 1990: 33, emphasis in original). Once we acquire language, the Real cannot be experienced except through the representational work of the symbolic or imaginary order, or through the crisis of psychosis (Grosz 1990: 35). For my purposes, Lacan’s distinction between the materiality of “the Real” and the representative and imaginary quality of “reality” is crucial, inasmuch as subjectivity, identity, and individuality belong to the imaginary, symbolic reality.

psychologically powerful (Weedon 1997: 31).⁶ In this way, the primary effect of ideology is to operate at a double remove: it represents one's relation to oneself as the complete identification of selfhood and subject, while in reality, the elaboration of a subject and the centrality of this subject to our conception of self is the ideological effect. In poststructuralist terms, ideology begins by de-centering the subject, fragmenting the Classical belief in the monolithic constitution of the self, and positing a world where language in particular, but also power and institutions, have the ability to define and delimit the apparently essential elements of selfhood. Since language gives us the ability to interact with and interpret the world, and power relations establish our ability to act in the world, these two fundamentally ideological concepts prefigure the existence of "meaning" and "consciousness", which are not, as they appear, transcendent.

Despite its discursive character, ideology also has a material basis, since it is embodied in the practices that replicate it. The material basis is most famously evoked in Althusser's definition of the "interpellating hail", which addresses an individual and defines him as an ideological subject (1971: 160-161).⁷ While Althusser considers us "always already" subjects (1971: 161), and unable to escape from ideology inasmuch as we cannot escape from language, the recognition of the imaginary, and thus the discursive and creative, character of much of our lived experience indicates the potential

⁶ The ideological aspect of subjectivity can be further underscored when we consider that "I", a signifier like any other linguistic sign, only gains its meaning in relation to other signs, so that our individual selfhood is defined linguistically by the Other (the "mirror stage", for Lacan): "the child identifies with an image of itself that is always also the image of another. Its identification can only ever be partial, wishful, anticipated, put off into the future, delayed" (Grosz 1990: 38). Thus, the very basis of the self is alienation (*ibid.*).

⁷ Althusser tellingly uses the example of being addressed by the police to explain "interpellation". Assuredly, the power of other ideological forces, whether national, legal, religious, etc., acts on the primary ideological effect as well.

for incisive criticism.⁸ This is the basis on which I refer to the *angelia* as ideological, in its productive capacity as an element of athletic discourse: it is representative, deals with the imaginary and symbolic order, and modulates and prefigures the identity of the individual in ideologies.

Despite our entrapment in the fundamental “ideological effect”, the critique of ideology is beneficial, particularly because of the fictive and imaginary (in all its senses) quality of art. More specifically, Althusser’s ideology comes into play in my project because of its explication of the practices and actions that we perform as ideological subjects – since Althusser’s ideology is concerned above all with representations, and with the identity of its subjects, I find it highly productive for thinking about how the *angelia* and athletics create ideological structures for society, and how they constitute their subjects within these structures. In order to understand exactly how the ability of speech and action to constitute and produce identity functions, I turn to Butler’s criticism of Althusser (especially 1993, 1997, 1999 [1990]). She defines the performative, the speech-act that comprises the constitutive ability of speech, as “that discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names” (Butler 1993: 13). By tying this understanding of speech-acts to the actions that we perform with our bodies, Butler argues that by endlessly citing ideologies, we give these ideologies *apparently real* existence, though they are, in fact, social constructions (1988: 270). By embodying them in our bodies and in our internal perception of ourselves, we naturalize the artificial (1988: 271); this is what Butler regards as *performativity*, the ability of actions and

⁸ The narrative of the interpellating hail is explanatory, not descriptive.

speech to be creative and productive.⁹ Creative potential, however, does not exist in a vacuum, and, in fact, the fundamental ability of language to be repeated in myriad contexts, an inescapable fact since we can find meaning in words, means that all performatives can be regarded as *citations* (Derrida 1988: 12).¹⁰

While Butler deals mainly with the naturalization of the ideology of sexual difference as gender, she argues broadly for the way our actions and speech, by constantly citing these ideologically (or discursively) constructed identities and concepts, produce the *appearance* of their reality. Since the possible constructions of performative identities rely on the ideologies in existence and collectively acknowledged (i.e., conventional) at a given time, identities are contingent and have no objective existence in and of themselves: they are identifications. The fact that these performatives rely on the citation of the very conventions that they themselves require (and perform) indicates the paradoxical nature of ideological and discursive practices; the paradoxical quality indicates the fundamental character of ideology as a practice embedded in (mis)representation and (mis)recognition.¹¹ Nonetheless, since these concepts form the very basis for identity and the constitution of the self, the bypassing of this paradoxical quality, our ability to accept the contingent and creative as apparently inherent and unchanging, is at the heart of ideological subjection.

⁹ For Butler, this naturalization of the artificial is the result of coercion, whether explicit or implicit (1988: 271). Despite the artificial nature of these coerced “realities”, by acting these out we give them the ability to enact real consequences, though this does not make them any more “Real”, in the Lacanian sense.

¹⁰ This inherent citational aspect of language and performativity comes out of Butler’s reading of Derrida’s critique of Austin’s work on performative speech-acts (Derrida 1988: 17-18).

¹¹ For Butler, the paradoxical quality of ideological subjectivity reveals the chance for resistance, since any disobedience towards the interpellating hail can be subversive: “the non-conforming interpellating person, in ‘the form of parodic inhabiting of conformity’ questions the legitimacy of the command, and thus the system itself” (1993: 122). The very existence of non-conforming individuals – which is impossible to deny – reveals the contingency of the whole system of interpellation and subjectivity. As such, every interpellation, every claim to identity is a “moment of crisis, not only for the individual, but for the hailing power” (Wohl 1998: xxxi).

Epigrams and epinician, speech-acts that are produced from within athletic discourse, can be explained as poetic speech with performative potency. In its initial proclamation the *angelia* does something, in that as a speech-act it makes one person an athlete, a competitor, a victor: the representation of this speech-act in epigram and epinician borrows this authority, and in doing so, also borrows the performative power. Therefore, we can speak of the identities embedded in athletic verse as discursive: they are *ideological* (they refer to social conditions and contexts, which are themselves imaginary relations; they are naturalized social constructions), *performative* (as a representation of a speech-act, the *angelia* reiterates identities), and *citational* (the identities the *angelia* creates are produced by virtue of its reference to conventions).

3.2: Political Identities at the Olympic Games

The *angelia*'s inclusion of patronymic and *polis* highlights the prominence of political identity to the representation of the athlete. At the Olympic Games, participation was further restricted to those athletes who could prove their Hellenic credentials (what Hall 2002 calls "Hellenicity"; cf. 2002: 154). Therefore, athletic representation at the Olympics was highly politicized, since civic, ethnic, and regional identities were implicated in the very rules of participation and competition. Political identities are ideological, since cultural and linguistic borders have been exposed, in both ancient and modern societies, as subjectively perceived and defined.¹² Sociologically and anthropologically-informed studies of ethnicity have revealed, above all, the contingent character of ethnic identity, a category of "ascription and identification by the actors

¹² For the Archaic and Classical Greek world, this has been demonstrated in the case of linguistic and alphabetic demarcations by Luraghi (2010). Cultural and "racial" borders and their subjective reality are the concern of Hall (esp. 1997).

themselves” (Barth 1969: 10). While modern societies distinguish among civic, ethnic, national, and racial identities, I nonetheless find ethnicity a productive concept for Archaic and early Classical political identity more generally; both broadly Hellenic and specifically *polis*-based identities are based on perceived shared kinship, putative shared descent, and, to some extent, legendary and mythical genealogy and history. In modern work on ethnicity, these characteristics, especially the perception of shared descent and relation, are fundamental (Barth 1969: 13; Eriksen 2010: 17). Thus, in this section, I argue for the existence of several ancient political identities, whether *polis*-based, regional (e.g., *ethnos*), or Hellenic, which can be productively described, and analyzed, as ethnic, and which are intrinsically part of the athlete’s identity and his representation. Such identities are not exclusive, but complementary, and identities based on *polis*, region, or “Hellenicity” are nested within a non-hierarchical structure.

Hall recognizes that Olympia the sanctuary was not as important as the Games themselves (2002: 159; see 2002: 95-97 on the lack of ethnic exclusion at other sanctuaries); non-Greeks could dedicate at Olympia, but athletic participation in the Olympics was severely curtailed. Herodotus’ story of Agariste (6.126-131), for example, connects Hellenic identity with the Olympic Games specifically: the tyrant of Sicyon, Kleisthenes, chooses the Olympics specifically (directly after his victory) to announce a contest of sorts for the right to marry his daughter. Herodotus lists the suitors from across the Greek world (6.127), remarks that Kleisthenes asked of each man’s lineage (6.128: ὁ Κλεισθένης πρῶτα μὲν τὰς πάτρας τε αὐτῶν ἀνεπέθετο καὶ γένος ἑκάστου “Kleisthenes first inquired of the parentage of them and lineage of each”), and then concludes the story with the proverbial tale of Hippokleides’ dancing (6.129) and the

eventual selection of Megakles as Agariste’s husband (6.130). The correlation of the Olympic Games and the inquiry into descent and lineage in this story has not gone unnoticed: “Herodotos’ account, then, of the wooing of Agariste emphasizes the criteria of descent and territory within Hellenic self-identification at the same time as it highlights the Olympic Games as the *locus* in which that identity was performed” (Hall 2002: 156).¹³ The exclusivity is perhaps most evident through the presence of the *Hellenodikai*, the “judges of the Greeks”, who, as Herodotus makes clear, were responsible for deciding whether a potential participant was Greek or not (Hdt. 5.22.2; cf. Paus. 5.9.5); the story of Alexander of Macedon, who somehow ἀπέδεξε ὡς εἶη Ἀργεῖος (“demonstrated that he was an Argive”) and ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλληνα (“was judged to be a Greek”) underscores this point (5.22.2).¹⁴

There is also evidence to suggest that the Olympics were substantially closed not only to non-Greeks, but to those who were not integrated into the Hellenic genealogy, and thus could not adduce a literally *Hellenic* (i.e., from Hellen) descent:¹⁵ Hall collates the Olympic victors of the Archaic period and concludes, remarkably, that 91.3% originate from cities that claimed an affiliation to either an Aiolian, Dorian, Ionian, or Achaian

¹³ That Kleisthenes chooses the Olympic Games (Hdt. 6.126.2) as the venue in which to announce the contest for Agariste, speaks to its elite character as well as its closure to non-Greeks, an instance in which class, ethnicity, and gender intersect.

¹⁴ On the issue of Macedonian ethnicity in constructions of “Greekness”, see Hall (2001). Herodotus suggests that both the Macedonians and their rulers were “Greek” (Hdt. 6.44; 7.9A); Thucydides, in contrast, considers only the Macedonian rulers Greeks (2.99.3).

¹⁵ The Hellenic genealogy can be substantially reconstructed from fragments of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (especially frs. 9 and 10 M-W; cf. West 1985). As preserved, the genealogy evinces a kinship relation through the eponymous ancestors Doros, Aiolos, Achaïos and Ion (Hall 2002: 27). While genealogical material need not have ethnic relevance, the “generally anonymous and faceless” nature of characters such as Doros and Ion points to the fact that they exist simply as the putative origin of ethnonyms, rather than mythological characters in their own right (Hall 2002: 26). The omissions from this genealogy, for example the Arkadians, whose eponymous founder Arkas is nowhere to be found, are telling for the nature of the genealogy as an instrument of identification and ideology, rather than a reflection of the geographical and historical reality of the Archaic population (on history and mythic genealogy, see Fowler 1998).

ancestry (2002: 163).¹⁶ Victors from cities without these affiliations (e.g., Arkadians, Lokrians) appear rarely, and not in any substantial numbers until 525-475 (*ibid.*). It may even be the case, as Hall argues, that victors from outside the Hellenic genealogy are even less diverse than the numbers indicate: “seven of these nineteen victories (36.8 percent) were gained by just two families” (2002: 163). Just as Alexander of Macedon was able to prove his Hellenic pedigree without affecting its definition, so too were other families able to do the same. In any case, once a family had participated at the Olympics, descendants of participants could point to their ancestral participation (in some cases through the patronymic) as evidence of “Hellenicity”: the Olympics are not only *representative* of Greek identity, but *performative* of that identification (cf. Hall 2002: 167).

Since Barth’s seminal essay, sociological studies of ethnicity have moved away from cataloguing cultural practices and linguistic or dialectical differences, and to the practical and experiential side of ethnicity.¹⁷ Barth argues persuasively that ethnicity exists on the margins: “the nature of continuity of ethnic units is clear: it depends on the maintenance of a boundary” (1969: 11).¹⁸ He demonstrates that boundaries are fundamental to ethnic identities, a concept which has been developed by later scholars,

¹⁶ In an appendix Hall deals with the historicity of early Olympic victors (2002: 241-246); he comes to largely the same conclusions about Hippias’ methods as Christesen does in his more comprehensive volume (2007: 122).

¹⁷ The solitary use of ethnicity to mean heathendom aside (*OED*, i), ethnicity with the definition “ethnic character or peculiarity” was coined in 1953; as Eriksen notes, since then it has become ubiquitous in scholarly and popular literature (2010: 4). Eriksen rightly concludes that “ethnicity” is derived from Greek ἔθνος, but he offers an imprecise etymology, “pagan” (*ibid.*), derived from Williams (1976). In fact, ἔθνος derives from a Greek root referring to a collectivity of any kind (*s.v.* ἔθνος, Chantraine); on the use of ἔθνος in Greek historical writing, and a sustained argument against the “evolutionary” model, which regards *ethne* as atavistic collectivities, see McInerney (2001: 53-57).

¹⁸ Barth argues that the importance given to a common culture in defining ethnic units is imprecise; rather, common culture is the result of ethnic identification, rather than a “primary or definitional characteristic” (1969: 11). Hall provides a cogent summary of the inability of cultural traits to adequately demarcate ethnic identities (1997: 20-24).

who have argued that ethnic identities develop and exist only in “interethnic relations” (Cohen 1978: 388). Thus, contexts, whether historical or geographical, must be accounted for in the study of ethnicity, since, as Baumann indicates, ethnicity has no real existence, but is simply a series of identifications in context (Bauman 1999: 57). In fact, ethnicity is perceived by subjects as their “basic, most general identity”, and as an identity that emerges from presumptively shared origins and background (Barth 1969: 13).¹⁹ While cultural identifiers, lived practices, and language come to be characterized as “ethnic”, these are merely elaborations from the sharing of apparent kinship and descent (Cohen 1978: 387). Cultural and linguistic borders, after all, do not always correspond with ethnic borders, and different ethnicities sometimes share virtually every cultural trait (cf. Eriksen 2010: 15-17). This approach highlights the subjective and relative character of ethnicity, which is not a peculiarly basic identity, but is a social relationship between peoples who consider themselves distinct; since there is no material existence to ethnic identities – i.e., they are discursive and ideologically – the constituent elements are open to change and manipulation (Eriksen 2010: 17; cf. Barth on the “ecological” influence on culture, 1969: 13).

While Hall recognizes the importance of “putative shared ancestry” to Archaic and early Classical conceptions of Hellenic identity (1997: 25), I conceive of several

¹⁹ “Presumptively”, in this definition, is crucial. Ethnicity purports to represent “real”, “essential” differences between peoples, but in doing so it “mistranslates relational difference into natural and absolute difference” (Baumann 1999: 90). This contemporary definition is used in the two main schools of thought on ethnicity, the so-called primordialist and the instrumentalist (cf. Hall 1997: 17). The former supposedly sees ethnicity as an intrinsic element of social identity, to which peoples retreat in times of crisis (Eriksen 2010: 63); the latter, in contrast, views ethnicity as a form of political organization, which is invoked for specific ends at specific times (*ibid.*). While the latter has been the most popular academic perspective, Baumann argues that instrumentalism ignores the apparent primordial aspect of ethnicity (1999: 91). Primordialism, which Baumann subsumes to the “essentializing of culture”, “is part of the realities that social scientists must examine” (1999: 90) – the essentialized culture, ethnicity as primordial truth, is part of the lived reality of peoples, and therein lies much of its political and organizational power (1999: 95).

political identities from these periods as “ethnic” identities in the vocabulary of modern social science.²⁰ The complementary nature of these identities can be demonstrated by the fact that an implicit component of the Hellenic identity claimed at the Olympics was that the participant was a citizen of a recognized Greek state, a community that had accepted the *ekecheiria* and hosted the Elean *theoroi* (Nielsen 2004a: 107).²¹ While there existed a wide variety of state and community structures in the Hellenic world, Nielsen concludes that, in the Archaic and early Classical period, athletic participation at Olympia carries with it, “the implication... that the community to which he [the victor] belonged had been visited by the Elean *theoroi* and was thus a political centre” (2004a: 107).

The *theoroi* sent out by the Eleans to announce the timing of the Olympic festival for the coming year (i.e., the *epangelia*; Perlmann 2000: 46) were hosted in political communities across the Greek world – starting at least in the fourth century, this hosting was institutionalized in the form of the *theorodokos*, an individual, probably from the upper-classes, whose function was to house the *theoroi* and mediate between them and the *polis* (at Olympia, see Perlman 2000: 63-66). The involvement of civic authorities, on both ends of the *epangelia*, whether sending out ambassadors or hosting them, emphasizes the early politicizing (in the literal sense) of athletics (Nielsen 2004a: 108).²²

²⁰ I am not arguing for any particularly “ethnic” status for the *polis*. Rather, I am suggesting that the perception of shared descent, putative kinship groups, and restricted citizenship (all characteristics of the *polis*) accord well with how modern sociologists conceive of ethnicity.

²¹ The research of the *Copenhagen Polis Centre* concludes that across the four pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, from the sixth century onwards, athletic participation on the part of a citizen is a good indicator of *polis* status (Nielsen 2004a: 108). The *ekecheiria*, as Young makes clear, was never a cessation of hostilities, but a ban on invasion of Olympia, or the harassment of athletes en route to the Games (2004: 124-125).

²² This early political involvement has been further supported in recent years with the publication of an Archaic inscription from Olympia, in which *theoroi* from *poleis* are mentioned at Olympia itself (Ebert and Siewert 1990: 391-412). The early criticisms of Xenophanes (*IEG*² fr. 2) and Tyrtaios (*IEG*² fr. 12), concerning the civic benefits meted out to victorious athletes, are further evidence of the mixing of politics and athletics from an early date.

The involvement of the *polis* in athletics, far from negating the relevance of modern work on ethnicity, heightens the implication of ethnic identity with athletic participation and dedication. The *polis*, after all, despite its apparently civic nature, was, unlike modern cities, a citizen-state (Hansen 1993: 7-9), whose community could be envisioned as an extended kinship group.²³ Nielsen argues persuasively that in the Archaic and early Classical period, the word *patris*, Greek “fatherland”, was overwhelmingly associated with the *polis* (2004b: 58-64), and in many cases could act as its synonym (2004b: 69). Since *patris* implied emotional and familial bonds (Nielsen 2004b: 74), it points to the utility of modern ethnic studies, which are similarly structured around emotional and psychological bonds of family and kinship, to *polis*-identity. Unlike modern citizen status, which is, above all, juridical, Greek political identity was personal and emotive: while *ethnika* were used in some parts of the Greek world, the standard name of a Greek citizen included personal name, father’s name, and an adjectival form of the name of his *polis* (Hansen 1996: 176, calls this adjective a “city-ethnic”). Hansen suggests that this personal onomastic use of the *polis* name, almost unique to the Greeks, implies the existence of generally small political communities, which constantly interacted, but in which specific political identities were jealously guarded and central to the individual’s conception of identity (Hansen 1996: 191).²⁴

Considering the importance of inter-ethnic situations and boundaries to the development, maintenance, and reification of ethnic identities in the modern social sciences, Hansen’s identification of the importance of *polis*-identity to Greek

²³ Cole adds that religion and the *polis* were intimately connected (1995: 310).

²⁴ The opening of many prose works includes personal name and *polis* name as a form of identification: e.g., Hekataios of Miletos (*FGrH* 1 F 1); Herodotus of Halikarnassos (Hdt. 1.1); Thucydides the Athenian (Thuc. 1.1.1).

nomenclature is crucial. As he observes, *polis*-identity is overwhelmingly the most common political identity in places where Greeks from different *poleis* interact (e.g., pan-Hellenic sanctuaries; Hansen 1996: 188-191). Within *poleis*, the adjective derived from a *polis* is joined by adjectives derived from sub-*polis* political structures such as demes or phratries (Hansen 1996: 179); the utility of *polis*-identity in situations where individuals from different *poleis* meet indicates that *polis*-identity can be conceived of as an identity that develops, is maintained, and reified, especially, in interethnic places and situations. Fowler acknowledges this possibility, but suggests a competitive relationship: “the independence of the cities produced a centrifugal force counteracting the desire for unity under the name ‘Hellenic’” (1998: 16). I prefer to see these political identities as complementary (cf. Konstan 2001: 31), since they posit descent as the generative principle for organization and, since, at the Olympics, both types of identity are necessary for participation. Myths of autochthony, citizenship restricted by birth, and restricted naturalization point to a *polis*-identity constrained by the same characteristics that bound ethnic identities.²⁵ Thus, despite the lack of an ethnic dimension to civic nomenclature in modern times, Greek civic identity appears as ethnic; it certainly adheres to Cohen’s definition of an ethnic group as being putatively self-perpetuating, sharing cultural forms, and, most importantly, “a grouping that identifies itself and is identified by others as constituting a category different from other categories of the same type” (1978: 385).²⁶ In

²⁵ The Greek predilection for naming the *polis* after its inhabitants (e.g., the Athenians, rather than Athens), reflects the *polis* as a social body, not solely a governmental structure (see further, Hansen 1993: 8-17). Myths of autochthony, at least at Athens, meant that the Athenians could consider themselves a single kinship group (Ober 1989: 263-264) – the similarity to the self-perception of ethnic groups is striking. At Athens, such a metaphorical kinship was strengthened by the literal endogamy required for citizen-status after 451/0 (Ober 1989: 80-81).

²⁶ This is a challenge to Classicists, who are used to using “ethnic” to refer to linguistic and regional divisions in the Greek world, such as Aiolian, Dorian, Ionian, etc. Such a challenge, however, results from overlapping vocabulary, and does not represent a conceptual problem.

fact, civic ethnicity complements Hellenic identity, at the same time as Hellenic identity acts as a guarantee of *polis*-status; both emerge and can be defined within the act of athletic, and especially Olympic, participation.

Descent is crucial to Greek political identities, regardless of the community to which they pertain; genealogy is personal, political, *and* athletic. The full name of the Greek male citizen, distributed within the *angelia*, intersects multiple times with descent: personal names were often the repetition of the names of earlier generations (in Athens, at any rate, generally the paternal grandfather for the firstborn); the father's name served as evidence of legitimacy and political citizenship; the *polis* itself, within its own mythology and legendary foundation stories, often characterized its inhabitants as an extended kinship group, or enacted laws that contained citizenship within a delimited group. Of course, the very genealogy embedded in the name of an individual would be essential to define the right to participate at the Olympics, and furthermore to detail the inheritance of athletic prowess. Therefore, descent-based identities, imagined as either broadly collective (e.g., Hellenic) or limited (e.g., *polis*), contain within them the capacity for athletic participation. In the way that such discursive identities function, political identity is performative and ideological; it creates the very identities on which it relies. Therefore, the ideologically potent space of the Olympic Games – participation at which is indicative not only of ethnic “Hellenicity”, but political “*polis*-ness” – demonstrates the fundamentally reciprocal relationship of civic and ethnic identities, and highlights the importance of political identity, of any sort, to the representation of the athlete, and the interpretation of athletic verse.

3.3: Sexual Identities at the Olympic Games

While the biological sex of the athlete is not part of the *angelia*, women were prohibited from attending the athletic festival (Paus. 5.6.7), and female athletes could not compete at the Olympics. Gender discourse, then, is implicated in the *angelia*, and in the representation of athletes, since the presumed sex of the Olympic athlete, and Olympic spectator, is male.²⁷ Like ethnicity, gender is ideological, since it is based on an extrapolation from reality, a representation of the supposedly essential differences between men and women as a result of their biological distinctiveness (Scott 1986: 1067). While female athletes and athletics existed from an early point, their distinct character marked them as significantly different from their male counterparts, and contributed to an implicit gendering of institutionalized and competitive athletics, and, especially, Olympic identity.

Ancient and modern discourse on sexuality is highly implicated with sex and gender, in that specific biological difference, socially perceived as gender, is thought to manifest itself in a particular type of desire. In the ancient world, the social context of athletics, especially the involvement of adult and adolescent men and the phenomenon of athletic nudity, relates to sexuality. I utilize modern gender and sexual theory to understand the connected notions of sex, gender, and sexuality, and their intersection with athletics. In order to contextualize my analysis of gendered and sexual athletic identities in antiquity, I review the evidence for a distinctively feminine athletics, as well as the role of athletic nudity in the world of Greek sport.

²⁷ The law, to which the above citation from Pausanias refers, is the first mention of a prohibition of women from the Olympic festival. Pausanias later contradicts this prohibition, and mentions that *parthenoi* were allowed at the festival (Paus. 6.20.9). Young regards the second reference, a corrupt portion of the text, as the error of a later copyist (2004: 119-121); he prefers the common-sense approach that, regardless of any *de jure* prohibition, it was unlikely that fathers and sons would bring along sisters, wives, or mothers to the Games, at least in any great quantity. Dillon concludes that *parthenoi* were probably allowed, but he still stresses that adult women were not permitted, and that Olympia was unique in this respect (2000: 479-480).

Contemporary gender theorists have questioned any approach that seeks to delimit and categorize cultural phenomena such as gender. Feminists have problematized the very idea of “female” as an epistemological category: “the term fails to be exhaustive... because gender is not always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts” (Butler 1999 [1990]: 4). Irigaray questions the possibility of a feminine subject within highly masculinist discourse, disputing the ability of gender to actually describe anything (Irigaray 1985: 69);²⁸ Butler further notes that the integration of gender into the idea of the subject means that divergent or “incoherent” genders call into question not only the binary gender structure, but the categories of “subject” and “identity” themselves (Butler 1999 [1990]: 23).²⁹ Each of these critics poses the question of whether we can ever reach beyond the surface of normative and idealized gender; in short, whether there is a gender to which we can attach objective characteristics. The notion of gender must be understood not as a reified cultural element to be catalogued and described, but as a discursive characteristic open to manipulation. Moreover, the definition of this characteristic is itself variable – gender is no more a realized concept than other elements in the construction of identity: gender can be utilitarian, produce different meanings, and different definitions across genre and context.

Despite the problems of a positivist approach to gender, Foxhall rightly stresses that contexts, that is, historical, political, social situations, are to be privileged (2009: 483). The problem is not the perceived reality of these contexts, but our access to them:

²⁸ As Butler explains it (1999 [1990]: 14), Irigaray’s argument posits the impossibility of a feminine subject; the feminine cannot be relationally identified with the masculine in any discourse, since discourse in the modern sense presumes a “phallogocentric language” (1999 [1990]: 15).

²⁹ In their illuminating discussion of “masculinities”, Cornwall and Lindisfarne also focus on the problem that available language presupposes a binary division of sexes and genders (1994: 11-12); therefore, the disruption of received notions of sex and gender suffers from the prefiguration of the received notion in language itself.

our extant texts are not, after all, passive objects, in which gendered agents appear and which objectively describe gendered qualities. Rather, these texts, especially those implicated in public discourse, are constructive and legitimizing.³⁰ The challenge, with a fluid understanding of gender and its place as a locus of politics and power, is how to use it as a concept for literary analysis. Scott defines social gender across four categories: the symbolic, the normative, the political, and the subjective (Scott 1986: 1067-1068).³¹ In a society such as Archaic or Classical Greece, in which kinship served as the foundational element of politics, the regulation of gender in that kinship system is the regulation of gender within the wider polity; the political dynamic, the authorization of texts, speakers, and venues, plays a role in the social value of gender.

Gender is crucial to our understanding of athletics in the ancient world, since there were athletic opportunities and occasions for both men and women (thus, athletics was not restricted by sexual difference). Where these occasions diverged was not in the fact of sporting events in and of themselves (though female athletics tended to have a more restricted program), but in the value attached to athletics, the ethos of competition, and the elaboration of a complicated system of festivals, events, and, especially, dedications (i.e., athletic verse). Indeed, large-scale festivals that permitted female athletes did not exist until the Hellenistic period, and female athletes are not common dedicators until the Roman era (Scanlon 2008:180; cf. Moretti no. 63; Dillon 2000: 462). Whereas the athletic festivals of male athletes were expansive occasions, where sports,

³⁰ In this way, as Foucault argues for sexuality, gender too becomes a locus for the interplay of power relations, whether individual, social, or literary (Foucault, 1990 [1978]: especially 75-132). With respect to gender, Butler too observes regulatory power at work: bodies are disciplined to fit a heterosexual construction of sexuality, which conceals gender discontinuities and incoherence and thus elides the activities of a normative authority (1999 [1990]: 184-185).

³¹ Scott defines gender as a connection between two propositions: that gender is a constitutive element of social relationships and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power (Scott 1986: 1067).

display, and power were intertwined, athletic occasions for women were such that competition seems to have been an afterthought and, in a sense, the agonistic ethos etymologically present in athletics (derived from *athlon*, “prize of contest”; *s.v.* ἄθλον, *LSJ*) is absent (at least in the evidence at hand). The lack of evidence and the masculine perspective of our sources have no doubt contributed to this perception but, in any case, until the Roman period, female athletic dedication is rare, and thus we can speak of an implicitly gendered subject in athletic verse.

Among the exiguous evidence for female athletics, the *Heraia* is the most detailed example. These games, which were dedicated to Hera at Olympia, are mentioned only in Pausanias (5.16.2-6): he describes a ritual dedication (a *peplos*) and the specifics of a sporting event (a footrace, in the Olympic stadium at a distance slightly shorter than the men’s race).³² Beyond this sole literary reference, Scanlon discusses two pieces of material evidence: an Archaic bronze statuette and a Julio-Claudian marble statue (Scanlon 2008: 160). As Scanlon observes, the lack of evidence for the *Heraia* outside of Pausanias is not surprising: “silence about women’s festivals is typical in a society where men controlled publicity” (2008: 161).³³ Scanlon concludes that the *Heraia* probably attracted competitors from outside the Elis region and was likely organized around the same time as a great number of male-only contests came into being, such as the Pythian,

³² Scanlon also infers that the shorter girl’s course “could also be avoidance of direct and overt comparison or competition with men. A shorter course thereby implicitly acknowledges males’ traditionally higher position in the agonistic sphere” (2008: 179). Golden adds that the shorter distance prefigures women’s failure to match up with men; he notes the similar challenges that face women’s sport in the modern Olympic movement (1998: 131-132). The antiquity of the *Heraia*, despite Pausanias’ reference and the willingness of modern scholars to believe him, is not at all certain (Young 2004: 115-116).

³³ “Publicity” is an anachronistic notion, but Scanlon is correct that a male bias in our sources undoubtedly effaces important female situations; the same is true for the lived experience of, for example, the lower-classes and slaves.

Isthmian, and Nemean Games (Scanlon 2008: 194).³⁴ Regardless of Scanlon's optimistic perspective on the significance of the *Heraia* to competitors (2008: 196), the *Heraia* seems to have privileged an initiatory element (Golden 1998: 132); this was undoubtedly important, but the contrast with male athletics is striking. The strictly unmarried status of the competitors, who were split into three groups based on age (Paus. 5.16.2), distinguish the *Heraia* from the two age-group Olympic Games, and even from the rest of the pan-Hellenic festivals, where marital status was not a component of athletic identity. The restriction to *parthenoi* calls to mind choral performances, which were similarly restricted in age, structured along age-groups, and perhaps important initiatory rites themselves (Scanlon 2008: 191-192; cf. Calame 2001).

Evidence from the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron also seems to depict the footraces of young women (Scanlon 2002: 139-174). Sherds of pottery appear to represent girls in a distinctive running form (cf. Scanlon 2002: fig. 6.1), although it is difficult to determine precisely the character of the activity, especially since no literary evidence survives to contextualize the material remains. Scanlon concludes that the Brauron rites belong, broadly, to the same transitional rites as the *Heraia* (2002: 164). He argues that the pottery's iconography depicts not a race, but a chase (*ibid.*; Golden 1998: 126), and involves the mysterious "playing the bear" for which Brauron was known; that is, the Brauron events seem even further from the competitive world of male athletics than the *Heraia* festival. The specifics of the activities at Brauron may remain mysterious until further remains are excavated, or some literary reference is discovered or

³⁴ Whether or not the *Heraia* attracted non-local competitors is impossible to tell, since the archaeological and epigraphical evidence are fleeting, and Pausanias' comment remains the only literary reference.

recognized, but, as Golden notes, the initiatory character of the event, “a prenuptial rite” (*ibid.*), is the consensus opinion.

The athletic evidence at Brauron and the *Heraia* has been understood in comparison to early and strongly attested female athletics at Sparta: at Sparta, “the girls’ athletic regimen more closely resembled the men’s in form and variety than anywhere else” (Scanlon 2002: 121). The athleticism of Spartan women was famous throughout antiquity (Prop. 3.14.1-4), inasmuch as Spartan women were known for their physical activities (among others: Xen. *Lac.* 1.3-4; Pl. *Leg.* 7.805E-806A; Plut.*Mor.* 227 D.12).³⁵ Spartan girls, like boys, were integrated into the complex system of Spartan education called the *agoge* (Scanlon 2002: 121-122). References as early as Alkman (late seventh, or early sixth century B.C.; on Alkman’s date, see West 1992) seem to reflect a complex system of age-groups for Spartan girls: Alkman’s speaker calls the chorus members ἀνεψιᾶς (“cousins”, 1.52 *PMGF*), a word which Scanlon notes is used by Pindar to refer to the age classes of Spartan boys too (Pind. fr. 112; Scanlon 2002: 122).³⁶ What these examples suggest, importantly, is that Spartan athletics was restricted to young women; the integration of athletics into a system of education points to it as a complex system of

³⁵ Whether or not Spartan women exercised in the nude has proven a challenging question. Plutarch reports that Lykourgos instituted athletic activities for women (*Mor.* 227 D), and, separately, that Spartan women paraded through the town naked, like men (*Mor.* 227 E). Plutarch somewhat enigmatically remarks that Lykourgos instituted naked parades so that women might τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπιτηδεύουσιν (“follow the same practices as men”); this could be read to extend nudity to gymnastic exercise, but it is certainly not the only reading. Another frequently cited piece of evidence for nude athletics among Spartan women is Ibykos 339 *PMGF*, which calls them φαينوμηρίδας (“thigh flashers”), though this may simply mean “scantily clad” rather than naked (Scanlon 2002: 125-127; *contra* Pomeroy 2002: 26). In any case, even if the women were simply scantily clad, or bare to their breast like the runners in the *Heraia*, this would have been shocking in comparison to what we know about women’s dress and the attitudes towards women and athletics in most of the rest of the Greek world.

³⁶ Scanlon’s use of the Spartan girls being called “fillies” as evidence that “they belonged to ‘horse-herds’ in Archaic and Classical times” is less convincing (2002: 122). He notes examples from Alkman (1.59 *PMGF*) and Aristophanes (*Lys.* 1308-1313), but one could point to other instances (e.g., Anac. 417 *PMG*), in which women are analogized to horses without any indication of age-groups.

initiation commensurate with the boys' system.³⁷ The only actual evidence for competitive female athletics at Sparta is supportive of this claim: Pausanias reports (3.13.7) that eleven women, called “daughters of Dionysus” (Διονυσιάδας), participate in a footrace.³⁸ Pausanias has nothing concrete to say about the age of these women, though Calame has conjectured that Dionysus' role as a divinity of adult women indicates that this race was an initiatory and transitional rite (2001: 185-191). Scanlon notes the “striking formal and structural parallels with the *Heraia* at Olympia” and characterizes both as prenuptial rites (2002: 135); it should be cautioned, however, that the reference in Pausanias is the *only* reference to the footrace, and the specifics are quite tentative.

These three instances of female athletics, even with the caveat that the evidence is uncertain, point to some sort of tradition of female athletics, at least in some parts of the Peloponnese, which was connected with initiation, transition, and rites of passage. The characteristic element seems to have been a footrace, the “original” athletic contest at Olympia for men as well; even after the elaboration of the Olympics with other events, the winner of the footrace still gave his name to the four-year Olympiad (Miller 2004: 31). At Sparta, with a strong and early tradition of female athletics, ritual footraces do not seem to have developed into anything similar to the elaborate athletic festivals for men; *parthenoi* seem also to have been the only participants. Male athletics too, so it seems,

³⁷ Anecdotal evidence from antiquity characterizes Spartan education as a system designed with eugenic purposes: consider Gorgo's famous saying, that “only Spartan women give birth to men” (Plu. *Lacae.* 3.5; also cf. Plu. *Vit. Lyc.* 14.2).

³⁸ Raschke points to brief note in Athenaios (4.139f = Polykrates *FGrH* 581 F1) to the effect that *parthenoi* raced two-horse chariots during the Hyakinthia (1994: 172). The relevant text (αἴδ' ἐφ' ἀμίλλαις ἀρμάτων ἐξευγμένων πομπεύσιν “while others process on two-horse racing chariots”), however, is vague as to whether the girls raced the chariots or simply processed with them *prior* to the race. Jacoby obelizes ἀμίλλαις (*ad loc.*), and I am inclined to agree, especially given the sense of the sentence, which seems to discuss how women processed during the Hyakinthia, either carried in baskets or in chariots. Even if the chariots were ones used for racing, and we retain ἀμίλλαις, the grammar of the Greek does not necessitate this word as anything more than a description: “two-horse racing chariots” (as translated by Olson in the latest Loeb). The ancient evidence for the Hyakinthia is discussed by Bölte (1929: 132-141).

originates in ritual or initiatory rites (Golden 1998: 10-23; 104-116), but what sharply distinguishes male and female athletics in the late Archaic and early Classical period is the great elaboration of athletic festivals for men.³⁹ In the course of the sixth century, festival sites appear, the athletic program expands (from simply the *stadion* at Olympia in the eighth century, to the nearly complete Classical program by the end of the sixth century), prize games proliferate (the re-organization of the Panathenaia is only one example: *BNP* “Panathenaea”), and the prestige of victory, for *male athletes only*, is recognized both on site (victory statues emerge), in song (the development of the epinician ode), and by the *polis* (Mann 2001: 31-37; cf. Xenophanes *IEG*²fr. 2; Plu. *Sol.* 23.3).⁴⁰ Regardless of the bias of our sources, and the inaccessible mindset of ancient athletes of either sex, female athletics retained its sharply smaller, less elaborate character, with a program restricted in scope (both in potential participants and in events), and with an absence of the dedications that form the basis for athletic verse.⁴¹

The masculinity of the ancient athlete appears most strikingly in the way in which athletics measured (through the competition for victory) and displayed the body, which was, for the Greeks, always male, and always naked, in the athletic context.⁴² In fact, Steiner provocatively claims that athletics, “was an erotically charged ‘spectator sport’ which put beautiful bodies on display” (1998: 126; cf. 2001: 222-224). Her persuasive argument demonstrates the erotic quality of athletes’ bodies, and their representations in poetry, statuary, and vase-painting. At Olympia in particular, gender prefigured not only

³⁹ This complex and intricate question is beyond the scope of my study: see Scanlon 2002: 64-97.

⁴⁰ On the Solonian laws on athletics and the rewards to be given to victorious athletes, see Mann 2001: 68-81.

⁴¹ We are, for example, completely unaware as to how the *Heraia* was publicized (i.e., whether there was an *epangelia*), or how or whether female athletes at this festival were proclaimed by the herald.

⁴² The body continues to be central to evolving theoretical approaches to masculinity in the modern world as well (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994: 35-39)

the participants, who were male, but also the audience, which was restricted to men as well.

By the fifth century, athletic nudity was a fact of life across Greece as well as a key signifier of elite masculinity in action.⁴³ Hubbard draws our attention to the coupling, often, of contests explicitly about male beauty (the *euandria* and *euexia*: cf. Crowther 2004: 333-339) with more recognizably athletic contests (2002: 264; so too, Steiner 1998: 127).⁴⁴ While “beauty contests” of this sort did not feature at the Olympics, nevertheless, the conceptual contiguity of contests for beauty and more traditionally athletic contests implies a structural relationship between athletics and male beauty (e.g., Paus. 9.22.1, at Tanagra; Athenaios 13.565f).⁴⁵ Considering this continuity, Hubbard connects the gymnasium (*palaestra*, and thus athletics generally) to the symposium:

⁴³ “The Greeks did not entirely understand the origin or development of their [athletic] nudity” (Bonfante 1989: 556); they did, however, understand that nude exercise was limited to their culture (Scanlon 2002: 208-210), and nudity and athletics became part of a particular ethos connected to ideas of freedom and individuality (cf. Hdt. 1.10.3; Thuc. 1.6) – only Greeks marked their status by wearing nothing. Scanlon summarizes nicely: “the omnipresence of athletic nudity served as a hallmark of Greek culture and a symbolic display of civic self-sufficiency” (2002: 209). McDonnell analyzes Thucydides’ confusing remark that nudity had only recently been introduced to Greece (Thuc. 1.6.5; 1991: 189-190); Plato also gives some troublesome testimony on athletic nudity, which McDonnell demonstrates is indebted to Thucydides (*Resp.* 452c; McDonnell: 1991: 192). The famous *perizoma* vases, in which athletes have their genitalia covered by white loin clothes, have been convincingly explained as products specifically produced for the Etruscan market, where male nudity was taboo (*ABV* 343.3-6; McDonnell 1991: 186-188).

⁴⁴ Contests for female beauty existed in the ancient world as well: e.g., Alc. fr. 130b Voigt. While Libermann discusses where this contest takes place in order to determine the probably location of Alkaios’ exile (1999: 2.216), others have observed the correlation of Lesbos and female beauty contests in other contexts too (e.g., *FGE* 23; cf. Robert 1960: 313-315). We have, however, no ancient source that pairs female beauty contests with athletics.

⁴⁵ Crowther remarks that the prize for victors in both contests was similar to those given to victorious athletes; he concludes that the *euandria* and *euexia* (2004: 333) “are indeed athletic in that they required training and performance and were found at local agonistic festivals alongside the more traditional events”. Golden remarks on the persistence of the idea of the “body beautiful” and athletics in modern sports: curling, he argues, was derided as a potential Olympic sport because of the prevalence of middle-aged stars (1998: 49).

“[they] were both sites of male desire generated by looking upon the naked bodies of the young in their powerful but evanescent moment of physical glory” (2002: 266).⁴⁶

The easiest access to prospective audience response to athletic bodies is through their construction in Pindar’s epinicians. Not only does Pindar’s construction of desire offer access to the assumed attitudes of his audience, but we can read in Pindaric verse a normative quality. In the same manner as a vase-painter, who often includes a pair of eyes to model the appropriate response of the viewer, or an inscription calling the painted figure *kalos* (e.g., Frontisi-Ducroux 1995: 281-282; fig. 95 = *ARV*²322, 36), Pindar too sometimes includes a paradigmatic viewer (Steiner 1998: 140),⁴⁷ in *Olympian* 10, for example, at the end of the ode, Pindar describes his own vision of the victor (10.99-104):

παῖδ’ ἐρατὸν <δ’> Ἀρχεστράτου
 αἶνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶ
 βωμὸν παρ’ Ὀλύμπιον
 κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον
 ιδέα τε καλόν
 ὥρα τε κεκραμένον

I have praised the lovely son of of Archestratos,
 whom I saw winning with the strength of his hand
 by the Olympic altar
 at that time,
 beautiful of form
 and imbued with the youthfulness

⁴⁶ Despite some protestations that male nudity was regular outside the confines of the gymnasium (Hannah 1998), most scholars are content to agree that the penis, unsurprisingly, remained a provocative body part (Osborne 1997: 506). Fisher points to the obviously erotic quality of nude, oiled, sweaty athletes (2006: 236). He remarks that the place of elite and athletic masculinity at the apex of the social and political hierarchy of the fifth-century means that erotic delight was a socially legitimized and socially useful reaction to the male body (2006: 237). That is, sexual arousal from audience members of both sexes is not at odds with the elaboration of political power from athletic display.

⁴⁷ In this cup, attributed to the Onesimos Painter and dated to the first half of the fifth century, a youth on the tondo washes himself in the palaestra; the inscription reads κ[α]λός, ἔρχεται (*sic*). As Frontisi-Ducroux observes, the objects hanging in the background, sandals, an aryballos, a strigil, a cane, dictate the setting as the gymnasium (1995: 282).

Such a modeling of the desired reception of his victors need not take explicit form; Young suggests that Pindar's "I" statements should be read as proleptically normative, since "[he] suggests what intelligent people in general, often the *laudandus* in particular, do or ought to do" (1968: 58). While Pindar occasionally models a female response to victors (e.g., *P.* 9.97-100, 10.59), his projected audience, especially in those odes with an improvised (i.e., at the male-only athletic venue) or sympotic flavor must be men, a reflection of the symposium and athletics, especially at the male-only Olympic festival, as homosocial institutions (Hubbard 2002: 256).⁴⁸

Fisher argues that Pindar's depiction of athletes emphasizes, the "view that normal men of any age are powerfully aroused by the display of... exceptional male beauty" (1998: 227). In the oft-cited fr.123, an encomium to the boy Theoxenos, Pindar presents a perspective that sees Aphrodite residing in the παίδων νεόγυιον ἐς ἦβαν ("new-limbed youth of boys") (fr. 123.12).⁴⁹ While not athletic itself, the generic boundaries between encomium and epinician are vague (or perhaps non-existent) in the Classical period; we can discern in this fragment a model of the appropriate response to

⁴⁸ Sedgwick defines "homosocial" as "social bonds between persons of the same sex" (1985: 1). She hypothesizes that homosocial and homosexual function on a continuum, despite the appearance, in our own society, of a radical disruption between the two; much contemporary discourse on homosexuality seemingly demonstrates that homophobia is a necessary condition of "male-bonding" (1985: 4). As Sedgwick remarks, pointing to the Greek example, this need not be the case: "for the Greeks, the continuum between 'men loving men' and 'men promoting the interests of men' appears to have been quite seamless" (1985: 5). Important to my discussion is the concept that homosocial bonds can be affective and intricate, and that the strict demarcation between "sexual" and "Platonic", which characterizes most contemporary male interaction, does not apparently exist in the Classical Greek world, in which "sexualizing" a relationship does not necessarily change its content (1985: 6).

⁴⁹ Hubbard adduces the generalizing "I" of Pindar as part of his argument against a biographical reading of this fragment (2002: 257). Rather, Hubbard finds comparisons with the encomium of Theoxenos throughout the epinician corpus (esp. *P.* 11); he argues that the poem praises Theoxenos by forcing any reader of the poem, as well as the audience, to accord to the perspective that praises the phenomenal beauty of the boy: "the first-person indefinite statement speaks for the whole pan-Hellenic community of boy-lovers, including the many who have never seen Theoxenos" (2002: 259).

beautiful young men.⁵⁰ Considering the repeated attention drawn to boys' limbs in epinician (e.g., *O.* 8.68; *N.* 11.12; cf. Hubbard 2002: 264), particularly beautiful boys, the construction of desire for adolescents, and the expectation that this is a normal erotic response, seems to be presumed in the athletic audience.⁵¹ Throughout the Pindaric corpus, the beauty of an athlete is adduced as a form of praise, but also as proof of the integrity and transmission of ancestral *phya*; thus, desire, beauty, and social status intersect (Steiner 1998: 17): Epharistos (*O.* 9.111) has εὐχειρα (“quick hands”), δεξιόγυιον (“nimble legs”) and ὀρώωντ' ἀλκάν (“determination in his look”); Strepsiades' strength and shape are explicitly called on as proof of his nature (*I.* 7.22); Hagesidamos is both beautiful in form (*O.* 10.103: ἰδέα τε καλόν “beautiful of form”) but also endowed with the youthfulness familiar to viewers of Greek statues (*O.* 10.104: ὦρα τε κεκραμένον “imbued with... youthfulness”).⁵² Steiner goes further and suggests a connection between the Pindaric tendency to depict victory as a “God-given gleam” (1998, 138), and the radiance of youthful bodies covered in sweat, spit, and oil (*ibid.*).

As Nicholson reminds us, the desire for the body of a young man should also be read in the context of the widespread pederastic practices of Archaic and early Classical Greece (2000).⁵³ The prevalence of pederasty, however, does not mean that it was

⁵⁰ Harvey long ago demonstrated that generic distinctions such as we see in the manuscript tradition are Alexandrian inventions, and that praise poetry was not categorically distinguished in the fifth century (1955: 161-164; cf., Lowe 2007: 168).

⁵¹ Consider the reaction of onlookers to the appearance of Autolykos, a victorious athlete, in Xenophon's *Symposium*: the onlookers gaze at the young man, who appears “as a light in the night”, and transfixes them such that they feel the effects deep in their souls (*Symp.* 1.9: ἔπειτα τῶν ὀρώωντων οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἔπασχέ τι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπ' ἐκείνου “then no one of those looking did not suffer something with respect to his soul”).

⁵² Youthful athletes, as Instone reminds us, were especially sought after by older men as lovers (1990: 34): beauty and athletics offer “the special implication that the athlete was good for sex” (1990: 34). Scanlon too comments on the fundamental connection between athletics and sex, especially inasmuch as “athletes become lovers; spectators are erotically attracted to athletes” (2002, 201); he quite rightly underlines the importance of the placement of worship of Eros, as a deity, inside the gymnasium (2002, 201-219).

⁵³ Scanlon covers the scholarship on the development and spread of pederasty (2002: 64-95). By our earliest evidence (Scanlon 2002: 67), institutionalized pederasty appears in the seventh-century; its

unproblematic for Greeks; Hubbard argues persuasively that, in Athens at least, “pederasty was an ethical crux” (1998: 49), and something to which the average labourer, the bulk of the population, had little access (*ibid.*).⁵⁴ Whether or not we can extrapolate from Athenian evidence to the larger Greek world is a difficult issue; Plato points to the notion that Athenian attitudes towards pederasty were peculiar by the standards of other cities (*Symp.* 182a-183b; Hubbard, 1998: 72); Xenophon too remarks that legal practices with respect to pederasty differed widely among city-states (*Lac.* 2.12-14).⁵⁵ Rather, it seems appropriate to assume that in other *poleis*, especially in the first half of the fifth century, when oligarchies and Archaic aristocratic culture were more widespread and politically potent, pederasty was probably a less troublesome issue. The class character of pederasty is extremely difficult to discern, and it is unclear whether we can assume that a pederastic desire was common across social classes. The prevalence of pederastic practices in Pindar, whose poetry was meant, in all likelihood, to be performed at public occasions, seems to point to an expectation that pederastic desire might be present across audience social class and status.⁵⁶

Sexuality, sex, and gender persist as meaningful concepts throughout ancient athletics. Athletics, insofar as we can talk about competitive, complex sport, centred on

exclusion from Homer probably means that it was not a key component of elite society in the composition and performance context of the Homeric poems (*ibid.*).

⁵⁴ By this, Hubbard must mean the “enlightened” pederasty of Plato and his circle, not simply sexual intercourse with men, which could easily be a practice across classes.

⁵⁵ Cohen observes that legal prohibition does not necessarily mean social condemnation, nor does a lack of prohibition imply acceptance (1991: 174-175); nevertheless, as he concludes, the attempt, by Foucault and others, to generalize from a set of evidence from one Greek city should not cloud our perspective on the diversity of pederastic practices and responses to pederasty in the fifth-century.

⁵⁶ In this context, we should recall that older men often appear in painted scenes of athletes as trainers and judges of athletic ability but also, implicitly, because of their erotic interest; as Frontisi-Ducroux puts it, for viewers of figured scenes, an older man stands as a “spécialiste de l’attention et du voir” (1995, 127). The oft-cited fragment of Theognis (1335-36) is particularly apposite for our understanding of the relationship of trainer-pederasts and their youthful charges, as well as the notion that nudity is intrinsic to exercise, which is underscored by the verb γυμνάζομαι, “to exercise (in the nude)”.

festivals and the goal of victory, is masculine, since female sporting events, despite their widespread and early existence, were characterized differently. In this respect, masculinity underlies all athletic representation, since athletic verse is emphatically concerned with the representation of the victor's dedication; without the competitive ethos that characterizes masculine athletics, there can be no victory dedication. The underlying masculinity implicates athletic identities in Greek discourse on sexuality, especially since male athletes competed nude, and nudity signified, in representative art of the Archaic and early Classical period, the athlete (cf. Osborne 1997: 512; Steiner 1998: 132). The evidence does not permit an easy identification of a cross-class and pan-Hellenic attitude about pederastic or same-sex desire, but it is suggestive that responses of attraction and desire were expected, and thus homoerotic desire should be considered as part of the representation of the gendered identity of the athlete.

3.4: Socio-Economic Identities at the Olympic Games

Whereas ethnic, civic, and gendered identities appear in either the heraldic *angelia* or the prohibitory language of the Olympic festival, socio-economic status is not part of the explicit exclusionary practices of Greek athletics. Nonetheless, it is clear from the prosopographical record (Kyle 1987: 102-123), the leisure necessary for athletic training and participation (Crowther 2004: 32), and the ideology of athletics itself (Pleket 1976: 71-76) that socio-economic identity, implicitly, is present in athletic discourse.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Kyle 1987 uses the relatively large corpus of Athenian prosopographical evidence to determine athlete social status in the Archaic and Classical periods. While the origins of athletes change from old political families to "nouveau-riche", there is no doubt that prior to the Hellenistic era, at Athens, athletes (at least athletes who could dedicate or appear in the historical record) remained upper-class, whether defined monetarily or strictly by birth (1987: 118-123). Pleket argues for a continuous participation in athletics by aristocrats, even after their loss of a relative monopoly on athletic participation in the fifth century (1976: 72); in any case, the prevailing ideology of athletics, regardless of the social background of participants, remains aristocratic because of their continued participation right to the end of antiquity (1976: 74). I would

Such identities, whether economic classes or social statuses, differ significantly from sexual and political identities: while the latter are ideological concepts that derive, at least in part, from the material existence of differences – whether biological, linguistic, or cultural – class has no such ontology. Indeed, class and status, since they are doubly imaginary – doubly discursive – underscore the contingent and ideological status of the other two identities as well. While this highly ideological quality makes class and status hard to define, it also makes them extremely potent and malleable identifications. In order to analyze these concepts in athletic verse, I first argue for the relevance of economic-based identity (i.e. class) in antiquity. Furthermore, I posit that, despite their temporal distance from antiquity, Marxist analyses of class relations are applicable to the late Archaic and early Classical periods. Finally, I demonstrate that athletics, whether in the act of participation, or the ideology of elitism that prefigures it, was a socially-exclusionary practice in the Archaic and early Classical periods; this was especially so in the act of athletic dedication, the basis for athletic verse.

From the first extant piece of Greek political analysis, Aristotle's *Politics*, a wealth-based status was identified as a fundamental antagonism in Greek society.⁵⁸ Aristotle emphasizes the existence of wealth divisions in Greek cities: *μεγίστη μὲν οὖν ἴσως διάστασις ἀρετῆ καὶ μοχθηρία, εἶτα πλοῦτος καὶ πενία* ("perhaps the greatest division is between virtue and vice, after that the distinction between wealth and

add that the overwhelming elite monopoly on representation undoubtedly contributes to the prevalence of aristocratic ideology in athletic representation.

⁵⁸ Aristotle is somewhat temporally distant from my focus on Archaic and Classical material, but he still provides early evidence for the importance of wealth-based status to social conflict in the ancient world. Ste. Croix suggests that Aristotle's opinion on the primacy of class as an explanatory tool reflects the thinking of many Greeks (1981: 71-73): Plato, Xenophon, and the Oxyrhynchos Historian use the same categories of wealth as Aristotle, and earlier historians such as Thucydides and Herodotus, as well as pamphleteers like the 'Old Oligarch' did the same (Ste. Croix 1981: 73). In poetry too, Euripides has Theseus distinguish the citizen body into three groups, which are defined by wealth (Eur. *Supp.* 238-245).

poverty”) (1303 b7; cf. Ober 1991: 121); the fundamental connection between political, social, and economic disruption and material relations is also highlighted when he claims that πανταχοῦ γὰρ διὰ τὸ ἄνισον ἢ στάσις (“inequality is everywhere at the bottom of faction”) (1301 b26). Aristotle’s description does not accord exactly with a concept of class derived exclusively from the analysis of capitalism, and there are striking differences in how people lived in the Archaic and Classical eras, which are derived from their relationship to the means of production. Even in the absence of a true market of free wage-labour (the fundamental element for the organization of capitalism according to Marx, *MECW*: 35.178-180), and in a society in which most of the population owned rudimentary elements of production, Marxist analysis can still be productive. As Ober states, after all, the relationship between the individual and the means of production still diverged widely depending on income level: “the rich constitute a leisure class, living from the labor of others... [whereas] the ‘poor’...possess insufficient property to permit them a life of leisure” (1991: 118).⁵⁹ Thus, despite the radically different social and productive organization of ancient Greek society, the fundamental basis of Marxist analysis, that class, defined as a relationship to the means of production, furnishes a framework for social organization, remains, more or less, accurate.

Ste. Croix’s magisterial attempt to analyze the ancient world in Marxist terms begins from the meaning of class, which he defines as “essentially a relationship” and, in

⁵⁹ As Ober points out, the difference between upper-class and lower-class might be ownership of slaves, to which Aristotle alludes, quoting Hesiod: οἶκον μὲν πρῶτιστα γυναῖκά τε βοῦν τ’ ἀροτῆρα· ὁ γὰρ βοῦς ἀντ’ οἰκέτου τοῖς πένησιν ἔστιν (“get a first a house and a wife and an ox to draw the plough. The ox is the poor man’s slave”) (*Pol.* 1252 b9; cf. *Hes.Op.* 405; Ober 1991: 119). Peasants had the productive capacity to feed themselves and their family, but they are independent *oikoi*, in as much as they did not consume the productive capacity of others, whether free labourers, slaves or the producers of luxury goods. Only in rich households, and Ober (and Aristotle) includes here the so-called “middling” class, is the *oikos* of such wealth as to allow the habitual consumption of goods produced outside the *oikos* – that is, rich *oikoi* relied on the labour of others to support their luxury consumption (cf. Pritchard 2003: 302).

a specifically Marxist sense, “the social relations into which men enter in the process of production” (1981: 32).⁶⁰ Rose also emphasizes that “the centrality of the notion of exploitation... means that classes are inherently plural and relational” (2009: 469). Many other relations and structures, of course, may come into play in the organization of a society, and at times and to individuals these other structures may appear to be more or less important than the notion of class, but to a Marxist analysis of society, class is the material relation that “conditions the general processes of social, political, and intellectual life” (*MECW*: 29.263) – that is, class prefigures other relations, although it does not completely determine them (for Aristotle’s approximation of this formulation, see Ober 1991: 120).⁶¹

While the sociological analysis of class is not the focus of my project, I agree with the founding precept of Marxist analysis that class figures in the ideas, whether social, political, or literary, of a given epoch; the hierarchical relationships within class structures precondition these ideas, especially our reception of them: “the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class, which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force” (*MECW*: 5.59). To get beyond, however, a banal condemnation of economic structures (unfortunately present in Ste. Croix’s rigidly dogmatic approach; cf. Rose 1992: 27), I follow Rose in focusing on those aspects of class conflict that are “readily perceptible” and emergent in literary

⁶⁰ Social relations are at the heart of Marxist analysis; socially necessary labor-time is the core of the labour theory of value (*MECW* 35.48-58). Value relations between objects, as Marx so often points out, conceal social relations (35.67-68).

⁶¹ This last point deserves emphasis, since Marxist analysis has often been lambasted as problematically deterministic. In fact, Engels defends the non-deterministic interpretation of Marxism in a letter: “according to the materialist conception of history the determining element in history is *ultimately* the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted”; and also, “the political [conditions], etc... and indeed even the traditions which haunt human minds also play a part, although not the decisive one” (1942: 475-77).

creations: “ideological struggle over the bases for justifying or questioning the existing social, economic, political, and sexual hierarchy” (Rose 1992: 21).⁶² Considering my above description of class and social struggle as doubly ideological, in that they naturalize socially constructed difference – that people of different social statuses are different types of people – class and ideology (in the pluralistic, historical sense of Althusser) are inextricably connected to a much greater degree than ethnic, linguistic, civic, or gendered identities.

The critique of class ideology is crucial to the interpretation of ancient verse, especially since this literature largely represents, as we must constantly remind ourselves, the output (and perspective) of a very small, elite group of males.⁶³ This ruling class, Marx argues, does not simply “regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age” (*MECW*: 5.59), but they configure their particular situation and interests as if general: “[the ruling class] has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones” (*MECW*: 5.60). Later critics operating in the Marxist tradition have been open to this persuasive model as well as the influence of the elements of the “superstructure” on society.⁶⁴ Most important among these is Gramsci, who emphasizes the importance of persuasion (“hegemony”) in the power

⁶² For an illuminating review of Marxism and the classics, see Rose (1992: esp. 6-26). Ste. Croix, despite the massive size of his study, gives only a few pages to a critique of ideology (1981: 409-452).

⁶³ In discussing the political aims of the petty bourgeoisie of mid-nineteenth century France, Marx comments on the relationship of the political and literary representatives of a class and their class: the representatives imagine themselves in the same social position as the class they represent (*MECW*: 5.131). This is especially true when we examine the role of the poet, i.e., the perceived class of the *persona loquens*. In terms of demography, Pritchard surveys the literary and documentary evidence for classical Athens and concludes that the group of Athenians making up οἱ πλούσιοι (“the rich”) were no more than five percent; in the ancient Athenian mind, “over ninety-five percent of the citizen body were lumped into this last class [i.e., the poor] without differentiation and were considered to be homogenous in their distance from and antagonism toward ‘the wealthy’” (2000: 58).

⁶⁴ “Superstructure”, the elements which develop from the “base”, the foundation of a given society established on the relations developed by its mode of production (e.g., in capitalism the development of bourgeoisie and proletariat as a result of the capitalist mode of production; in the ancient Greek context, see Ste. Croix 1981: 115).

relations between dominant and dominated classes (1971: 12). While dogmatic critics focus on the brutal repression of workers and the physical dominance of ruling classes, Gramsci instead analyses the role of persuasion and “consent of the ruled”. Rose’s formulation of Gramsci’s thought is succinct: “culture for Gramsci is by its very nature an attempt at persuasion, a form of rhetoric” (Rose 1992: 30). Gramscian ideology has a dual function: “first, to persuade those subject to its [the dominant class’s] will of the inevitability...of their subjugation, and secondly, to enforce the dominant group’s discipline” (Rose 2006: 102).⁶⁵

Whether class ideology is necessarily relevant to athletic verse relies, of course, on the social status of athletes. Unsurprisingly, this has been a contentious issue, which has been embroiled with contemporary discussions of class, professionalism, and amateurism (see “Introduction: ‘Identity Politics’ in the Modern Olympic Games”): at the birth of the Modern Olympic movement, ancient athletes were understood as elites, “amateurs”, who did not earn money from their participation in the games, at least until the “vulgarization” of athletics that commenced with the introduction of so-called professionals in the Hellenistic period (Gardiner 1955 [1930]: 99-116; esp., 99: “the Nemesis of excess in athletics is professionalism, which is the death of all true sport”). While this modern myth has been debunked (Young 1984), the social class of ancient athletes continues to be debated (cf. Pritchard 2003: 293-300).

Young argues that the wholly aristocratic status of ancient athletes is a mirage of sources and modern bias (1984: 147-157); he contends that a model of progression, whereby victories in boys’ contests provided money for further training and travel, even

⁶⁵ Rose indicates the distinction between ideology and propaganda as well, citing Lévi-Strauss: “only a few lessons from Marx’s teaching have stayed with me – above all that consciousness lies to itself” (quoted by Rose 2009: 471).

for poorer athletes, was possible (1984: 158).⁶⁶ This idea, in theory, has been accepted by other scholars, though Pleket is keen to note, “possibilities are not the same as probabilities” (1992: 148). Mann situates Young’s theory as a reaction against the previously prevailing views of Gardiner (1910) and Harris (1972), who anachronistically argued for the existence of nineteenth-century “amateurism” in antiquity (2001: 13-20). Pleket too points out that the “athletic value-system betrays aristocratic predominance and prosopography supplies sufficient examples throughout antiquity of actual aristocratic participation” (1992: 141). Golden concurs, arguing that even if victory offered a chance to start a career from poor beginnings, “it remains the case nevertheless that we know of no classical Athenian athlete who followed this trajectory” (1998: 165; cf. Kyle 1987: 111-123).

Regardless of specific participants, the prevailing ideology of Greek sport was predicated on aristocratic and elite definitions: “the athletic programme itself, involving as it did contests of individual strength, speed and skill essentially unchanged from those narrated in the great heroic epics, recalled and reinforced an aristocratic milieu” (Golden 1998: 161).⁶⁷ Mann argues that athletics, especially the competitive drive to distinguish oneself, is part of a particularly aristocratic self-perception in Archaic and Greece (2001: 35-37); “Ruhmstreben” was characteristic of elites, whether in their athletic or political pursuits (Mann 2001: 14; cf. Ober 1989: 84-85).⁶⁸ Throughout epinician and epigrammatic verse, the ideology of the elite, which focuses on in-born and inherent

⁶⁶ Pleket remarks that money in the prize games should not be seen as wage, but as a gift: “money won was very relevant to these gentleman-athletes, money earned was not” (1992: 144).

⁶⁷ Golden elucidates the Herakles myth as an indictment of athletics as wage-labour – an inherently aristocratic position (1998: 146-156). See too, Kyle, who argues “athletes saw prizes as *dora*, not *misthos* – gifts, not wages, a matter of *kleos* not *kerdos* – grand glory, not greedy gain” (2006: 208).

⁶⁸ I should clarify that the evidence for this particular quality being associated with elites is, of course, the literature and monuments of elites themselves. In any case, since my project is interested in representation in dedication and literature, such self-perception *is* the reality of the dedicatory context.

talent, predominates.⁶⁹ There is a normative power to such an ideology: despite their actual socioeconomic background, lower class athletes (however many actually existed) may well have wished to identify with the aristocratic athletic ethos, or at least, to not actively challenge it (Pleket 1992: 151).⁷⁰ Ideology can be prescriptive as well: “hierarchical patterns and values persisted in Greek sport and society. Lower class athletes may have had reservations about competing against their social superiors” (Kyle 2006: 215). Normative and prescriptive power accords well with Gramscian ideology, since the prestige of the ruling class (or in this case, a ruling class activity) works to shape those outside the class itself. Whether this prescriptive power prevented lower-class athletes from participating, or forced them to represent themselves as if they were aristocratic, the point remains essentially the same: the represented athlete is strikingly elite.

Nicholson recognizes that the prescriptive and normative power of athletic ideology operates within the elite sphere as well (2005). His study focuses on the exclusions and absences from athletic poetry, in particular trainers, charioteers, and jockeys (2005: 3).⁷¹ By studying such exclusions, Nicholson argues that the victory

⁶⁹ Philostratus, though much later than the material that I consider, summarizes: ἡ γὰρ φύσις ἢ ἀνθρωπεία τὰς ἀρετὰς ἀσπάζεται μᾶλλον τὰς ἐκ πατέρων ἐς παῖδας διαδοθείσας, ὅθεν εὐκλεέστερος μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκης ὁ ἐξ Ὀλυμπιονικῶν οἴκου (“it is human nature to set a higher value on abilities that have been handed down from father to son. Therefore, the Olympic victor who comes from a family of Olympic victors is more glorious”) (VS 611; quoted in Golden 1998: 145). Kurke further stresses the intra-class competitive aspect of athletics: “competition at the Panhellenic games, largely limited to the nobility, who were thereby distinguished from their fellow citizens, provided a forum for aristocrats to vie for preeminence within their own class” (1991: 99).

⁷⁰ Though I stop short of Nash’s contention that admiration of athletic success and aristocratic ideals was prevalent in all classes of society (1990: 9); we simply have too little evidence to support such a conclusion.

⁷¹ Nicholson’s argument is most compelling when it comes to trainers (2005: 119-210). A person like Melesios (*O.* 8), who supposedly trained athletes to *thirty* victories, and yet is still presented as if he were a guest-friend of the victor’s, is hard to situate. Nicholson’s most interesting suggestion is the relationship of *N.* 5 and *Bacc.* 13: he argues that the increased role given to the Menander in the latter might indicate that the ode was commissioned by Menander himself (2005: 187).

memorial, whether inscribed or oral, exists so as to emphasize the victor and aristocratic message at the expense of the so-called professional, who was becoming more important to victory (2005: 62-63). Nicholson's argument, while suggestive, is strained on several fronts, most notably the lack of any positive evidence to attribute socioeconomic class to the trainers, jockeys, and charioteers who appear throughout the corpus of victory odes (cf. Young 1984: 147). After all, as I have remarked above, in Chapter 2.2, the origins of victory monuments, whether material or metaphorical, are difficult to discern. Nicholson, however, accepts the ancient dates for Olympia and assigns no role to the growth of athletic festivals generally in the sixth century (again, see above, Chapter 2.2). Despite my reservations concerning the main thrust of Nicholson's argument (i.e., that the origin of victory monument can be located in aristocratic anxiety), his contention that a prescriptive aristocratic ideology operated within the elite class is compelling; undoubtedly, poet or inscriber would have to account for the tension surrounding the participation, in athletics, of non-elites. Furthermore, Nicholson's recognition of an elite disdain for anything approaching a commodity mode of relations with trainers, jockeys, and charioteers is unprecedented and cogent (2005: 2-6).⁷² Regardless of the historicity of these economic relations, the rhetoric of athletic verse downplays these aspects in favour

⁷² Nicholson states that aristocratic opposition to commodity exchange "was so central to their identity that their use of professionals to secure athletic victories must have generated something of a crisis in their self-understanding". Nicholson uses "commodity exchange" casually; I am less comfortable doing so, especially since I have adopted a Marxist methodology, in which this phrase plays a key role. Commodities, in Marxist theory, consist in themselves of "use-values" and "exchange-values" (*MECW* 35.45); their function in societies is as "an object outside us, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another" (*ibid.*). The popular use of the term commodity to mean, uncritically, a "thing", is categorically not what Marx intends: "a thing can be useful, human labour, without being a commodity" (37.50-51). The commodity must "be transferred to another, whom it will serve as a use-value, by means of an exchange" (*ibid.*). Thus, to use commodity in the context of the poet-patron relationship implies the existence of a continuum of values intrinsic to the productive things of Greek society and it forecloses any potential understanding of the poet-patron or patron-victory relationship as anything other than a market-driven value-economy.

of the relationships exemplary of the aristocratic class, whether family, house, or guest-friend relations.

Whether in the actual record of participation in athletics, or the ideological mode of representation, in which elite status was a primary characteristic of the represented athlete's identity, class and status are implicit in the identification and representation of the athlete. While the *angelia* and the prohibitions at the Olympic Games do not specifically exclude lower-class athletes, the evidence suggests that, in practice, lower-class athletes were not able to participate; the structure of participation at a pan-Hellenic venue and the necessary wealth to attain victory, let alone dedicate a memorial, generated a *de facto* exclusion of all but the most wealthy inhabitants of the Greek world.

In this chapter, I have outlined the basis for my understanding of the interconnected concepts of identity and ideology, as well as the workings of ideological identification. Since ideology operates at the level of identity, selfhood, and subjectivity, I have argued for the relevance of socially-constructed identities, whether political, sexual, or socio-economic, to the interpretation of the athletic identities found in epinician and epigram. Considering the early prohibitory practices at Olympia, whereby non-male, non-Greek, non-elite athletes were restricted from participation, let alone victory, identity emerges as a fundamental concern of athletic verse. By outlining a historically contextualized concept of gendered, ethnic, civic, and class identity, and connecting this concept with current social and literary theory on identities, I have argued that a theoretically informed basis for identity and identifications can be of great relevance to our interpretation and contextualization of Greek athletic poetry. The continuity of

identities and the concern with the process of identification across epinician and epigram, orally-performed and written poetry, reinforces my contention that these different types of poetry, often regarded as generically distinct, constitute, medium aside, a continuous genre of athletic verse and dedication.

In the following five chapters, I move to the analysis of several epigrams and epinician odes. While my arguments in the following chapters are mostly philologically-inspired, nonetheless, the foundation which I have established in these opening chapters prefigures my interpretation of athletic verse. Throughout the subsequent chapters, I refer back to these opening arguments, and my perspective on the concepts of identity and identification and the relevance of contemporary social and literary theory to these concepts, underlies my discussion. The remainder of this dissertation, through a series of case-studies, implicitly argues that the interdependence of the theoretical and the philological contributes to a contextualized and novel interpretation of athletic verse, and ancient athletic identity.

Chapter 4: Arkadian Identity in Olympic Epigrams

The catalogue of Arkadian *tituli dedicatorii* in the first volume of *CEG* is short: Hansen categorizes 1.379-383 as Arkadian. Of these, 1.379 is in terrible shape, with most of the hexameter missing; 1.380 to 1.383 are better preserved, though 1.382 also suffers from damage that obscures the beginning of the hexameter and end of the pentameter. The provenance of 1.380-383 is clear: they were all found at Olympia and are today kept at the site museum (only 1.383, however, is on public display, in the Museum of the Olympic Games in Antiquity); 1.379's provenance is unknown, and today it is kept at the archaeological museum at Tegea (*ad loc. CEG*).

My analysis focuses on *CEG* 1.381 and 1.383, since they are definitely athletic epigrams and are largely complete.¹ In this section, I examine two Arkadian athletic dedications at Olympia in terms of two elements of the heraldic *angelia*: ethnic or *polis* identity, and age-category. These categories are part of the *angelia*, but, at Olympia, especially, they are more potent: claiming *polis* identity is particularly effective, since, as Nielsen observes, “when an athlete of a given community is attested as an Olympic victor, the implication is that the community to which he belonged had been visited by the Elean *theoroi* and was thus a political centre” (2004a: 108). Both epigrams, for boy-victors at the Olympic Games, also demonstrate the ideological capability of youthful

¹ The fragmentary *CEG* 1.379 is certainly athletic, since it mentions the Nemean games, but it has an uncertain provenance and an extremely lacunose state. *CEG* 1.380 does not have a good claim to athletic pedigree, as it does not include any of the words or phrases associated with athletic epigrams, nor does Praxiteles appear on the fragmentary Olympic victors' lists, or in Pausanias' description of victory dedications at Olympia. Despite this, Moretti argues that 1.382 is athletic (no. 267: “io no esterei a considerare K. un vincitore olimpico”) and dates the victory to ca. 460. Furthermore, Moretti categorizes the victor's city, Lepreon, as Elean (*ibid.*); in contrast, Hansen states that the presence of *heta* suggests an Arkadian epigram (*ad loc.*). Lepreon's regional affiliation is hard to pin down; at times it is under Elean control, and in the fourth-century it is part of the emerging Triphylian state that eventually merges with the Arkadian Confederacy (Nielsen 2006).

victories, which reflected glory onto the athlete, but also his father and city; in this sense, the victories of boys are implicitly located in the discourse of their family's political community. Therefore, these Arkadian epigrams are exemplary of how athletic epigrams can represent the identity of the victor, but also how individual claims of identity can act reciprocally on groups (and produce or reinforce identity), whether at the *polis*, *ethnos*, or regional level.

4.1: Arkadia: *Ethne* and *Poleis*

Unlike other regional groupings of Greece in the Archaic and early Classical period, Arkadians were understood, both internally and externally, to constitute what we might call an ethnicity (Nielsen 2002: 115; cf. 1999: 15-18); this seems to have been especially the case from the perspective of non-Arkadians, who frequently use the ethnic Ἀρκάς “to indicate the ethnicity of the people described by the ethnic” (Nielsen 1999: 27), as opposed to any political identity.² As Nielsen points out, not only is the ethnic used, but the collective Ἀρκάδες is common from the earliest literature onwards (e.g., *Il.* 2.611, 7.134; Nielsen 1999: 22).³ Nielsen observes that such “etic” (that is, external to the group in question) labels may have particular resonance at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries such

² Nielsen stresses that a permanent common political union of Arkadians did not exist in the Archaic or early Classical period (2002: 121-142); a temporary alliance against Sparta probably existed (with the exception of Mantinea), but only in the period 479-465 (2002: 144; cf. *Hdt.* 9.35). Pan-Arkadian sentiment did have a place in Arkadia prior to the establishment of the Arkadian confederacy, as coins with the legend ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ have been found, though the identity of the minting organization is uncertain (Nielsen 1999: 22; see Williams 1965). With respect to the ethnic, Nielsen remarks that although civic subdivisions (normally *phylai*) are found in Arkadian *poleis*, these never become part of the personal name on the model of the Attic demotic (1996: 131). Rather, city-ethnics are used as the political part of the name when necessary, which Nielsen terms “an extremely good indication of the *polis*-ness of the site from whose toponym the ethnic is derived” (*ibid.*).

³ Arkadians were also amongst the suitors of Agariste (*Hdt.* 6.127.3), to which Hall attaches great importance for Hellenic status (2002: 156-157). In a lesser-known foundation story for the Olympics, Pindar reports that two Arkadians, from Tegea and Mantinea respectively, were amongst the first victors (*O.* 10.67-70). The idea that Arkadians were among the earliest users of Olympia is supported by archaeological evidence as well (Morgan 1993: 21-22).

as Olympia (1999: 31): epigraphic material from or by Arkadians is sparse, but the existence of the ethnic on Tellon’s dedication at Olympia (*CEG* 1.381, see below, Chapter 4.2) and in an inscription reported by Pausanias (5.27.2: Φόρμις Ἀρκᾶς Μαινάλιος “Phormis the Arkadian from Mainalos”) may point to a particular use of the regional-ethnic, in concert with a personal name, outside Arkadia-proper and in sites open to multiple ethnicities (Nielsen 1999: 24).⁴ In contrast to other Greek sub-divisions such as the Dorians or Ionians, the Arkadians are, from the earliest literary references up to the historical period, connected to a specific geographical region (Nielsen 1999: 16). Since ancient and modern conceptions of ethnicity are intimately linked to common descent and territory (Hall 1997: 25), as well as internal and external labeling (cf. Eriksen 2010: 15-16), the Arkadians are eminently suitable to be called an ethnic group.

The extensive evidence for a regional identity coincides with a myth of common origin for the Arkadians, and common cultural traits that are tied to Arkadian identity. Unlike many other sub-divisions of Greeks, the Arkadians do not figure into the significant “Hellenic Genealogy”, which came to prominence in the sixth and early fifth centuries (Hall 2002: 154-168). The ancestral hero of the Arkadians, the eponymous Arkas (Paus. 8.4.1), is a descendent of the similarly eponymous Pelasgos (Hdt. 1.146), but this is “a lineage... with no connections to the Hellenic stemma” (Hall 2002: 171). From the perspective of this genealogy, the Arkadians were part of Greek mythical history but their exact relation to Hellenic descent was unclear. The shared, and idiosyncratic, myth of descent also coincides with an Arkadian claim to autochthony: in

⁴ Indeed, the last clause of this reported inscription (“now of Syracuse”) may point to the use of *Arkas* in a context in which an Arkadian has moved away from Arkadia. Nielsen clarifies that Ἀρκᾶς is almost never found inside Arkadia in the fifth century, while Ἀρκάδες is frequently found internally and externally (1999: 31).

some versions of the story, Pelasgos was supposed to have been born from the earth, though this may represent later rationalizing of different mythic traditions (Nielsen 1999: 32-36, offers a complete summary of the myths). Culturally too, the Arkadians were thought of as different from most Greeks: Thucydides tells us that they never experienced the waves of immigration that characterize most regions of Greece and Greek peoples (Thuc. 1.2.3); the famous Delphic oracle that called the Arkadians βαλανηφάγοι “acorn-eaters” (Hdt. 1.66) refers either to their own myths of origin or to their antiquated dietary habits (Nielsen 1999: 35).⁵ In any case, their claim to autochthony, endemic myths, and odd habits seemingly reflect the general attitude in the Classical period of “the extreme antiquity that was attributed to the Arkadian people” (Nielsen 1999: 35).

In concert with this regional identity and its apparent existence in mythical traditions dating to the Archaic and Classical periods, another distinctive Arkadian element is political, that is, the existence of *ethne* (called such at Str. 8.8; Nielsen 2004: 508);⁶ in the Classical period, there were four *ethne*, the Eutranians, Kynasians,

⁵ Commentators on Herodotus have seen this as the historian’s first use of the *topos* of primitivism, especially with respect to the comparison of foes (Asheri et al. 2007: 128). This becomes more developed when Herodotus turns to the Persians, whom he contrasts with their Lydian enemies (Asheri et al. 2007: 132).

⁶ *Ethnos* is often used in modern scholarship to refer to a supposedly pre-*polis*, “tribal” formation that was an atavism by the end of the fifth-century (McInerney 2001: 53). More recent scholarship, influenced by Barth’s work on ethnicity and boundaries (1969), has revealed the Eurocentric and colonial assumptions behind this hierarchical understanding of *ethne* (McInerney 2001: 54). The *ethnos*, instead, should be understood as a different, though not hierarchically subordinated, form of political organization; multiple, overlapping and complementary identities are possible, and *ethnos* identification is simply one of the possibilities (see further, McInerney 2001: 59). As Roy observes (1996: 107), the *ethnos* is a non-hegemonial association, which could fluctuate (as the Triphylian example demonstrates) over time. Despite our inability to ascertain the internal workings of *ethne*, Roy remarks that *ethne* are sometimes listed as equals with “independent” *poleis* such as Mantinea and Tegea (e.g., *IG* V 2.1; 1996: 108); the major Arkadian *poleis* never appear in lists of Arkadian *ethne* (Nielsen 1996: 132). Roy concludes that the traditional perspective, which holds that *poleis* developed after *ethne*, cannot be sustained, especially in areas such as Arkadia (1996: 110). Nielsen too points to the contemporary appellation of these “tribal groupings” as *poleis*, which demonstrates that they were not a sort of atavism in the fifth-century (1996: 132).

Mainalians, and Parrhasians.⁷ This type of regional community was largely confined to the south-west of Arkadia (Morgan 2003: 42).⁸ In other areas, such as in central Arkadia and to the north, larger *poleis* like Tegea and Mantinea held sway over extensive rural holdings (the *great poleis* of Arkadia, according to Ps. -Skylax 44, were Mantinea, Tegea, Orchomenos, Heraia, and Stymphalos).⁹ To the west and northwest, minor *poleis* seem to have predominated; the border in this area, between Arkadia and Elis, was particularly unstable and exacerbated by the lack of any significant physical barrier between the two regions (Roy 2000: 133; Nielsen 2004: 505). This border was to change continually throughout the Archaic and Classical periods; the greatest change was in the early fourth-century when a new ethnic unit, the Triphylians, emerged (see Nielsen 2006: 75-76). By the middle of the fourth century, the Triphylians had been absorbed into the Arkadian Confederacy, which supports the malleability of ethnic identities in this part of the Peloponnese.¹⁰

Politically, Arkadia remained fragmented in the sixth and fifth centuries. *Ethne* and *poleis* were the dominant forms of social organization, although it is unclear what political role *ethne* had, and whether villages that were part of *ethne* should be

⁷ Another *ethnos*, the Azanians, existed prior to the fifth century (Str. 8.88) and the Parrhasians too, who appear in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.608). Roy concludes that “tribal identity” probably preceded *polis*-organization, but he admits the evidence is sparse and his conclusions uncertain (1996: 110).

⁸ Morgan conjectures that this may have more to do with our sources, which are interested in the synoikism of Megalopolis from these *ethne*, rather than an actual distinctive and regionally-confined phenomenon. While the selectiveness of our evidence is a problem, Nielsen concludes that there is nothing from antiquity to suggest *ethne* ever existed for the great *poleis* of Arkadia: Mantinea, Tegea, Heraia, Stymphalos and Orchomenos (Nielsen 1996: 132).

⁹ Nielsen, with reference to the Mainalian *ethnos*, suggests that such *ethne* may have been a result of pressure from the “great *poleis*” of Arkadia (1996: 143). It is likely that the Mainalians believed in some common ancestor or myth of descent, but geographical proximity to each other as well as to the dominant *poleis* of Arkadia probably also provided the impetus to form some sort of regional community.

¹⁰ In any case, despite this tenuous border with Elis, a belief in a concrete ethnic distinction between Elis and Arkadia persisted throughout antiquity (as indicated in Pausanias’ handling of the two; cf. Roy 2000: 136). On the relationship between the Eleans and their various subordinate communities through the Archaic and Classical periods, see Roy 1997.

considered, strictly speaking, as *poleis*.¹¹ Roy notes the “fundamental difficulty” is that in our surviving evidence we have no trace of how or why an *ethnos* took political decisions, or any trace of a transaction between *ethnos* and member-community (1996: 108); Nielsen concludes, “the internal structure of the tribal states [*ethne*] is largely unknown” (1996a: 105).

The best evidence is for the Mainalian *ethnos*, which was extant in the fifth and fourth centuries, to which both Thucydides (5.6.4.3), and the participation of the *ethnos* in the foundation of Megalopolis in the early fourth century attests (Paus. 8.27.3, who names its cities as Alea, Pallantion, Eutaia, Soumateion, Asea, Peraithea, Helisson, Oresthasion, Dipaia, and Lykaia; see Nielsen 1996: 134-138). At least one of its constituent cities could be referred to as a *polis*: Oresthasion, for example, is called a *polis* by Pherekydes (*EGM* 135) and Euripides (*El.* 1273-75), and is also part of the Mainalian *ethnos* according to Thucydides (5.6.4.3). Herodotus names the city as well (Hdt. 9.11.2), and Thucydides also provides the name of its surrounding *chora*, the Ὀρεσθίς (Thuc. 4.134.1); in addition, as *CEG* 1.381 demonstrates, athletes who went to the Olympics could dedicate as citizens of Oresthasion.¹² Pausanias also records a *polis* with the name of Mainalos, which was a *polis* “in ancient times” (Paus. 8.2.3), but its location is uncertain, and Nielsen includes it in his list of unattested Arkadian *poleis* (2004: 507). In other *ethne*, there is some evidence of actions that we might associate

¹¹ Nielsen surmises that *poleis* vested their foreign affairs in *ethne*, since it was as *ethne* that they joined larger regional bodies (such as the fourth-century Arkadian Confederacy) or alliances (e.g., of the Parrhasians with the Mantineans, see Thuc. 5.33), but this must remain only an assumption (1996a: 100).

¹² Nielsen reads more evidence in Thucydides to imply that *some* Mainalians were part of the Mantinean “empire” in the Peloponnesian War period, and *others* fought against Mantinea alongside Tegea (1996: 135). The only conclusion from this evidence is that different *poleis* within the Mainalian *ethnos* were acting independently, and thus have a claim to *polis*-status. Nielsen concludes that Thucydides (5.81.1) calls the allies of the Mantineans *poleis*, and that Thucydides’ usage of the term is to designate “the political centre of a city-state” (Nielsen 1996: 135).

with *polis* status: for example, dedicating on their own behalf at Delphi (e.g., Kortys, *SEG* 11, 1168; Nielsen 1996a: 102). Some *ethne* issued coins for their members (e.g., the Parrhasians: Nielsen 1996a: 102), and on the other hand, some *poleis* that were members of *ethne* issued individual coinage (e.g., Mainalian Pallantion: Nielsen 1996a: 102).

4.2: Dual Identity in Tellon's Epigram (*CEG* 1.381)

Ἰ Τέλλον τόνδε, ἄνεθεικε Δαέμονος υἱὸς ὁ πύκ]τας
Ἄρκας Ὀρεσθάσιος παῖς δ [υυ|—υυ—].¹³

Tellon the son of Daemon a boxer dedicated this,
an Arkadian Oresthasian and boy...

Tellon's inscription has been found reasonably intact at Olympia, embedded in the east Byzantine wall erected near the southern portion of the Altis (Hyde 1912: 211).

Pausanias saw the dedication, and observed that it was next to the dedication of another Arkadian, the Mantinean boy boxer Epikradians:

Λυκῖνον δὲ Ἡραιέα καὶ Ἐπικράδιον Μαντινέα καὶ Τέλλωνα Ὀρεσθάσιον καὶ Ἡλεῖον Ἀγιάδαν ἐν παισὶν ἀνελομένους νίκας, Λυκῖνον μὲν δρόμου, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κατειλεγμένους πυγμαῖς

Lykinos the Heraian, Epikradians the Mantinean, Tellon the Oresthasian, and Agiadas the Elean won victories as boys: Lykinos in running, the rest in boxing.

(Paus. 6.10.9).

According to Hyde's reconstruction, the dedication originally stood in a prominent location between the Heraion and the *Nike* of Paionius (1912: 220).

The inscription is on a marble base for a bronze statue, presumably of a youth, which would have been dedicated soon after the victory of Tellon, which is dated to 472 (Moretti no. 231). Jeffrey is unsure whether to classify the script as Arkadian or Elean,

¹³ For a full epigraphic apparatus, see Hansen *ad loc.*

since she notes that the two are virtually identical (1990: 208; Hansen concurs, *ad loc.* *CEG* 1.381). Luraghi argues that script and dialect, however, must be combined to see the true linguistic map of the Peloponnese (2010: 83-85). That is, while the dialectically similar regions of the Peloponnese utilize widely divergent alphabetic scripts, those areas whose dialects already diverge use rather homogenous scripts: it is the combination of script and dialect that serves to delineate the ethnic and linguistic (not to mention political) regions of the Peloponnese. Considering these arguments, it is suggestive that the specificity of identity appears in an epigram from an area of homogenous orthography, and thus this specificity may, in part, have been triggered by the lack of any distinction simply through script. In any case, there is nothing in the dialect or phrasing of the epigram to identify ethnicity positively, though this is likely a result of the limited vocabulary of the epigram, rather than a lack of dialectical distinctions.

The first three quarters of the hexameter, including the victor's name, are clear, and the remaining end of the word πύκτας provides enough for a reasonably certain reconstruction (especially in concert with Pausanias' testimony regarding Tellon's event). In the pentameter, the important beginning of the line, providing the ethnic Ἀρκάς and the city-ethnic Ὀρεσθάσιος has been preserved, as has the description παῖς, which provides the evidence for Tellon's age-category. The end of the pentameter is missing, and while Hansen does not posit a reconstruction, Ebert suggests Δι[ὸς | ἄθλον ἐλόν] ("he seized Zeus' prize"), for which he cites parallels (Ebert 1972: 66).¹⁴ Of further interest is the fact that the inscription has been copied at some point in antiquity, a

¹⁴ Ebert argues against a phrase such as ἀπὸ πυγμαχίας ("from boxing"), on the grounds of the absence of any surviving inscriptions with such language (1972: 65); Hansen also thinks this language is unlikely, given the traces of a Δ on the stone, and the prosody (*ad loc.* *CEG* 1.381). The surviving parallels for Ebert's phrase are few: he adduces an epigram from the *AP*, which uses a similar phrase (13.19.3, 13.19.6; cf. Ebert no. 26), and a later inscription from Olympia (Ebert no. 49.3 = *CEG* 2.862).

fortunate occurrence, since the name of the victor in the original inscription has been lost.¹⁵ The text of the dedication is short and conventional with its inclusion of the victor's name, father's name, the event, his *polis*; age-category was likely a standard element of epigrams (and the *angelia*) for boy-victors.¹⁶ The inclusion of both regional and civic-ethnic (*Arkas* and *Oresthasion*), however, is extremely unusual, and does not reflect the heraldic proclamation at Olympia; the epigram is exemplary of the way athletic verse appropriates the form of the *angelia*, but represents it in the heraldic mode of representation, which can be modified and manipulated (see Chapter 2.1).

Oresthasion, which the epigram lists as Tellon's *polis*, was one of the settlements that make up the *ethnos* of Μαινάλος. Thucydides (5.64) and Pausanias (8.21.3) place Oresthasion within the Mainalian *ethnos*, but Euripides, in both *Orestes* (1643-1647) and *Electra* (1273-1275) recognizes it as part of Parrhassion.¹⁷ While its location has been tentatively identified near the modern town of Anemodouri, southeast of Megalopolis, to which it contributed settlers and an oikist when that city was founded in 370 (Paus. 8.27.3), geography offers little to support either identification:¹⁸ the site, in the upper Alpheos valley, is not especially close to the Parrhasian sanctuary of Zeus Lykaios (despite Eur. *El.* 1274, which says it is πλησίον “nearby”) or Mount Mainalos, whence that *ethnos* gets its name. The city was known as a staging ground for the mustering of

¹⁵ The later inscription (ca. 1st century A.D.: *ad loc.* CEG) is in clearer lettering and the versification of the epigram is respected (Ebert 1972: 66). There is very little interest on the re-inscription in the epigraphic scholarship, aside from its dating.

¹⁶ Category, not chronological age; Crowther suggests that Pausanias may have read the age of Damiskos of Messene (2004: 89). I am aware of no extant inscriptions or epigrams that show a victor's age in the Archaic or Classical period, and the source of Pausanias' information must, I think, remain a mystery.

¹⁷ Willink discusses the discrepancy, though he concludes that Oresthasion, while not in Parrhasia proper, was not too far away to be considered among its outlying settlements (1986: 354). A look at a map of the area, however, is revealing: Oresthasion is separated from Parrhasia by the entirety of the Alpheos River Valley, where Megalopolis (on the Helissos) will eventually be founded.

¹⁸ Excavations on the hill-top near Anemodouri have uncovered sherds dating from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period, and the hill probably represents the acropolis of ancient Oresthasion (Pikoulas 1988: 102-104).

troops of the Peloponnesian League in antiquity, and the modern city's location near the E65, the major highway through the southern Peloponnese, attests to its convenient geography. In fact, it may be that the convenient travel offers some explanation: perhaps Oresthasion's Mainalian identity was effected, despite distance, by the ease of travel along the roads and river valleys leading north towards and beyond Tegea. In this case, the Euripidean mishandling of Oresthasion's *ethnos* affiliation may simply be a result of non-Arkadian unfamiliarity with the *ethne* system.

Oresthasion played a minor role in Greek myths: Orestes supposedly founded the city, or at least the city was named after him (Eur. *El.* 1273-175; *Or.* 1645-1647). Pausanias records two foundations: the first, under the name "Oresthasion", founded by Orestheus the son of Lykaon (8.3.1); the second, under the name "Oresteion", after Orestes (8.3.2). The confusion of traditions surrounding the city's foundation goes back at least to Pherekydes, whom the scholia cite as an authority for Orestes' foundation of the city (*schol. ad Eur. Or.* 1645 = *FGrH* 3 F 135; Willink 1986: 354).

Pausanias reports a story about the people of Oresthasion aiding refugees from Phigalia, in accordance with a prophecy at Delphi (8.39.4): a hundred Oresthasians fought against Spartan invaders with the Phigalians to secure their freedom – a common tomb of these soldiers was apparently visible in the Phigalian marketplace (8.41.1). By the time of Pausanias' travels, however, the city itself had been abandoned and was in ruins (8.44.2). Huxley suggests that the famous incident of Orestes' bones (*Hdt.* 1.67.5-1.68.6) probably occurred closer to Oresthasion than Tegea, despite Herodotus' report (1979: 145-148).

While the epigram records Tellon's city-ethnic as Ὀρεσθάσιος, the victor list found on *P. Oxy* II 222 identifies him as Mainalian (col. i, line 29); this striking discrepancy is at the heart of my analysis, since local and regional identities, while concurrent, are not necessarily coterminous. It seems that for some later writers, possibly working from the list of victors recorded by Hippias of Elis, Oresthasian and Mainalian could be synonymous, which might reflect an alternative source for Olympic victors' information, or confusion on the part of non-Arkadians as to how Arkadian *ethne* functioned. Different identities, of course, have different holds over individuals, whether political, legal, or emotional; the imprecision of later writers should not obscure the very real distinction of these identities for contemporary Arkadians.

Since Arkadia was not a federated state in the fifth century, the political affiliation of Oresthasion has been troublesome to modern scholars too: Pikoulas argues that it was a Lakonian *perioikoikic* settlement (1988: 157-160), but Forsén, mostly on the basis of *CEG* 1.381, regards it (and Tellon) as Mainalian (2000: 46, n46). Ancient writers offer little help: Thucydides identifies the city simply as “Mainalian Oresthasion” (4.134) – whether Mainalian in this case is to be understood as a political or ethnic identifier (or both) in addition to Oresthasion is unclear.

Regardless of the political hegemony under which Oresthasion was situated, Tellon (or his patron) seems to have regarded himself as Arkadian by virtue of the use of the ethnic Ἀρκάς.¹⁹ The difficulty in Forsén's argument, which stresses the importance of a Mainalian affiliation, is that it is based on the notion that Tellon “once is described as an Oresthasion and once as a Mainalian” (*ibid.*). He fails to consider that the Oxyrhynchos

¹⁹ Tellon's is the *only* certain epigraphic use of the ethnic in the fifth century. The context external to Arkadia is probably of consequence, as Nielsen remarks (1999: 24).

list, even if it is based off Hippias of Elis' work, was compiled in the early fourth century (Christesen 2007: 46-47; see Chapter 2.1); the various changes in political affiliations in the fifth and early fourth centuries may be reflected in Hippias' assessment of Tellon's ethnicity – he is not, as Forsén implies, described *at one and the same time* as Oresthasian and Mainalian.²⁰ Rather, *his own* epigram characterizes him as an Oresthasian (and an Arkadian), whereas the work of an Elean historian a century or so later describes him as Mainalian. As such, I take the evidence of the epigram seriously, and agree with Nielsen's remark: "the victor himself seems to have placed emphasis upon his being an Oresthasian" (2002: 293).

In the dedication of this statue and inscription, as well as ancient (and modern) readings and receptions, we can discern the importance (and complexity) of Tellon's political and regional identity. Day argues that Tellon's epigram is exemplary of the generic origin of athletic epigrams in the herald's *angelia*: "the hexameter presents three elements of the *aggelia*: victor's name, father's name, and event. The pentameter adds political identity and age category" (2010, 204). The relationship between an epigrammatic proclamation and the herald's actual proclamation, however, is not the straightforward re-presentation of an utterance. Day leaves unexamined the *double* political identity that exists in this epigram, but which was not a component of the

²⁰ Hippias' catalogue of victors must also be considered in its socio-political context: Elean control of its hinterland as well as the Olympic sanctuary itself was threatened by Spartan attack in the early fourth century (Christesen 2007: 54-55). Christesen situates Hippias' work in the context of justifying and locating Elean control of Olympia in the distant past (2007: 57-62). His work likely accounted for contemporary Elean claims to their hinterland; Pausanias, for example, remarks that the Eleans forced Lepreate victors (from the disputed Triphylian region) to declare themselves as Lepreates *from* Elis (Paus. 5.5.3). The political nature of ethnic identities may be reflected in the inconsistency concerning Tellon's origin; alternatively, the Oxyrhynchos list may simply demonstrate the changing nature of such identities over time. Christesen points to the fact that *P. Oxy* II 222 is dated to the third century CE (203); at this time, Oresthasion was no longer a *polis* (Paus. 8.44.2), but Mainalian may have still had resonance as part of the *polis* of Megalopolis.

herald's actual proclamation of victory. The ephemeral *angelia*, after all, had no reified existence; in contrast, Tellon's epigram, and the heraldic representation inherent in it, preserves a modified and manipulated version of the *angelia*, which attests to the *polis* status of Oresthasion, and inaugurates the representation of a history of visits by the Elean *theoroi*.

Tellon's epigram celebrates a boys' victory, and Golden suggests that the increasing popularity of boys' contests across the Greek world came from their ability to provide further opportunities for victory for the same elite families who managed, organized, and participated in athletic festivals (1998: 109).²¹ Boys' victories were not a sort of "junior circuit", which was disparaged in contrast to competitions in the *andres* category; in fact, our evidence indicates that boy victors received the same symbolic prize at Olympia, and that similar civic awards were given to victors of any age-category (Golden 1998: 111).²² Therefore, boys' victories were able to play the same social and political role as victories by adults; the only distinction, of course, was that the victor probably had less control over the promotion and celebration of his victory, which, we must imagine, was in the hands of his father or another family figure.²³ Since the epigram

²¹ While competitions for boys did not begin at Olympia until 632 (Paus. 5.8.9; Golden 1998: 104), boys' athletics proliferated around Greece after this date. Golden adduces some statistics to support his model of local elite motivation for the increase in the number of competitions: he compares, for example, the proportion of Elean victors in the *andres* category at the Olympics (10.5%) with the number of Elean victors in the *paides* category (22.5%; 1998: 107). Conversely, at relatively distant Delphi, Elean boy-victors represent a paltry one of the fifteen known victors (Golden 1998: 108).

²² The *paides* category probably included youths from 12-17 (Golden 1998: 105), though the evidence for specific ages is slim. At other competitions there were more age-classes than the two at Olympia; the *ageneioi* ("beardless youths"), for example, were an intermediate category at the Nemean and Isthmian Games, which probably included young men in their late teens (Golden 1998: 104-112).

²³ There is evidence to suggest that mothers showed interest in their sons' athletic successes too: Pausanias relates the story of the athlete Deinolochos, who only started practicing athletics after his mother dreamed of his success (Paus. 6.1.5); Pindar too alludes to maternal happiness at the success of a young athlete, when he sings of the lack of light laughter from a mother's lips as the lot of the loser (*P.* 8.83-87). Many young victors were probably accompanied to Olympia and other far-flung festival sites by a retinue of male relatives, including fathers, uncles, and prominent familial allies (Golden 1998: 108). Victory also ran in

records an unusual dual identity, which would have likely had to be insisted upon by the person in charge of commissioning the statue and inscription, we should consider the two political identities (*Arkas* and *Oresthasion*) in concert with the involvement of individuals beyond the victor.

Tellon's epigram reflects a modulated and politically potent version of the *angelia*; whatever the actual words of the herald's proclamation, the inscribed and recorded epigram simultaneously stresses regional identity (*Arkas*) and *polis* identity (*Oresthasian*): it represents Oresthasion as an Arkadian political centre, in which the *theoroi* of the Eleans were received. The epigram takes advantage of the narrative possibilities of the genre in order to evoke a possibly imaginary landscape (of Oresthasion) and history (of the village's reception of the Eleans) at the same time as this landscape and history place it among the *poleis* of the Greek world (on par with Elis, Athens, Sparta, etc.). As readers and viewers of the statue and epigram read aloud the inscribed verses, they performed a proclamation, including a double-identity, which likely never took place; instead, the inclusion of both regional and *polis* identity points to Tellon's (or more likely his father's) interest in promoting a particular type of identity, predicated on the possibilities of the Arkadian approach to political organization (a sort of unofficial federated identity), and the insistence on the *polis* status of the villages that made up the *ethne* of the Arkadian region (perhaps directly contradicting the ignorance of non-Arkadians). The simplified version of this identity in the Oxyrhynchos victors' list may point to a lack of acceptance of double identifications, or, more probably, the inability of non-Arkadians to understand the Arkadian political situation.

families, as the example of the extraordinary success of the family of Diagoras of Rhodes demonstrates: Diagoras himself was a *periodonikes* in boxing, his three sons won Olympic victories in boxing and pankration, and his grandsons were also Olympic boxing champions (Paus. 6.7.1-7).

My interpretation of Tellon's dedication underscores that epigrams can participate in the process of civic and ethnic identification, and are not simply representations (or, as Day would have it, *re*-presentations) of identity. That the context of this act of identification is the Olympics should come as no surprise: modern theorists stress the situational salience of ethnicity, and in particular, the new (or revived) potency of ethnic identification outside of home or community (Fenton 1999: 108; especially at places where different ethnicities interact). By using the city and regional ethnic, and thus narrating the *polis*-status of Oresthasion in an imagined past, the epigram takes advantage of the narrative possibilities of athletic verse to make it appear as though the Oresthasian *polis* existed, received envoys, and must merely be referred to in this epigram; the epigram actually participates in the representation (and thus generation) of this *polis* status, but this creative aspect – the inter-connections between representation, reality, and ideology – is effaced at the moment of inscription.

Participation in the Olympics was, for the individual, *the* act of Hellenic self-identity, and for a *polis*, *the* act of political autonomy. By reifying the political status of Oresthasion, Tellon's dedication ensures the Hellenic identity (i.e., that the residents of Oresthasion were Greek) of the *polis*' inhabitants at the same time as it ensures the political potential of the *polis* (i.e., that Oresthasion was a *polis*). It is this potency that the re-inscription indicates: someone centuries later did not necessarily care for Tellon as an Olympic victor *per se*, but Tellon's declaration was the starting point for a history of ethnic and political identity, which conflicts with the alternative, and simplified version of Tellon's identity, which the Oxyrhynchos list records.

4.3: The Politics of Identity and Naming in CEG 1.383

πύ[κ]τα[ς] τόνδ' ἀνέθεκε | ν ἀπ' εὐδόξοιο [Κ]υνί | σκος
Μαν[τ]ινέας νικῶν | πατρὸς ἔχον | ὄνομα.²⁴

A boxer, Kyniskos, from famed Mantinea dedicated this,
when he won; he has the name of his father.

As the minimally restored text above demonstrates, the inscription of Kyniskos was found in relatively good condition during excavations at Olympia. The statue is missing, but the inscribed marble base was found in the structure of the Byzantine church built over the ruins of the workshop of Pheidias. Kyniskos' statue is mentioned by Pausanias (6.4.11): Κυνίσκῳ δὲ τῶ ἐκ Μαντινείας πύκτη παιδὶ ἐποίησε Πολύκλειτος τὴν εἰκόνα (“Polykleitos made the statue for Kyniskos the victor in boys’ boxing from Mantinea”), who adds the age-category of the victor as well. Through his analysis of Pausanias’ route, Hyde conjectures that the dedication originally stood opposite the eastern front of the Temple of Zeus (1912: 208). Pausanias names Polykleitos the sculptor of Kyniskos’ statue, and the Roman copy known as the “Westmacott Youth” has often been associated with this dedication (British Museum Sculpture 1754; see Day 2010: 219 for a photograph).²⁵ The pose of the youth, set in the classic *contrapposto* stance, has been interpreted as that of an athlete crowning himself (Richter 1970: 193). The identification of athlete and statue, however, has been challenged: “Kyniskos’ victory is dated 464 or 460, and the inscription (epigraphically) *ca.* 470-450. However, even 450

²⁴ For full epigraphic apparatus, see Hansen (*ad loc.*).

²⁵ Most of Ebert’s discussion on this epigram concerns the “Westmacott Youth” rather than the text itself (1972: 84).

seems to some too early for Polykleitos, and the statue is often dated stylistically to the 430s or 420s” (Day 2010: 217 n174).²⁶

Even with Pausanias’ possible error (we have no information on how he knew the sculptor’s name, which is not located on the surviving base), Kyniskos’ statue likely had an appearance similar enough to the “Westmacott Youth” to have appeared Polykleitian: “if we accept such a reconstruction, readers of the epigram re-performed Kyniskos’ *aggelia* as they gazed upon a statue of him looking as he did when the officials crowned him and the herald first proclaimed his victory” (Day 2010: 217-218). Perhaps more evocatively, if one looks at the layout of the inscription (*ad loc.* Hansen), the epigram, of only two lines, is broken into five segments, which circle the feet of the statue and return to the beginning with the last word of the pentameter. Thus, the text of the epigram led readers around the statue and displayed to them, as they read the epigram, the three-dimensional, naturalistic quality of the dedication. In few surviving epigrams is there such interplay of epigram, inscription, and statue.

As with most epigrams of this period, the text is quite short. Like *CEG* 1.381, Jeffrey is unsure whether the text is Arkadian or Elean (1990: 208; see above); while Mantinea experimented alphabetically in the Classical period (Jeffrey 1990: 213), nothing on this inscription reflects any scriptural innovation. The victory itself has been dated to 460 (Moretti no. 265), and the epigram includes all the components of the *angelia*, including, periphrastically, the father’s name.²⁷

²⁶ Stewart claims that it is an early work of Polykleitos (1990: 264). Richter favours the Polykleitian identification (1970: 193), despite the apparent chronological problems. Berger argues for an entirely different identification (1978).

²⁷ Day remarks on the completeness of both *CEG* 1.381 and 1.383: two of the “relatively few epigrams [that] approach a minimal but complete proclamation” (2010: 205).

Tuplin suggests that the use of the same name in successive generations, as opposed to the normal Greek practice of naming sons after their grandfather, implies some special significance to the name (1977: 8).²⁸ In fact, the name of Kyniskos in this epigram has sparked some interest: Herodotus tells us that “Kyniskos” (i.e., little dog) was the nickname of the Eurypontid Spartan royal Zeuxidamos, who was the father of the later king Archidamos II (6.71.1; on whom, see Chapter 6.1). Since Kyniskos won in the boys’ competition, we should place his birth in the early 470s (Tuplin 1970: 8); in this case, the father’s birth should probably be dated to ca. 510, or some twenty years after the birth of Zeuxidamos, who may have already acquired the nickname “Kyniskos” (Tuplin 1977: 8). Tuplin suggestively considers that “the Mantinean Kyniskos was named for Zeuxidamos as a tribute to relations between the Mantinean family and a branch of the Eurypontids” (*ibid.*).²⁹ He adduces some further evidence from Xenophon (*Hell.* 5.2.3), which suggests a special relationship between the Mantineans and the Eurypontid royal family: in particular Agesilaos’ refusal to campaign against Mantinea because of the aid they gave his father (i.e., Archidamos ca. 460; Tuplin 1977: 9). Such a connection to other aristocrats throughout the Peloponnese, while not certain, is not unlikely, especially considering the elite character of athletics in the early Classical period.

Kyniskos’ dedication is markedly different from the other mostly complete agonistic epigram of an Arkadian found at Olympia, that of Tellon (*CEG* 1.381, see above). Whereas Tellon indicated both his city-ethnic (*Oresthasion*) and regional-ethnic (*Arkas*), Kyniskos’ epigram describes himself solely in terms of *polis*, “from famed

²⁸ Of course, it is unclear how *normal* this practice was; needless to say, we have no idea if Kyniskos was the first-born son, and presumably only the first would *normally* be named after the grandfather. Naming practices aside, the epigram does emphasize the identity of father and son’s name, and this, especially in the *CEG*, is unusual.

²⁹ See Tuplin for other examples of cross-border adoption of names by different families (1977: 8).

Mantineia” (1.383.1).³⁰ The ethnic ambiguity of *CEG* 1.381 is absent, although the performative aspect (i.e., that the epigram participates in the creative act of ethnic identification), especially as relates to re-performance of the epigram, is still present. In the same way as Tellon’s dedication, Kyniskos’ epigram, especially if coupled with a statuary dedication reflecting the conflated moment of proclamation *and* coronation, implies the *polis* status of Mantineia in the same way as Tellon’s epigram performed the status of Oresthasion. What is different, however, is Kyniskos’ dedication does *not* associate “famed Mantineia” or its victor with the ethnic *Arkas*; instead, Mantinean civic identity stands alone.

The lack of the ethnic *Arkas*, and the emphasis on “famed Mantineia”, has prompted some to consider the relevance of the political specificity and epithet in concert with either the foundation or synoikism of Mantineia. While the *polis* (i.e., political entity) of Mantineia probably existed in the early Archaic period, the foundation of the urban centre of Mantineia (as opposed to the traditional four or five villages of the state) dates to either the middle of the sixth century or the 470s-460s (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981: 260). Hodkinson and Hodkinson remark on the difficulty of using archaeological evidence to date the establishment of the urban centre, since the destruction of the city in 385 and its subsequent re-foundation in 370 have significantly disturbed the remains of the earlier city (1981: 259).³¹ Nonetheless, they suggest that the literary and archaeological testimony likely points to the Classical foundation of the urban centre,

³⁰ The epithet does not appear in Homer. It is found on a funerary epigram dated to ca. 500 (*CEG* 69) and otherwise first appears in the *Theognidea* (195) and in Pindar (*P.* 12.5); in both of these instances, the adjective is applied to a person, rather than a city.

³¹ Pausanias has a long description of Mantineia (8.7-9), which has aided excavators. Unfortunately, his discussion of the city’s past is notoriously dishonest, and therefore of little importance in reconstructing the dates of synoikism (cf. Pretzler 2005).

traditionally set in the 470s or 460s, while preeminent Peloponnesian power Sparta was occupied with a revolt of its Helot population and recovery from the earthquake of ca. 465 (1981: 261).³² This date, of course, coincides with the conventional dating of Kyniskos' victory and dedication (cf. *ad loc.* Hansen). Spartan antipathy towards the synoikism of Mantinea, expressed later through their forced dissolution of the city (ca. 385), need not mean that we can see a distinct split between aristocrats on the Spartan (and village-life) side and democrats on the urban side (as Hodkinson and Hodkinson would have it, 1981: 271) – this is especially true if a Mantinean like Kyniskos (or his father), whose family may be connected to Spartan royalty, can blatantly promote his specifically Mantinean identity so soon after the foundation of the urban centre.³³

If the dating for the formation of Mantinea's urban centre is correct, the alignment with Kyniskos' Mantinean-centric dedication is striking. As Hodkinson and Hodkinson argue, the formation of an urban centre probably accomplished little for the subsistence farmers, who would have continued to live in their ancestral villages or in temporary shelters near their fields; rather, "the most important impact of the town probably derived from its role as a stage upon which wealthy Mantineans, now concentrated together as a group, daily acted out their elite life-style in full view of a greater proportion of the citizen population than in the villages" (1981: 288). The influx of elite Mantineans to their new urban centre aligns well with the prominent place of the city-ethnic on Kyniskos' Olympic epigram (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981: 287). Participation in the

³² The earliest definite literary testimony of the town's existence is the mention of the temple of Zeus in the town's agora in the anti-Spartan treaty of 420 (Thuc. 5.47.11; Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981: 260).

³³ This is not to confuse *polis* and city-formation, as the former was clearly in evidence prior to the establishment of the city-proper of Mantinea. Nonetheless, if the dating of the foundation of the city is so coincidental with the dedication, it is difficult not to read a pride in the new city in the epithet "famed Mantinea".

Olympics, of course, was prime evidence for the *polis*-status of a given community and a primary stage for intra-elite competition. It is noteworthy in this regard that Mantinean victors are virtually restricted to the early years of the fifth century (500-460; cf. Moretti nos. 163, 193, 202, 254, 256, 265); the conventional interpretation stresses that an increased interest in participation in the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries derived from an increased ability for self-promotion and competition between elites at home, in this newly founded urban centre.³⁴

The unusual formulation of the father's name in this epigram also points to the promotion of Kyniskos' victory as a socially and politically-potent event.³⁵ Just as with the epigram of Tellon, we can assume that the commissioning and phrasing of the epigram were out of the hands of the boy-victor himself; therefore, the unusual phrasing used for the father's name deserves some scrutiny. The evidence for heraldic proclamations at Olympia suggests that the regular formula of the proclamation would have announced the victor as "Kyniskos, the son of Kyniskos" and the proclamation would have likely included the age-category of the victor, in this case, a *pais* (Wolicki 2002: 75).³⁶ In Kyniskos' epigram, however, age-category is absent, and the epigram stresses the identity of the names of father and son (1.383: "he has the name of his father"). While this could simply be the creative rendering of a lapidary poet, I suggest

³⁴ One of these is Praxiteles, whom I do not necessarily count as an athletic epigram.

³⁵ In only one other epigram in the two volumes of the *CEG* does this phraseology occur. In *CEG* 2.532, the name of father and son are tied together and their identity is stressed (1: [τῶνο]μα μὲν τῶμόν καὶ ἐμοῦ πατρός ἦδε ἀγορεύ[ει] "this announces my name and that of my father"). Another close parallel is *CEG* 2.564.1 (παῖ πατέρος σουτοῦ πατρός ἔχων ὄνομα "a child having the name of his grandfather"), but the identity of names in that epigram is of grandson and grandfather. Neither of these texts are athletic epigrams.

³⁶ We rely on Pausanias for the fact that Kyniskos won as a *pais* (Paus. 6.4.11). As normally, we have no idea of the source for this extra piece of information, though presumably, Pausanias' guide added the age-category.

that it has some added political and social relevance, especially considering the context of the victory.

The victories of boys, especially in pan-Hellenic contests, were as potent and powerful a political symbol as any adult victory.³⁷ The glory of victory, through the proclamation of the father's name and the celebration (e.g., through an epinician ode) of the victory at home, redounded to the family and clan of the victor (cf. Burnett 2005: 48). While this extension of glory could certainly work to reintegrate the victor to his community, and to extoll the virtues of his extended family, Kyniskos' epigram and its unusual naming formula go slightly further. The absence of the age category and the identity of name between father and son stress the identical sharing of the glory of victory as well; casual observers of this statue could not realize which Kyniskos had even won in the Olympics, nor would they realize that the epigram celebrated a boys' victory. While the herald's proclamation would have emphasized the specific identity of "Kyniskos the son of Kyniskos", as well as his age-category, the modulated recording of the proclamation in the epigram instead emphasizes the identity of victor and father. Whether we read this as a cynical attempt to appropriate the son's glory for the father, or a firm belief in the performative power of inherited ability, the epigram's phrasing forces Kyniskos' father, unnamed except periphrastically, into focus.³⁸

The emphasis on the father's identity and his close tie to the athletic victory, and, most importantly, its reification at Olympia prompt me to re-consider the supposedly

³⁷ Consider Bacchylides 8.22-25, which collects together victories in boys' and men's contests, and suggests they are of equivalent value.

³⁸ The ambiguity of Greek word order may even reinforce this point: εὐδόξοιο, a two-ending adjective, could theoretically modify πατρός rather than Μαντινέας. While I prefer my translation, there exists the possibility that some readers or listeners would construe "he has the name of a famed father", rather than (or along with) "from famed Mantinea".

causal relationship between Mantinean synoikism and the inscribing of Kyniskos' epigram. Cohen argues that "ethnic mobilization requires the active instigation of individuals and organizations" (1978: 396); he calls such individuals "entrepreneurs" who demonstrate the saliency of ethnic identity and articulate the process of identification (*ibid.*). Kyniskos' father, who has put great emphasis on his own part in the victory of his son, fits the profile of such an ethnic "entrepreneur"; this is not to argue for reading the intentions of Kyniskos' father, but rather to stress the insistent presence of the father in the son's epigram, along with the explicit Mantinean civic identity (the ambiguity of εὐδόξοιο may add to this emphasis).

Ethnic "mobilization" can occur *prior to* its justification; in other words, ethnic identities might act to find rationalization *after* their creation, or enunciation (Cohen 1978: 397-398). From this perspective, it is possible to posit a reversal of the conventional relationship between Mantinean victory dedications and the establishment of a Mantinean urban centre. If we recall that the Olympic Games are a *performative* venue for identities, then the inscribing in stone of Mantinean city-ethnics can be understood as the emergent mobilization of that ethnic identity: that is, expressing civic identity (in this case "from famed Mantinea") could itself be the catalyst for the synoikist movement – that the identity ("from famed Mantinea") purports to be an expression of that which it generates is demonstrative of the fictive and imaginative character of socio-political identity. In this way, rather than see cause-and-effect relationships between physical and metaphorical communities, my perspective highlights the dialectic of ethnic solidarity and the performative declarations of that sense of community; it also highlights the role of elite individuals and athletics in the *generation* as well as *representation* of

socio-political identities, especially those embedded in the form of the *angelia*, and the heraldic mode of athletic verse.

Chapter 5: Genealogy and History: *Oikos*, *Ethnos*, and *Polis* in *Olympian* 9

At the end of *Olympian* 9, the ode for Epharmostos, the champion wrestler from Opountian Lokris, Pindar declares *phya*, his idiosyncratic rendering of *physis* (s.v. φύη *LSJ*; cf. Slater), the essential nature of someone or something, κράτιστον ἅπαν (“altogether best”: 9.100); he says that the herald’s proclamation ought to record that his victor was born εὐχαιρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὀρώντ’ ἄλκάν (“with quick hands, nimble legs, determination in his look”), all the endowments necessary for athletic success (*O.* 9.108ff). Despite his emphasis on Epharmostos’ birth (*O.* 9.110: τόνδ’ ἀνέρα δαίμονιά γεγάμεν “with divine help he was born”; cf. Hubbard 1985: 118), Pindar, unusually, names neither the father of the victor nor acknowledges any family whatsoever.¹ In a genre as concerned with family and identity as epinician, the omission is striking, and potentially troublesome for the rhetoric of epinician praise. Miller remarks that such an omission would almost certainly only occur at “the instruction of the client himself”, and thus we should conclude that Epharmostos did not regard family or father’s name “as essential to his self-definition” (1993: 113). While Miller goes on to explain how Pindar’s encomium still functions (1993: 114), the absence of family disturbs many of the regular features of epinician, especially the standard integration of *phya* and family (Rose 1992: 150-161).²

¹ On γεγάμεν, cf. *O.* 6.49, 53; in both cases, the expression relates explicitly to birth rather than a copulative usage (s.v. γίνομαι, Slater).

² Rose argues for a specifically Pindaric use of *phya*, which is not “the essential character of individuals” (1992: 150), but a specifically elite pride in birth a particular *genos* or *oikos* (1992: 161; also, Pavlou 2012: 57). Hubbard marks that *phya* and *physis* never lose their etymological connection to growth and birth (from φύω; 1985: 107).

Family, via the father's name, was an element of the *angelia*, and would have been announced as part of the proclamation after Epharmostos' victory; Pindar's epinician evokes the *angelia*, but freely includes, excludes, or modifies elements of the proclamation, what I have called in this project the "heraldic mode of representation" (see Chapter 2.1). This modification, or omission, of a component of the *angelia* serves as an opening for my analysis of the ode: rather than focus on the question of why Pindar did not include father's name (the subject of Pavlou 2012), I explain how Pindaric praise, particularly the praise of family inheritance and aristocratic transcendence, still functions in an ode that omits a key component of epinician poetics (cf. Kurke 1991: 6). I underscore how Pindar, despite the ostensible absence of family in this ode, nonetheless connects *phya*, *ethnos*, and *polis*, with a narrative of early Lokrian and Opountian history. While the focus on the conjunction of the victor with *ethnos* and *polis* is certainly not without parallel, *O.* 9 is singular in its emphasis on the correlation of biography and history. The Archaic and early Classical assimilation of genealogy to ethnic and civic history joins such seemingly disparate concepts as inheritance, family lineage, and genealogy with ethnic descent and civic foundation (see Chapter 3.2). The *polis*, one component of the *angelia*, can replace family, another component, because of the conceiving of ethnic and civic identity as essentially genealogical.

5.1: Fathers, Family, and City in Pindar's Odes

In her study of the economy of praise in epinician, Kurke concludes that family is crucial, not only to the celebration of athletic success, but to success itself: "in Pindar's world, the athlete never competes alone. If he has the quality to win, it is because he has inherited it from his ancestors." (1991: 3; cf. Cole 1987: 560). She suggests that the

family connection is important enough that we should recognize Pindar's (and his victor's) different concept of self-hood, which was integrated, to a great degree, with family identity (1991a: 289; cf. Nash 1990: 7, 82-91).³ In this different concept of self-identity, athletic victory can be understood as a renewal of the family, especially through the metaphors of new birth, marriage, and rites for dead ancestors (1991: 62-73).⁴ Thus, the exclusion of family from Epharmostos' ode is striking: his victory, while it may have brought fame to his living relatives, is not represented as renewing or reviving the fame of his *oikos*, since the *oikos* is absent from the ode; his Olympic victory cannot participate in the common analogizing of athletic victory to family renewal, since there is no literal family in the poem. As he appears in the ode, Epharmostos is fatherless and family-less; this lack persists, despite the likely presence of his father's name in the *angelia* at Olympia.

Miller lists the odes in which Pindar does not mention fathers, and I have narrowed this list down to those that do not mention *any* family members (1993: 113 n110): *O.* 1, *O.* 4, *O.* 9, *P.* 3, *P.* 12, and *I.* 3.⁵ As Miller indicates, in a number of these, the paternal and familial absence can be rationalized: the victor is either a ruler or politically or socially prominent (*O.* 1 for Hieron; *P.* 3 for Hieron); in another two cases the father's

³ Children are, after all, intricate parts of the family's future, perhaps even performative components, by virtue of their names. Kurke identifies epic names as indicative of their father's actions (1991a: 289: Telemachos as indicative of Odysseus' "far off war"; Asytanax as indicative of Hector's position as "lord of the city"). Historically, while grandfathers tended to provide the name of the firstborn child, other children were named after the achievements of their father (1991a: 289; cf. the case of Themistokles: Plut. *Vit. Them.* 1.1, 32.1). Thus, Kurke speculates on epinician as a type of "naming magic" (1991a: 297 n30; cf. Cole 1987: 567).

⁴ Kurke points to the mortality of human bodies, but the immortality of reputation in fr. 94a.14-20: ἀθάναται δὲ βροτοῖς / ἀμέραι, σῶμα δ' ἐστὶ θνατὸν ("humans have immortal days / but their body is mortal", 1991: 56). Since reputation transcends the death of the mortal body, dead family members can still gain praise and be integrated to the celebration of all family rites, including the celebration of victory.

⁵ The exact identity of the father in *O.* 8 has been questioned (see Chapter 7.3). Hamilton includes *I.* 1 among those odes that do not mention a father (1974: 15), but *I.* 1. 34-5 specifically mentions Asopodoros as the father of the victor (Bundy 1986: 48).

name appears in a second ode for the same victor (Hieron's father's name appears in another ode as well: *P.* 1.79; *O.* 4 for Psaumis of Kamarina, whose father Akron is named at *O.* 5.8, and his sons at 5.23; *I.* 3 for Melissos of Thebes, whose father is named at *I.* 4.45).⁶ Miller includes *P.* 4, 5, and 7 in his list (*ibid.*), but these poems do mention family, only in an allusive manner. In *P.* 4 and *P.* 5, while explicit discussion of Arkesilas' direct ancestry is absent, both odes are about the legendary ancestry of the king (from Euphamos, one of the Argonauts; or Battos the founder of Kyrene).⁷ In the latter poem, it should not be overlooked that the father of the victorious chariot driver, Karrhotos, makes an appearance and so family still figures in the ode's encomium (*P.* 5.45; on this charioteer, see Nicholson 2005: 42-53). In the case of *P.* 7, the descent of Megakles is prominent: in fact, his clan is mentioned even before his name (*P.* 7.2, 17); the whole of the opening stanza deals with the pan-Hellenic fame of the victor's clan, the Alkmaionidai (*P.* 7.5-8). In addition, in the second stanza, the family's refurbishment of the temple of Apollo at Delphi is a main focus, and a victory catalogue of the whole family closes out the strophe (*P.* 7.9-16).

Pythian 12 and *Olympian* 9 stand out, since they lack any explicit reference to the father, clan, or family of the victor. *P.* 12 praises the victory of Midas of Akragas in the *aulos* competition at the Pythian Games; it is possible that the non-athletic context explains the absence of a few of the generic elements of the *angelia*, that is father and

⁶ The question of whether *I.* 3 and *I.* 4 should be considered a single poem or two separate poems, of course, is relevant. In the Loeb editions, Race separates them; the Teubner couples them. The question of their status as separate poems is beyond the confines of this project; see Lidov on the question of the separation or integration of the poems (1974: 175-178).

⁷ *P.* 4 is, altogether, an unusual poem, both in scope (it far exceeds the length of any other epinician), and in its conclusion, when Pindar explicitly pleas for the return of the exiled Demophilos (*P.* 4.279-299). Braswell correctly points to the political circumstances that accompanied the commissioning and performance of this ode (1988: 3). The unusual circumstances of the ode may account for its exclusion of explicit mention of family, along with the political prominence of the laudandus.

family name. Strauss-Clay speculates that Midas' name betrays Phrygian origin, and that the *aulos* may have been a particularly professional and non-aristocratic instrument (1992: 519). She further conjectures that there may have been less desire to celebrate the victories of musicians than those of the athletes who are the standard Pindaric patrons; aside from the almost complete absence of musical victors from epinician, however, we have nothing to substantiate this argument. More convincingly, Pavlou situates *P.* 12 in the social and political context of early fifth-century Akragas: she suggests that Midas' victory is an *agalma* for the city, since Akragas itself receives an extended encomium (*P.* 12.1-5; Pavlou 2012: 83). She argues that Midas' victory ode was commissioned by the then-ascendant Emmenidae (perhaps Theron himself), in order to stress their power, and to relate them to a celebration of Akragantine culture (2012: 87). If Pavlou's persuasive argument is correct, the absence of family in *P.* 12 is explained through the association of the victor and victory with a powerful aristocratic family, similarly to the odes for actual politically powerful patrons.

Consequently, *O.* 9 is alone in its complete absence of a literal family or ancestry. The lack of father's name cannot be explained because of personal political prominence, or a powerful patron; it is not self-evident that the theme of the ode precludes mention of his father. A lack of any previous athletic success in the family does not explain the absence of family, since in other odes victory acts to retroactively glorify otherwise obscure ancestors (e.g., *N.* 6.17-29). The omission of father and familial connection is striking in the context of epinician, which, as Carey points out (1989: 3), memorializes through naming. The lack of naming, however, rather than indicating a biographical fact,

may be part of the program of praise in the ode, especially insofar as it correlates Epharmostos to other figures in Opountian myth that are similarly orphaned or adopted.

Before pursuing this line of inquiry, however, it is important to evaluate the only other historical individual mentioned in the ode, Lampromachos, whose presence has sparked much ancient and modern discussion (Miller 1993: 140; Gerber 2002: 58). He is introduced as a cause for the poet's presence at the celebration of *Olympian 9* (82-84):⁸

προξενία δ' ἀρετᾶ τ' ἦλθον
τιμάορος Ἴσθμιαῖσι Λαμπρομάχου μίτραις, ὅτ' ἀμφότεροι κράτησαν
μίαν ἔργον ἀν' ἀμέραν.

Because of guest friendship and achievement
I have come to honour the Isthmian fillets of Lampromachos, when both won
their victories in one day.

The scholiasts are divided on the meaning of προξενία: 123a and 123c regard Lampromachos as a *proxenos* in the technical sense, while 123d and 123e consider προξενία to be equivalent to φιλία in this passage. Modern scholarship has been similarly divided: Carey (1995: 94 n16) and Gerber (2002: 58) prefer the institution, while Most argues for the metaphor (1985a: 324-325). Wallace explains the details of *proxenia*, and covers a selection of Classical instances of this term, but it is not certain that an institutionalized *proxenia* ("one city's official friends in another city", Wallace 1970: 189) has any relevance to Pindar's use of the term in *O. 9*.⁹ Pavlou agrees with Gerber, but offers a more substantial argument, which focuses on the early evidence for *proxenia* in Lokris specifically; she is skeptical that Pindar would use a technical term so loosely and she contends that by the fifth-century, *proxenia* was firmly entrenched as an

⁸ Gerber reports that the syntax of this line is disputed, but he treats the two datives as causal (2002: 57). I follow him and the translation of Race here.

⁹ On *proxenia* more generally, including an enormous list of examples of the institution, though not including *O. 9*, see Marek 1984; Herman also deals with the distinction between *xenia* and *proxenia* (1987: 130-142).

institution (2012: 77). This, however, is not what Wallace concludes, and he regards even 460 an arbitrary date for the institutionalization of *proxenia* (1970: 189 n2).¹⁰

Pavlou connects the status of Lampromachos as the *proxenos* of the Thebans at Opous to an argument for a civic commissioning of the ode (2012: 78-79). While I am not averse to the speculation on Opous' role in the commissioning of the ode, nonetheless, I am uncomfortable with such certainty about Pindar's language (not to mention the circumstances of commissioning), when, in fact, the other appearances of *proxenia* in epinician do not definitively support this argument.¹¹ *I.* 4.8 seems to nod in the direction of an institutionalized *proxenia* (*I.* 4.7-9: τοὶ μὲν ὦν Θήβαισι τιμᾶντες ἀρχᾶθεν λέγονται / πρόξενοί τ' ἀμφικτιόνων κελαδεννᾶς τ' ὄρφανοί / ὕβριος “but from the beginning they are said to have been honoured in Thebes / as hosts of neighbouring people and free of loud-voiced / arrogance”), but Most has argued that the adverb ἀρχᾶθεν renders it unlikely that the word refers to a contemporary institution (1985a: 325); it is probable that appropriate hospitality is simply another component of the praise of the Kleonymidai. In fr. 94b, Pindar also uses *proxenia* to describe a tradition of hospitality, which began in the past and extends to present day (38-45):

πιστὰ δ' Ἀγασικλέει
 μάρτυς ἦλυθον ἐς χορόν
 40 ἐσλοῖς τε γονεῦσιν

¹⁰ *O.* 9 celebrates a victory from the Olympics of 468 (supported by the *P. Oxy* II 222 victors' list). Presumably, the epinician can be dated to soon after the games. Early Lokrian *proxenia* is often related to its unusual political division, which broke the *ethnos* into two distinct parts, Eastern and Western Lokris: Eastern Lokris, across from Euboia, contained the Opountian Lokrians and the Epiknemedian Lokrians; Western Lokris, on the north coast of the Gulf of Corinth, was home to the Ozolian Lokrians (Plut. *Mor. Quaest. Graec.* 15; cf. Gerber 2002: 52). Nielsen convincingly argues that the ancient sources present a unified Lokrian *ethnos*, despite the geographical and political divide between Eastern and Western Lokrians (2000: 95). The only other Lokrians we hear about are the Epizephyrian Lokroi, whose city was located in Southern Italy (cf. *P.*, *P.* 2.18-20), though Redfield remarks on the absence of linguistic or cultural traits that connect the two populations (2008: 254).

¹¹ Bundy also argues against the literal interpretation of *proxenia* in these passages (1986: 89 n122). In addition to these examples, Bacchylides seems to use the word, though the fragmentary state of the papyrus makes certainty about the word and its context impossible (Bacch. 9.76).

ἀμφὶ προξενίαισι· τί-
 μαθεν γὰρ τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν
 τ' ἀμφικτιόνεσσιν
 ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων πο[λυ-
 45 γνῶτοις ἐπὶ νίκαις

As a faithful witness for Agasikles
 I have come to the dance
 and for his noble parents

because of their hospitality, for both of old
 and still today they have been honoured
 by their neighbours
 for their celebrated victories
 with swift-footed horses,

Once again, it is unlikely that the combination of a temporal adverb referring to the past and *proxenia* refers to the institution (cf. Most 1985a: 326). In the example from the second Partheneion in particular, the syntax and meaning are similar to the expression in *O.* 9, since in that passage too, Pindar connects *proxenia* and athletic victory. *N.* 7 has presented its own issues of interpretation, in terms of situating the passage in the larger organization of the poem, but *proxenia*, nonetheless, likely remains metaphorical (*N.* 7.64-65: ἔων δ' ἐγγύς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεταιί μ' ἀνήρ / Ἴονίης ὑπὲρ ἄλῶς οἰκέων, καὶ προξενία πέποιθ' "if any Achaian man is nearby, one dwelling beyond / the Ionian Sea, he will not blame me; I also trust in my host's hospitality").¹² While many have understood the reference to *proxenia* as part of the ambiguous allusion to an "Achaian man", Most disconnects the two phrases (1985a: 322-323), and suggests that in this

¹² Several prominent arguments have been made in support of the metaphorical use of *proxenia* in *N.* 7: Ruck (1972: 151), Lloyd-Jones (1973: 135 n129a), and Woodbury (1979: 126 n137) all regard the institutional meaning as highly unlikely.

passage *proxenia* is rather evocative of the previous reference to *xenia* at *N.* 7.61 (ξεῖνος εἶμι “I am a guest-friend”, Most 1985a: 326).¹³

In other poetic uses from the early fifth-century, the term can refer to general hospitality: in Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women*, *proxenia* refers to general “protection” by a powerful patron (or deity), rather than an institutionalized system of city-sponsored hosting (Aesch. *Supp.* 420, 491, 919).¹⁴ A fragment of Aeschylus’ *Diktyoulokois* uses *proxenia* but then glosses it with the word προπράκτωρ “champion” (*TrGF* III: fr. 47a.768-770; Most 1985a: 326). As such, I am inclined to consider *proxenia* in *O.* 9, and perhaps throughout the Pindaric corpus, as a metaphor for hospitality, guest-friend relations, and *philia*, rather than a reference to the civic institution.

Another scholion (schol. *ad O.*9.125c) suggests an alternative, although it too is probably guesswork, since it claims that Lampromachos is a συγγενής (“kinsman”) of Epharmostos.¹⁵ While Gerber is correct to remark that “the relationship between the two would be obvious to the audience” (2002: 58), the evidence from the naming of family members in other odes implies that Pindar preferred certain identification (Carey 1989: 3); in any case, had Pindar wanted to stress some special relationship (whether political or familial) between the two, this would likely have been indicated in the ode. Carey emphasizes that the catalogue of Nemean and Isthmian victors was hopelessly confused in antiquity, and any supposed insight into family relationships from the scholia should be

¹³ *P.* 10.64 seems to offer an almost exact parallel phrase: πέποιθα ξενία προσανεί Θώρακος (“I put my trust in the comforting hospitality of Thorax”).

¹⁴ *Proxenia* appears also at *Hdt.* 8.136.1 and 8.143.1, to describe Alexander of Macedon’s relationship to the Athenians. It is not entirely certain whether this usage implies an institution at Athens, though it is likely. Herodotus uses the term again at 9.85.3 for the Plataeans.

¹⁵ Kurke too assumes Lampromachos is a relative of Epharmostos (1991: 19-20).

treated with extreme skepticism (1989: 2; cf. Christesen 2007: 108-111); I share his incredulity.

If Lampromachos is not the *proxenos* of Pindar, nor a relative of the victor, why does he appear in the ode? He opens the victory catalogue – two other Isthmian wins are recorded separately in the following line (9.86), and the special mention of Lampromachos is likely a flourish with which to open the catalogue (Miller (1993: 140) calls it a “bridge”), an instance in which Epharmostos and his countryman both won at a pan-Hellenic festival on the same day.¹⁶ Cole offers some analysis of this question, although his conclusion is confused by his misidentification of the victories ἐν Κορίνθου πύλαις (“at the gates of Corinth”, 9.86) as different from the Isthmian games (1987: 555). Gerber also finds it “unclear” whether these additional Isthmian victories belong to Lampromachos or Epharmostos (2002: 59), but in my view, the lines are pellucid: Pindar begins with a special victory, won on the same day at the Isthmia with a countryman, and then proceeds to begin the catalogue-proper of Epharmostos, proceeding, as is normal, from victories in the Crown Games. The victory with Lampromachos is given special prominence (it begins the catalogue) because of its significance to the city of Opous, a city poorly represented in victories at the Crown Games.¹⁷ Considering the ode’s explicit

¹⁶ Gerber points our attention to *O.* 13.37-39 and Ebert no. 39.7-9 for victories won on the same day (2002: 59). *O.* 13, however, simply praises the father of Xenocrates for winning at two contests on the same day. The epigram in turn celebrates victories won on the same day by the same athlete. In *O.* 9, the interest is in victories won by athletes from the same city on the same day. Our knowledge of the winners of the Isthmian and Nemean games is hopelessly vague, but we can assume that victors might have followed the general outline of those in the Olympic and Pythian Games: Epharmostos might be an athletic superstar, a *periodonikes*, but Lampromachos’ Isthmian victory would not be meaningless to a small city.

¹⁷ Prior to Epharmostos’ victory (Moretti no. 239, ca. 468 B.C.), Opous could claim only two other Olympic victors: Nikeas (Moretti no. 150; ca. 500 B.C., boxing) and Rhexibios (Moretti no. 119; ca. 536 B.C., *stadion*; cf. Paus. 6.18.7).

focus on praise of Opous as well as Epharmostos, the inclusion of its other Stephanitic victor is hardly surprising.¹⁸

We should also note that hospitality and guest-friendship are also conjoined in the mythic section of the ode, when foreigners are welcomed to the new city of Opous (*O.* 9.67-69). In fact, the settlement of foreigners (explicitly *xenoi*: *O.* 9.67) and the *arete* of Opous himself (*O.* 9.65-66; and the *polis* at *O.* 9.16) as well as one of the descendants of the new settlers (Patroklus, *O.* 9.70-76), have already appeared together in the ode's narrative (Most 1985a: 325). Thus, Pindar comes to Opous because of the same qualities that have already characterized the *polis* and *ethnos* in the mythic narrative; repetition and a cyclical perspective on Lokrian and Opountian history predominate in the structure of the ode, and so the rationale for Pindar's visit seems to reinforce the identity of Epharmostos' victory with the past history and mythology of his city and *ethnos*. If my arguments are correct, Lampromachos is not included because of any political office, special relation, or involvement in the commissioning of the ode, but simply because of his status as an Opountian pan-Hellenic victor.¹⁹ Pavlou's suggestion that Lampromachos' presence implies a civic commissioning of the ode (2012: 79) does not necessitate his holding of any formal office of *proxenos*. Regardless of the historical circumstances surrounding the commissioning of the ode, the focus is on Opountian

¹⁸ It may be strange, in this case, that Pindar does *not* mention Menalkes (Moretti no. 240), who won at boxing at the same Olympics as Epharmostos. If *P. Oxy* II 222 is correct, it may be that the inclusion of another *Olympic* victor would challenge the primacy of Epharmostos' praise in the ode – Lampromachos' lesser Isthmian victory fulfills the function of praising the city without eclipsing the praise of the laudandus. The lack of inclusion of Menalkes also supports the idea that this is not necessarily a civic commission, but merely an ode that emphasizes the victor's connection to his *polis*; were Opous (the *polis*) behind its commissioning, we would expect a dual celebration of Olympic victories.

¹⁹ Cole points to *N.* 6.61-63 as the only other instance in Pindar where a seemingly random person occurs in an ode because of having shared the same fate (there, a loss) as the ode's subject (1987: 556).

achievements in the victory catalogue, first in the single victory of Lampromachos, and then in the longer record of Epharmostos' myriad victories.²⁰

Kurke argues that epinician is a form of *megaloprepeia*, the adornment of the city and *demos* expected of wealthy citizens, and as forms of adornment Pindar's poems are doubly beneficial, since they are both a memory of adornment and the objects of celebration themselves (Kurke 1991: 187).²¹ From this recognition, Kurke suggests that *O.* 9 exemplifies the Pindaric tendency to merge *oikos* and *polis* (1991: 200-201). Merger, however, is imprecise, since the family in *O.* 9 does not simply combine with the *polis*; that, in athletic verse, is the normal state of affairs, since the *angelia* teams together individual, familial, and civic identities. In *O.* 9, in contrast, Epharmostos' family is absent, and the *ethnos* of Lokris and the *polis* of Opous replace the *oikos* of the victor. The presence of Lampromachos in the victory catalogue, in a place generally reserved for family achievements, as a result of his civic identity, indicates this replacement: the *polis* relegates family and positions itself as the family of the seemingly family-less

²⁰ Carnes remarks on the identity of victor and civic praise in his analysis of *N.* 8: "athletic competition and the fame it engenders are part of a zero-sum system for the winning of honor, in which prestige may be gained only at the expense of other competitors; what is true on an individual level is also true for cities" (1995: 28). He goes on to note that Pindar uses myth to implicate his patrons in a timeless chain of excellence: civic myth is relevant to the victor because Pindar concentrates on the "unchanging, essential qualities" of cities and peoples (1995: 29). Just as the Aiakidai are both instances of Aigina's glory and performative of it, so too are the civic and ethnic origins of Lokris and Opous (and thus Epharmostos) simultaneously evocative of glory and the manifestation of it.

²¹ Kurke points to Aristotle's (later) formulation of *megaloprepeia* as one of the virtuous uses of wealth (*Eth. Nic.* 1124 a5-10). *P.* 7 is quite instructive of the important connection between family, city, and the expenditure of wealth to adorn the latter and praise the former: "the glorious reputation of Athens – what makes it the most beautiful κρηπίς of songs – depends, in turn, on the *megaloprepeia* of the Alkmaionidai" (Kurke 1991: 191). In Pindar, *megaloprepeia*, as a single word, is never used, though Kurke points to the opening of *O.* 1 as a "veritable unpacking" of the constituent elements of the compound (*O.* 1.2: ἄτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μέγανος ἔξοχα πλούτου "like fire blazing / in the night, shines preeminent among lordly wealth", 1991: 182). Beyond this etymological evidence, the idea that wealth is best used when mixed with virtue is prevalent in Pindar (*O.* 2.52-56; *P.* 5.1-4). In fact, at *I.* 2.37-40, praise of Xenocrates' virtues (respectful to his fellow-citizens, welcoming and sharing in feasts, generous to his peers) compares well with the prosaic descriptions of *megaloprepeia* found in Xenophon (*Oec.* 2.5-7) and Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1123a4-5: οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἑαυτὸν δαπανηρὸς ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ κοινὰ "for the magnificent man does not spend money on himself but on public objects"). For more examples, see Kurke (1991: 182-186).

Epharmostos, so that the history of Lokris and Opous becomes the biography of Epharmostos, the city's putative ancestry becomes the victor's genealogy.

While "homeland praise" has been recognized in Pindaric criticism (cf. Thummer 1968-69 and Hamilton 1974), Kurke notes that the place of neither family praise nor homeland praise in epinician has ever been questioned (1991: 197 n5). She stresses the public and communal nature of the reception of Pindar's art: "such praise [i.e., homeland praise] abounds in the epinikia, because it affirms the public or common nature of the patron's commission" (1991: 197). As Kurke comments, Pindar uses foundation myths because of their inherently political quality, since they "transform an entire *polis* into a single family descended from a common mythic ancestor" (1991: 200).²² The public aspect of epinician, and the function of homeland praise as part of the civic reception of epinician provokes my interpretation of *Olympian* 9: the recognition of Opous and Lokris standing in as the *oikos* of this otherwise-orphaned victor allows us to reimagine the connection between Epharmostos' Olympic victories and the mythic narrative in the ode in the context of family and ancestry.

Segal argues that there exists a "continuity in *Olympian* 9 between the primordial creation of the remote past and the political foundations in the nearer (though still mythical) history of Opous" (1986a: 78).²³ This is certainly true, but the identification of Epharmostos with the history of his *ethnos* and *polis* opens up the potential to read this "continuity" into the present tense of the ode's performance. Foundations and renewals of *ethnos* and *polis* are emphasized in the ode and function to praise Epharmostos by placing

²² Dougherty indicates that foundation narratives became their own genre after the Archaic and Classical periods, but that they were more of a *topos* in earlier poetry: Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, and Pindar all include foundation tales as part of their poetry (1993: 15).

²³ Gerber points to the similarity between *O.* 7 and *O.* 9 in this respect, as each contains myths which "explain the origin and early history of the victors' homeland" (2002: 11).

him in a continuity of inheritance (Pindaric *phya*), modulated through civic and ethnic lineage. It is therefore in the two founding figures, Deukalion and Opous (ethnic and civic founders) that we should look for the mythic parallels through which Pindar praises his patron, Epharmostos, and the *polis*, Opous.²⁴

5.2: Epharmostos and the History of the Lokrians

Despite the fact that they figure into legends surrounding the beginnings of humanity and human civilization, the Lokrians were little discussed in antiquity. The *Iliad*'s "Catalogue of Ships" devotes nine lines to them (*Il.* 2.527-535): they are led by Ajax son of Oïleos (*Il.* 2.527) and the poet delineates the main settlements of Eastern Lokris (*Il.* 2.531-533; cf. Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970: 47-50). The Opountian Lokrians fought at Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.203), and they were aligned with Sparta during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.9.2); Xenophon regards the Opountian Lokrians as responsible for the outbreak of the Corinthian War in the early fourth century (*Xen. Hel.* 3.5.4-6). Pausanias promises to provide an account of Lokris in his *Geography* (9.23.4), but lamentably he concentrates almost solely on Western or Ozolian Lokris (on the north side of the gulf of Corinth: Paus. 10.38.1-7; cf. 9.24.4-5, 10.1.1). Strabo gives a summary description of Eastern Lokris and Opous (9.425-426), but otherwise the city is generally absent from ancient historical and geographical writings; Fossey has a complete list of ancient authors who mention Opous (1990: 167-172).

²⁴ I am sympathetic to Gerber's contention that Opous and Patroklos are the paradigms (2002: 12). In particular, while Gerber notes the comparison with Patroklos is "not so obvious", he thinks it "safe to assume" that Pindar meant his audience to see a comparison between Patroklos' stand against Telephus (*O.* 9.70-73) and Epharmostos' victory in an unexpected contest against adults (*O.* 9.89-90). I think, however, that the comparison with Patroklos is more happenstance than intent; if Epharmostos exemplifies the figure of one who adorns his city in this ode, then the appropriate comparisons are with other champions of Opountian history, Deukalion and Opous. It is certainly possible to read a comparison with Patroklos, and I do not argue against an implicit comparison.

Pindar's narrative in *O.* 9 is one of the earliest, and most complete, Lokrian myths; he begins from the flood, after which Deukalion and Pyrrha descend from Mount Parnassos to found a city and establish its autochthonous inhabitants (*O.* 9.43-46), the Leleges who become the *ethnos* of the Lokrians;²⁵ second, the lineage of kings is renewed through the adoption of a son, Opous, descended directly from Zeus (*O.* 9.57-66), through whom the civic identity of Opountians is established.²⁶ The section on Deukalion and Pyrrha opens after Pindar's self-recrimination for the Herakles narrative; he directs himself to stay to the topic at hand, which is "the city of Protogeneia" (*O.* 9.41-56):

φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας
 ἄσται γλῶσσαν, ἴν' αἰολοβρέντα Διὸς αἴσα
 Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρνασοῦ καταβάντε
 δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, ἄτερ δ' εὐνᾶς ὁμόδαμον
 45 κτισσάσθαι λίθινον γόνον·
 λαοὶ δ' ὀνύμασθεν.
 ἔγειρ' ἐπέων σφιν οἶνον,
 αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων

²⁵ Pavlou suggests that λαλάγει evokes the name of the original inhabitants of Lokris (*O.* 9.40; 2008: 555). Evidence of Thessalian "genealogical hegemony" over the Lokrians can be seen in their usurpation of the "originally Lokrian hero" Deukalion (Hall 2002: 169). Even though Deukalion and Pyrrha founded the Lokrian *ethnos*, ancient sources are confused about the descent of the Lokrians: most considered them *Leleges*, the descendants of the "stone people" (Hes. fr. 234 M-W; *O.* 9.45; Str. 7.7.2), rather than direct descendants of Deukalion and Pyrrha – in this case, they stand outside the Hellenic genealogy, which structured ethnic identity around the children of Deukalion's son Hellen (see Chapter 3.2). Hall notes that other genealogies existed that included the Lokrians, such as that of Hekataios (*FGrH* 1 F 16), which had Lokros as the younger brother of Ion, and thus the grandson of Hellen (2002: 27).

²⁶ I regard these narratives as foundation stories, though as far as I can tell, no other critic has considered these myths as a double foundation of both *ethnos* (Lokrian) and *polis* (Opous). My framework for foundation stories is derived from Dougherty's work on poetry (particularly Pindar) and colonization (1993). While Opous is not colonized in the true sense, several of the motifs that Dougherty identifies as colonial appear here as well, which possibly indicates their broader status as foundation motifs. Colonial myths also focus on founding figures, *oikists*, who were the objects of cult worship (Dougherty 1993: 24). Unfortunately, the archaeological and literary record of Opous is so scant as to make an evaluation of any sort of cult there quite difficult (cf. Fossey 1990: 151-157; at 2, he remarks that he includes a discussion of cult to parallel his treatment of Phokis and Boiotia, not because the evidence warrants any conclusions). That said, it must be noted that Fossey ignores the end of *O.* 9, which specifically indicates some sort of festival of the lesser Ajax (*O.* 9.112; cf. Gerber 2002: 69-70).

50 νεωτέρων.²⁷ λέγοντι μάν
 χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν
 ὕδατος σθένος, ἀλλὰ
 Ζηνὸς τέχναις ἀνάπωπιν ἐξαίφνας
 ἄντλον ἐλεῖν. κείνων δ' ἔσαν
 χαλκάσπιδες ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι
 55 ἀρχᾶθεν, Ἰαπετιονίδος φύτλας
 κοῦροι κορᾶν καὶ φερτάτων Κρονιδᾶν,
 ἐγχώριοι βασιλῆες αἰεὶ

...apply your speech to
 Protogeneia's
 city, where, by decree of Zeus of the bright
 thunderbolt,
 Pyrrha and Deukalion came down from Parnassos
 and first established their home, and, without coupling,
 founded one folk, an offspring of stone:
 and they were called people.
 Awaken for them a clear-sounding path of words;
 praise wine that is old, but the blooms of hymns

that are newer. Indeed they tell that
 mighty waters had flooded over
 the dark earth, but,
 through Zeus' contriving, an ebb tide suddenly
 drained the floodwater. From them came
 your ancestors of the bronze shields
 in the beginning, sons from the daughters of Iapetos'
 race and from the mightiest sons of Kronos,
 being always a native line of kings,

In this passage, Pindar briefly summarizes the end of the flood narrative, which left only Deukalion and Pyrrha alive atop of Mount Parnassos. In Pindar's telling, the origin of the flood is left obscure, though Zeus' will is the clear cause of its cessation (D'Alessio 2005: 220). As Gerber, Miller, and others observe, the flood story is told here for the first time

²⁷ These lines have received much comment, which has attempted to ascertain just what Pindar means by παλαιός and νεώτερος; Gerber provides a summary of ancient and modern views (2002: 45-46). Furthermore, I take seriously the salutary advice of Carnes, who remarks that modern critics overestimate Pindaric innovation by underestimating the variety of myths in circulation in antiquity, and our ignorance of them (1995: 25). In the face of this glaring problem, especially in the dearth of archaeological and literary testimony concerning the Opountian Lokrians, Pindar's meaning in these lines may be beyond us. The idea that Pindar's innovation is the connection between Opous and Elis is as good as any, but impossible to prove (Gerber 2002: 50).

in extant Greek literature; a papyrus fragment of the early fifth-century comedian Epicharmos is contemporaneous with this ode, and also mentions the flood (113 K-A).²⁸ While a fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* mentions Deukalion and Pyrrha (fr. 234 M-W), West is uncertain whether the flood narrative was in the *Catalogue* (1985: 55 ff).

What is immediately noticeable in the opening of the story of the flood is that the foundation of Opous, the first human habitation following the destruction of the race, comes about Διὸς αἴσα (“by decree of Zeus”, *O.* 9.42). αἴσα is a complicated word in Pindar, though its basic meaning of “share” or “portion” often metaphorically denotes fate (*s.v.* αἴσα (A), Slater), and, in several instances, αἴσα is the fate that allows athletic victory to come to fruition: in *N.* 3.16, Aristokleidas’ strength in the *pankration* persists κατ’ αἴσαν (“thanks to your [i.e., the Muses] favour”); at *N.* 6.13, Alkimidas’ fortune at Nemea is expressly connected to Zeus’ favour (Διόθεν αἴσαν “a fortune from Zeus”); in *P.* 10, it is κατ’ αἴσαν (“duly”) that a living man sees his son crowned at the Pythian Games (10.25-26).²⁹ *O.* 9 itself points to the intrinsic necessity of the favour of the gods (above all, Zeus) to athletic victory: ἄνευ δὲ θεοῦ, σεσιγαμένον / οὐ σκαίότερον χρῆμ’

²⁸ Gerber (2002: 47) deals with early evidence for the flood narrative (2002: 47). A scholion says that the flood was sent by Zeus because of the “pollution” resulting from the butchering of Pelops (*schol. ad O.* 9.78d). Much later, Ovid remarks that mankind’s arrogance, violence, and contempt for the gods were to blame (*Met.* 1.161-162). As West demonstrates (1997: 489-94), the flood narrative is heavily indebted to Near Eastern sources, particularly Sumerian, Akkadian and Hebrew; he conjectures that the borrowing should be placed no earlier than 550. If this is the case, both Pindar and Epicharmos are quite early exponents of this myth. Since the flood narrative so obviously privileges Deukalion and Pyrrha, it is tempting to speculate that Pindar utilizes this myth in order to highlight praise of the Lokrians and Opountians. Pindar’s geographical specificity in his telling of this myth may have some importance, especially if Hall’s conjecture on the Thessalian usurpation of Deukalion is correct (2002: 169).

²⁹ On αἴσα, see Pfeijffer (1999: 626-630). He argues that αἴσα is related to the expectations engendered, at least in part, by the deeds of the victor’s ancestors: “the fact that the father was successful provides the son with the αἴσα of being a successful athlete himself” (1999: 630). In *O.* 9, the connection seems to be the Opountian heroes that the ode delineates, who provide an *oikos* of success for Epharmostos from his *polis*. The fragmentary *I.* 9 also attests to the use of αἴσα for “will” or “ordinance”, though in this case it indicates the source of a victory of a military nature. In the last example I cite, from *P.* 10, Slater translates “befittingly”, rather than “will” or “ordinance”. I see very little distinction in this instance: it is according to the “will” or “command” of a god that a man sees his son crowned – of course, it is also “befitting” that something happens according to the will of a god.

ἕκαστον (“but when god takes no part, each deed is no worse / for being left I silence”, 103-104) (also, *O.* 9.28-29). In fact, as D’Alessio quite rightly reminds us, Zeus is one of the honorees of Epharmostos’ ode (*O.* 9.6; 2005: 221). The involvement of the *nous* of Zeus in Opountian history connects the distant foundation of *ethnos*, the legendary establishment of *polis*, and the present praise of Epharmostos. As Pindar describes it, these three instances are correlative, not through content, but through the *aition* for each, that is, divine will; they are thematically contiguous despite the vast expanse of time.³⁰

Deukalion and Pyrrha are the founders of the Lokrian *ethnos*; their arrival at what will be Opous is characterized less as an arrival at a foreign land and rather as the arrival at their destined home – Deukalion and Pyrrha are not alien (although simultaneously not native) to the land of Opous, and it is there that they “establish their home” (*O.* 9.44).³¹ κτισσάσθαι λίθινον γόνον suggestively combines foundation language (κτίζω “to found”) with parentage (γόνος “offspring”); it also evokes Pindar’s vocabulary for athletic inscriptions (cf. *O.* 7.86: ἐν Μεγάροισιν τ’ οὐχ ἕτερον λίθινα / ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον “while in Megara the record in stone / tells no other tale”).³² Deukalion and Pyrrha begin the replacement of *oikos* by *ethnos* and *polis*: their natural daughter, Protogeneia, evaporates into the city they found (*O.* 9. 41-42);³³ the λίθινοι λαοί (“stone people”) are treated as if their children; the original inhabitants of Opous, their fellow-

³⁰ The involvement of divine will in city foundation is not out of the ordinary. Historical foundation stories of colonies frequently involve the Delphic oracle (Dougherty 1993: 15), and Apollo appears in many legends and myths surrounding colonial foundations (e.g., *P.* 9).

³¹ Most traditions have Deukalion and Pyrrha descend from Parnassos to Opous, though Strabo is more specific, and connects their original inhabitation with the seaport of Opous, Kynos (9.4.2).

³² As Gerber indicates, the verb κτίζω is rarely used with a human object (2002: 44).

³³ The identity of Protogeneia here has caused consternation: Gerber is correct to note that the most economical assumption is that Pindar is using the same genealogy as other ancient writers, and that Protogeneia here is the daughter of Deukalion and Pyrrha (*schol. ad O.* 9. 62b, d; 9.79c, d; 9.81; Gerber 2002: 49). I see no reason to quarrel with what seems like the most common-sense approach.

citizens, are also their descendants.³⁴ Pindar emphasizes the blurring of *oikos* and *polis*: he describes the descendants of the λίθινοι λαοί as “from them [i.e., Deukalion and Pyrrha] came your ancestors of the bronze shields...” (9.53-54).

The antecedent of κείνων has provoked much discussion among commentators ancient and modern; Gerber summarizes the different opinions, and prefers that the demonstrative refer to the λίθινοι λαοί only (2002: 48). In contrast, Miller regards Deukalion and Pyrrha as the only antecedents, especially since the description of the flood has brought them back into the audience’s mind (1993: 133); a scholion agrees with him and provides a genealogical framework (*schol ad O.* 9.79c; see too, D’Alessio 2005: 222). While I agree that a strictly grammatical interpretation seems to support Miller (and D’Alessio), the diversity of ancient and modern opinions points to the substantial ambiguity in Pindar’s usage; ambiguity, as I have already observed, exists in the initial description of the “city of Protogeneia”, and the parentage of the λίθινοι λαοί. As frequently, Pindar’s verse resists an interpretive straightjacket: the ambiguous demonstrative suggestively begins the replacement of *oikos* by *polis*, which is, of course, salient to the encomium of the ode’s laudandus, Epharmostos.

The understanding of ὑμέτεροι (9.54) has proceeded along similarly fraught lines: Gerber wants it to be able to refer equally to Epharmostos’ family and the Opountians more generally (2002: 48), whereas Miller argues for it as a description only of the Opountians (1993: 134). I agree with Gerber’s conclusion, though not his reasoning:

³⁴ Surely the emphasis on the creation of this people ἄτερ δ’ εὐνᾶς (“without coupling”) stresses at once the lack of sexual generation, but another type of generation, the establishment of an autochthonous people. While autochthonous people should naturally have no parentage, the “stone people” of Opous are given parents of a figurative sort in Deukalion and Pyrrha; they are, after all, called an “offspring of stone” (*O.* 9.45). Earth gives birth to the Sea (*Pontos*), in Hesiod’s *Theogony*, without sexual intercourse (Hes. *Theog.* 132), though in this case, it seems the emphasis is on parthenogenic procreation, rather than autochthony. The phrase is used in the *Shield of Herakles*, though perhaps with less of extended meaning ([*Sc.*]15).

ὑμέτεροι can refer to both Epharmostos' family and the Opountians more generally only because Epharmostos' family, as represented in the ode, is the Opountians. Pindar's verse, through mythic narrative and purposeful ambiguity completes not a merger of *oikos* and *ethnos* and *polis*, but rather a replacement of one by the other: Deukalion's natural daughter becomes an alternative name for a city that is populated by the fellow-citizens (or family) of the descendants of the λίθινοι λαοί.

The appearance of the autochthonous original inhabitants of Opous, the race of stone, evokes colonial motifs, which make distinctions between native and foreign ambiguous. Dougherty points to the importance of riddles in the oracular responses for supposedly historical colonial foundations: "oracles within colonization tales exploit the ambiguity of puns to create a new vision of reality, one that translates local phenomena into the Greek language, just as colonization itself transforms foreign soil into Greek soil" (1993: 45). While the latter is not crucial to *O. 9* – Opous is already Greek – the emphatically stressed etymological pun (*laos* > *laas*) operates in similar fashion to the riddling oracular responses of Delphi (Gerber 2002: 44; cf. *Il.* 24.611).³⁵ The stones, strewn about the site of Opous, are transformed through word-play into the inhabitants; through etymology and riddles, the empty land is invested with a supposedly original people, both inherently connected to it and externally generated.³⁶

³⁵ Consider, for example, Aristotle's later definition of riddles: αἰνίγματός τε γὰρ ἰδέα αὕτη ἐστὶ, τὸ λέγοντα ὑπάρχοντα ἀδύνατα συνάψαι ("the essence of a riddle consists in describing a fact by an impossible combination of words.") (*Poet.* 1458a 25). On imaginary etymology in early Greek poetry, see Ferrante 1965.

³⁶ The combination of autochthony and generation by an external force here is not unique to Greek mythology, which has similarly ambiguous origins for the Thebans (Spartoi, the "sown people"), the Aiginetans (Myrmidons, the "ant-people"; cf. Pherekrates fr. 125 K-A) and the Athenians (sometimes descended from snakes and other times from divine semen). In describing the political qualities of autochthony in *N. 8*, Carnes discusses the problematic nature of autochthony, which in Greek myth is often posited "as a solution to the problem of the origin of the human race" (1995: 12), but is also troublesome

5.3: Epharmostos and the History of the Opountians

If the first foundation story of Opous begins the subsuming of *oikos* into *ethnos* and *polis*, the second foundation continues and expands it (*O.* 9.57-66):

πρὶν Ὀλύμπιος ἀγεμῶν
 θύγατρ' ἀπὸ γᾶς Ἐπει-
 ῶν Ὀπόεντος ἀναρπάσας, ἔκαλος
 μίχθη Μαιναλίαισιν ἐν δειραῖς, καὶ ἔνεικεν
 60 Λοκρῶ, μὴ καθέλοι νιν αἰῶν πότημον ἐφάψαις
 ὄρφανὸν γενεᾶς. ἔχεν δὲ σπέρμα μέγιστον
 ἄλοχος, εὐφράνθη τε ἰδὼν ἦρωσ θετὸν υἰόν,
 μάτρως δ' ἐκάλεσσε νιν
 ἰσώνυμον ἔμμεν,
 65 ὑπέρφατον ἄνδρα μορφᾶ τε καὶ
 ἔργοισι. πόλιν δ' ὥπασεν λαόν τε διαιτᾶν.

until the lord of Olympos
 carried off the daughter of Opous
 from the land of the Epeians³⁷ and quietly
 lay with her in the Mainalian glens, and brought her
 to Lokros, lest time destroy him and impose a destiny
 with no children. But his spouse was bearing the
 greatest
 seed, and the hero rejoiced to see his adopted son;
 he called him by the same name
 as the mother's father,
 and he became a man beyond description for his beauty
 and deeds. And he gave him his city and people to
 govern.

In Pindar's narrative, the native-born kings of Opous (descended from Deukalion and Pyrrha), at some point cease to be fertile (the typical problem of autochthonous peoples). In response to this, Zeus (once again) generates offspring for the people of Opous: the

because it offers no transition to normal sexual reproduction: autochthons typically suffer infertility (e.g., Laios), inability to produce male heirs (e.g., Kychreus, Aktaios, Kekrops), difficulty in securing peaceful and orderly succession (e.g., Oedipus, Aiakos), as well as fraternal or father-son conflict (the Spartoi, Eteokles and Polyneikes; Laios-Oedipus; on all of these, see Carnes 1995: 12). While Carnes mentions the "stone people" of *O.* 9 in his list of autochthonous peoples, he does not discuss the Lokrians as partaking of the problems of autochthonous races, although infertility does play a role in the second foundation story.
³⁷ To be identified with the territory of Elis, in Pindar's day (Gerber 2002: 50). Homer confirms the Epeians lives in Elis (*Od.* 13.275); Pausanias too, while writing on the early history of Elis, provides a genealogy that includes Protogeneia and an eponymous great-grandson, Epeios (5.1.3-8).

god absconds with a daughter of the king of the Epeians (named Opous; Pindar leaves the daughter unnamed) and presents the fruit of this encounter, a remarkable boy, to the childless king of Opous.³⁸

In the second foundation story of the ode, αἴσα as a piece of vocabulary is absent, but considering it is the action of Zeus himself that brings about the rejuvenation of the Opountian line of kings (*O.* 9.59-61), we can see a parallel between this story and that of Deukalion and Pyrrha. In both, the threat of an extinct family and civic line is mitigated, not through natural reproduction, but through the intercession of Zeus.³⁹ The intercession, as in the case of Deukalion and Pyrrha, results in a further replacement of *oikos* by *polis*: the genetic connection, which had been muddled in the first foundation story (i.e., the parentage of the λίθινοι λαοί), is now clearly severed: instead, the *oikos* of Opountian kings is defined through their political identity. Furthermore, whatever troubles beset the autochthonous populations of other Greek *ethne* or *poleis*, the dual nature of Lokrian origin, in concert with the continuing presence of divine will, has ensured the continuity of ethnic and civic identities; the intercession of Zeus has manufactured a tradition of inheritance where, in strictly genealogical terms, none existed.

³⁸ The identity of the unnamed daughter is much discussed: Gerber cites Huxley, who argues that the unnamed daughter is the eponymous heroine of the town of Kaphyai, at the foot of Mount Mainalos (2002: 49-50). She is mentioned, though the name is corrupt, in a fragment of the Aristotelian work on *Constitutions* (F 561 Rose); Plutarch also refers to a Καβύη as the wife of Lokros and the mother of Opous (*Mor. Quaest. Graec.* 15). Of course, both of these sources post-date this ode. Huxley believes that Pindar “cleverly reveals” that he knows this backstory by means of his reference to Mount Mainalos (1975: 31). This may be the case, but we cannot go so far as to claim that “his story ties the Opountian royal line... to Arkadia through the eponymous heroine” (*ibid.*). If this was a concern to Pindar, surely he would not leave it to be inferred by his audience through such an oblique mythological reference. In the course of the ode, it would seem, the identity of the daughter of Opous is of less concern than her father, whose name (Opous) provides the name of the eponymous hero of the Opountians.

³⁹ It is compelling to consider a hidden autochthony in the Opous story as well, since he, like Aiakos, lacks a childhood (cf. *N.* 8.6-8). The rapidity whereby the childhood of Opous is sidestepped has been noted by interpreters of the ode: Gerber, for example, simply remarks “when there is no need to elaborate Pindar moves swiftly from σπέρμα to υἰόν to ἄνδρα” (2002: 52). Carnes, however, argues that *N.* 8 reflects a “suppressed autochthony” for Aiakos (1995: 16), and one wonders if the conflation of origin story for *ethnos* and *polis*, in both odes, contributes to this suppression and ambiguity.

The political character of family identity is further emphasized by the name given to the son. Naming, of course, figured in the first foundation story as well, emphasized through the pun of λαός (“people”) from λᾶος (“stone”). In the story of the adoption, naming is of primary importance: whereas the earlier story indicated the origin of the name of human beings generally, the second story particularizes the power of naming. The child born from the anonymous daughter of the king of the Epeians is named “the same name as the mother’s father” (*O.* 9.63-64). This does not stray too far from historical Greek practice, but considering the child is adopted, it is unusual to locate the child’s name outside the bounds of the patrilineal Opountian kingship. Of course, as Pindar has already made clear to us, the maternal grandfather of this child, the king of the Epeians, is named nothing other than Opous (*O.* 9.58): Opous’ name is performative of the civic identity of the Opountians themselves.⁴⁰

Just as Deukalion and Pyrrha were closely correlated with the Lokrian *ethnos*, Opous and his namesake city are almost identical; the description of Opous as “beyond description for his beauty and deeds” redounds onto the city itself (*O.* 9.65-66). It is probably of no coincidence that Pindar’s coupling of beauty with matching deeds is a commonplace of his praise of athletic victors as well, even in this ode (*O.* 9.94; also, *O.* 6.74-76; *O.* 8.19-20; *N.* 3.19; Simpson 1969: 122).⁴¹ As Pfeijffer remarks, appearance is more than simply surface in aristocratic Greek culture: “what a man looked like was

⁴⁰ In colonial narratives, Dougherty calls this sort of onomastics “retro-motivation”, and the label is appropriate here too (1993: 47).

⁴¹ *N.* 3 is the best example, but Pindar resorts to the same basic trope in a gnomic statement in *N.* 11.12-13 as well: καὶ τὸ θαητὸν δέμας ἀτρεμίαν τε σύγγονον· / εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾶ παραμεύσεται ἄλλους (“and praise him for his admirable build and inborn courage. / But if a man possessing riches surpasses others in beauty of form...”)

regarded as a reliable index of his total worth” (1999: 283; cf. *Il.* 13.431-32).⁴² The coincidence of Opous’ beauty and noble deeds results in his possession of the city itself and its people (*O.* 9.66).⁴³ His adornment of the city of Opous, however, does not stop: rather, Opous, like Deukalion and Pyrrha, brings new people to the city (*O.* 9.66-70):⁴⁴

ἀφίκοντο δέ οἱ ξένοι
 ἔκ τ’ Ἄργεος ἔκ τε Θη-
 βᾶν, οἱ δ’ Ἀρκάδες, οἱ δὲ καὶ Πισᾶται·
 υἷὸν δ’ Ἄκτορος ἐξόχως τίμασεν ἐποίκων
 70 Αἰγίνας τε Μενοίτιον.

Foreigners came to him
 from Argos and from Thebes:
 others were Arkadians and still others Pisans;
 but of the settlers he honored most the son of Aktor
 and Aigina, Menoitios...

In this stanza, Opous’ *μορφά* (“beauty”) and *ἔργοι* (“deeds”) lead to people coming from all over the Greek world to see him, and to settle in the land of Opous (note the characterization of these people first as *ξένοι* [“strangers”, 9.67], then as *ἐποίκοι* [“settlers”, 9.69]).⁴⁵ Just as Deukalion and Pyrrha arrived in their homeland, already at home in it, and populated it, so too does Opous arrive in his homeland, already named for him, and populates it again. That this immigration continues the confusion of *oikos* and *polis* is clear, since the people who arrive in Opous will be called from the name of their

⁴² The counter-example of Thersites (*Il.* 2.216: ἀΐσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε “this was the ugliest man who came beneath Iliion”) is instructive to the connection between beauty, noble deeds, and morality (see also, Chapter 1.2).

⁴³ Gerber covers the alternative tradition, that Opous and Lokros quarreled, and that Lokros then left Opous to found Western Lokris (Plut. *Mor. Quaest. Graec.* 15; 2002: 52). This tradition, *pace* Huxley (1975: 32), is absent in Pindar’s telling. As Pavlou points out, such changes and omissions (if that is what they are) are possible because, in contrast to catalogue poetry, epinician is occasional and tailored to a patron and audience (2008: 559; cf. also Carnes 1995: 25 and 29 n60).

⁴⁴ *Contra* Gerber, who contends that the foreigners “flocked” to Lokros (2002: 52). At 9.66, the elided indirect object of ὤπασεν (“gave”) must be Opous; that is, the foreigners arrive at a city that is now governed by Opous, to whom direction over it has already been given.

⁴⁵ In *N.* 8.7-12 too, the birth of Aiakos brings the “best of the neighbouring heroes” (ἡρώων ἄστοι περιναιεταόντων) to submit to his rule (*N.* 8.8-10).

eponymous hero – Opountians – just as if they were family members. Opous’ adornment of the city is so great as to include the incorporation of a hero of epic fame, Menoitios’ son Patroklos, whose story Pindar briefly alludes to at *O.* 9.70-79;⁴⁶ that the story obliquely appropriates Achilles is probably all the better when it comes to praise of the city of the Opountians.⁴⁷

Miller argues that city praise is a commonplace of epinician, but that in *O.* 9 it is “explicitly proclaimed as a theme co-equal with that of the victor” (1993: 122; cf. 9.14: αἰνήσαις ἔ καὶ υἱὸν). As my focus on the coincidence of *oikos* and *polis* indicates, Miller’s conclusion is an understatement: it is not just co-equal, but the equation of Epharmostos’ biography with Opous’ history means that praise of the victor and praise of the city are *one and the same*. While Epharmostos appeared at first glance to be family-less in the ode, Pindar actually represents him in a lineage that stretches back to the mythical beginnings of his *ethnos* and *polis*.

5.4: Performing Epharmostos’ *phya*

Through the telling of these myths, Pindar correlates the mythical and legendary foundations of *ethnos* and *polis* with the athletic victory of Epharmostos. This correlation

⁴⁶ On the identification of a parallel with Patroklos for Epharmostos, see Gerber (2002: 12). I wonder if it is possible to read a parallel between the stories of Patroklos and Herakles: both are introduced supposedly as a matter of course through the improvisational style of Pindar; both end formally, with a transition phrase returning to the subject at hand. In the case of the Herakles myth this is a typical *Abbruchformel* (9.35-41); in the Patroklos myth Pindar does not chastise himself, but he nonetheless resorts to a plea to find the “right words” (9.80: εἶην εὐρησιεπής) to continue his praise of Epharmostos. The content of the Patroklos and Herakles myths is not altogether dissimilar. In the latter, however, a story of perseverance in the face of overwhelming odds is set in the history of Opous (and thus the biography of Epharmostos), rather than an impious tale unconnected with the subject matter at hand.

⁴⁷ Race points to the formal features of the catalogue of immigrants that emphasize Patroklos: “it is obviously of great relevance in an ode for the Opountians, who prided themselves on Menoitios (whose name is reserved for climactic effect until the very end of its member) – and on his son Patroklos, whom Pindar goes on to praise extensively” (1989: 50). The praise of Patroklos and Menoitios here, however, I think falls into, as Race implies, city praise, rather than, as Gerber assumes, praise of Epharmostos through direct analogy to Patroklos (2002: 12).

is effected not only through the use of phraseology reminiscent of athletic victory, but through the continuity evidenced by the will of Zeus: it is by following the will of Zeus across epinician time that we can recognize most accurately the connecting line that the poem draws for us from Deukalion to Opous to Epharmostos. This device allows Pindar to elevate the athletic victories of one man to the same level as the foundational actions of Deukalion and Opous. The content of the actions appears as less important than their cause: the ode celebrates the instantiation of the will of Zeus, and those whose fate Zeus' will affects are themselves implicit objects of praise as well; as D'Alessio puts it: "under the sign of Zeus, the history of Opous turns out to be a prefiguration of the story of Epharmostos" (2005: 226).

Other elements draw this analogy together even tighter, especially in the story of Opous. As many have observed, the origin of Opous' mother, from Elis, presages the similar arrival of Epharmostos from Elis, in possession of an Olympic victory (D'Alessio 2005: 227; Gerber 2002: 50; Miller 1993: 132). Where the arrival of Opous rejuvenates the royal line of Opous and sparks the influx of immigrants who come to marvel at the semi-divine ruler, the arrival of Epharmostos with his Olympic victory similarly exalts the city of Opous, and reactivates its ancient connection to Elis (*O.* 9.16-20). Pindar draws an explicit connection between the immigrants who come to marvel at Opous and the victories that Epharmostos brings in tow with his triumph at Olympia: foreigners come from Argos, Thebes, Arkadia, Aigina, and Pisa (9.67-70). In the victory catalogue that follows, each of the victories comes from a contest held in these same areas: Argos (9.88), the Lykaia and Pellene in Arkadia (9.95-98), the Ioleia in Boeotia, and of course,

Olympia, which corresponds to Pisa (D'Alessio 2005: 226).⁴⁸ Thus the athletic victory and the epinician that celebrates it revive and renew the κλέος (“fame”) of Epharmostos’ represented family, that is, the putative line of descent of the entire Lokrian ethnicity.

Through the intricate intertwining of Epharmostos’ biography with the history of Opous, especially the founding figures of Lokrian ethnicity and Opountian civic identity, Pindar encourages us to understand Epharmostos in the lineage of these founding figures, as an effective contributor to the reification of ethnic and civic identity and its glorification. The occasion of Epharmostos’ victory is, we must remember, the occasion of the re-telling of the story of ethnic and civic foundation; Segal remarks on the “continuity... between the remote past and the present” in this ode (1986a: 78), and the poem works as a myth of putative descent in its performance, by delineating supposed ancestry and correlating the biography of Epharmostos with the history of his city. Miller argues that the ode configures its praise around the notion that Opountian *arete* is a “civic and cultural phenomenon that need not depend on the mechanisms of straightforward biological inheritance for its perpetuation” (1993: 144), but this is not the case, since his argument ignores the correlation of biography and history: replacement and identification during the singing of the ode develop the metaphorical civic and ethnic lineage into an actual one. Regardless of the impossibly obscure commissioning process or the possible relevance of the institution of *proxenia*, the ode’s tight correlation of victor and city emphasizes the importance of one to the other: the identity of genealogy and history underscore the notion that the *polis* is *oikos* for Epharmostos, and Epharmostos both citizen and son to Opous. In fact, the unity of victor and city, *oikos* and *ethnos* and *polis*,

⁴⁸ Gerber offers information on these contests: on the Argive festival in honour of Hera (2002: 60), on the games of the Lykaia and those at Pellene (2002: 63), the Ioleia (2002: 64).

removes any need for biographical speculation, since the rhetoric of the ode leaves us with no doubt that this is a joint encomium of Epharmostos the *periodonikes*, and Opous “the Lokrians’ famous mother city with its splendid trees” (*O.* 9.20); after all, Pindar enjoins his chorus to αἰνήσαις ἔ καὶ υἰόν (“praise the son and his city”) (*O.* 9.14).⁴⁹

Beyond this civic and familial identification, Pindar’s ode takes advantage of genealogically-imagined ethnicity to situate Epharmostos in a relationship of inheritance, despite the ostensible absence of such a relationship with his literal forbearers; the heraldic mode allows him to “correct” reality (cf. Nicholson 2005).⁵⁰ The end of the ode is emphatic, as Pindar declares *phya* “altogether best” (*O.* 9.100); he commands any would-be proclamation to include divinity, in-born excellence, and the physical attributes of his victor (*O.* 9.108). The heraldic mode, as so often, allows Pindar to allude to the *angelia*, but nonetheless leaves him free to fill out the categories of the proclamation as necessary, or even invent new categories. Physical beauty, for instance, one of the key signifiers of aristocratic excellence in the Archaic and Classical world, has no place in the vocabulary of the herald’s proclamation, yet the importance of beauty to athletic victory should not be overlooked. As important as it is in Pindar’s praise for athletes, even as prosaic a document as the Oxyrhynchos Olympic Victors’ List refers to physical

⁴⁹ Another “mother” city of an ethnicity is found at *O.* 6.100, where Stymphalos is ματέρ’ εὐμήλοιο... Ἀρκαδίας (“mother-city of flock-rich Arkadia”). On the adjective ἀγλαόδενδρον, perhaps a *hapax* (though, *O.* 2.73 comes close: ἀγλαῶν δειδρέων “radiant trees”), see Gerber (2002: 30; cf. Poltera 2008: 372-373). Nash regards the motif of the “mother-city” as a way for Pindar to integrate himself into the victor’s social circle, and for the victor’s *polis* to become *genos* (1990: 39).

⁵⁰ As Hubbard also puts it, “praising an athlete’s genetic stock and hereditary talent is an effective technique for appearing to give an aristocratic pedigree to a family that might not have actually had one” (2001: 391). He also effectively reads *O.* 9 as part of the “complementary dialectic” (1985: 108), in Pindar, of *phya* and *techne* (1985: 116-124). This persuasive argument for an emphasis on both inborn talent and training does not vitiate my own contention that Pindar uses myth to “correct” the family history of Epharmostos. In fact, Hubbard argues that Pindar’s poetics require both *phya*, that which is “original or primary” (1985: 107), and *techne*, that which “can be seen as an external addition to it” (*ibid.*). Therefore, Pindar’s encomium requires a family history that emphasizes athletic pedigree, even as he concurrently praises training and education.

attributes: Astylos of Syracuse (winner in the *hoplitodromos*) is recorded as the “most powerful” (κράτιστος) of athletes at the Olympics of 476 (*P. Oxy* II 222 col. i, line 18; cf. *FGrH* 415 F 1); an unnamed (perhaps Hippotion) Tarentine victor in the pentathlon is “friendliest” (φίλιστος) in 468 (*P. Oxy* II 222 col. ii, line 36; cf. *FGrH* 415 F 1; Paus. 5.25.7); finally, a Parhassian boy wrestler is “the most beautiful” (κάλλιστος) in the same games (*P. Oxy* II 222 col. ii, line 41).⁵¹ Pindar’s emphasis on Epharmostos’ one-time youth (9.89) and beauty (9.94) bring external physical attributes into the sphere of athletic praise, even as they connect Epharmostos to his mythical antecedents (specifically, Opous: 9.65-66).

Therefore, Pindar can imagine the herald’s voice not only proclaiming his victor, but describing his physical attributes, all of which is subsumed to an apparent inheritance: *phya*, is, after all, best, and Epharmostos’ ode is not performative of any “cultural” notion of identity. Rather, through the imagining of ethnic and civic history as genealogy, the performance of the ode effectively generates a lineage for Epharmostos. The remote past repeats through time, and the acts of ethnic establishment, civic foundation, and athletic victory are entwined through the will of Zeus, and the resolution of family ties in Lokrian and Opountian genealogy. In such a performance, we need not speculate on the impossibly obscure commissioning process, since the very structure of the ode, the praise of city and athlete, connected as if family members, stresses its civic character, regardless of the specifics of commissioning. Epharmostos’ ode signifies the ability of civic identity

⁵¹ Grenfell and Hunt discuss the papyrological issues with these words (1899: 91). To my knowledge, no study has concluded why some athletes were recorded as such, or how these determinations were made (cf. Robert 1900: 142-143). Despite his learned discussion of Olympic Victors’ lists of all types, Christesen does not comment on the superlative descriptions attached to these three victors on *P. Oxy* II 222 (2007: 28-30; 202-206; 382-384). Pausanias refers to one athlete, Kratinos of Aigina, as the most beautiful of athletes at his games (Paus. 6.3.6); it is possible, though uncertain, that he refers to the same tradition recorded in the Victors’ List.

to replace family identity, as well as the essential importance of *polis* in the act of athletic participation, the praise of victory, and thus the represented identification of an aristocratic athlete.

Chapter 6: Kyniska and the Masculine Rhetoric of Athletic Verse (CEG 2.820)

The εικῶν (“image”) of Kyniska, not far from the Temple of Olympian Zeus, beside the statue of a countryman, must have been striking: her life-like posture, pose, and scale placed a physical manifestation of the female form in the very sanctuary to which women were forbidden entry during the Olympic Games (Paus. 5.6.7). Five hundred years later, Pausanias nonchalantly describes Kyniska’s statue among the “forest of ancient sporting fame” (Decker 2013) found at Olympia (Paus. 6.1.6): some are of remarkably handsome men (Paus. 6.3.6), one or two are associated with famous sculptors (e.g., Paus. 6.2.7, 6.4.3-4, 6.4.5), a few are unnamed (Paus. 6.3.1, 6.9.2), a couple are even sculpted from wood (Paus. 6.18.7), while most replicate the life-size victor in stone – almost all are naked, youthful, male bodies.¹ The second-century AD geographer can remark blithely on the chariot and horse group highlighted by a statue of Kyniska, but this is only because for him, female victors, even in the pan-Hellenic games, were routine (Scanlon 2008: 180; cf. Dillon 2000; Mantas 1995). In the early years of the fourth century, however, Kyniska’s victory and dedication were unique in the masculine landscape of Olympia.² Both body and voice were given to Kyniska through the medium of stone, and although Pausanias does not report the text, excavators at Olympia have found a fragmentary statue base and part of the epigram which powerfully declares her achievement:

¹ Estimates on statue numbers are speculative: Pausanias lists 197 statues (Hermann 1988); 100 inscriptions have been excavated, of which around 60 are additional to those mentioned by Pausanias (Smith 2007: 95). Hyde extrapolates from Pausanias’ account and the excavated bases that 494 monuments stood on the Altis (1912: 229); Smith declines to guess, but remarks that Pausanias himself tells us he is only giving a selection of statues, in contrast to the 25 statues of Zeus, which he says was a complete account (2007: 95)

² Ancient tradition has her winning two Olympic victories, the first in 396 (=Moretti no. 373) and the second in 392 (=Moretti no. 381). The inscribed dedication mentions only one victory and, given its boast, I assume the epigram celebrates her fist victory.

Σπάρτας μὲν ἰβασιλῆες ἐμοῖ | πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί,
 ἄριμα(τ)ι δ' ὠκυπόδων ἵππων | νικῶσα Κυνίσκα
 εἰκόνα τάνδ' ἔστασ(ε), μόνιαν | δ' ἐμέ φαμι γυναικῶν
 Ἑλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόνιν | δε λαβεῖν στέφανον.³

Spartan kings were my fathers and brothers,
 but, victorious with a chariot of swift-footed horses,
 Kyniska set up this statue. And I declare that I alone
 of women from all of Greece seized this crown.

Despite the singular status of Kyniska, her lost statue and its epigrammatic boast, and her fundamental importance to the history of women and sport in antiquity, the epigram proclaiming her athletic achievement has been treated as documentary evidence rather than being the subject of literary studies. Although historians have situated her in the annals of sporting firsts (Tod 1949: 106; Young 1996: 181) or contextualized her within Spartan social and economic history (Cartledge 1987: 149-150; Ducat 1999: 168; Hodkinson 2000; Kyle 2003; Perry 2007) – thus reflecting a general interest in female athletics in the ancient world (e.g., Golden 1998; Scanlon 2002) – a rigorous literary study of the epigram and its place in the poetics of feminine athletics is still missing. Since antiquity, the short poem has been interpreted as evidence for Kyniska's reasons for competing in the Olympics or the intentions of her brother, the Spartan king Agesilaos. In such biographical criticism, Kyniska's notable victory becomes an afterthought in a moralizing tale (Xen. *Ages.* 9.6; Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 20.1), an event that only possesses meaning in the context of male political machinations (Kyle 2003; Perry 2007), or a naïve feminist folk story (Pomeroy 2002).

This chapter's focus on the epigram's literary quality is, therefore, a rebuttal to these reductionist narratives. Building on my analysis of the representative quality of the

³ I cite the text from Hansen's *CEG*, though I follow Ebert for ἔστασε (Ebert 1972: 110; cf. no. 33.3). The fragmentary text was found at Olympia; for full epigraphic apparatus and lengthy discussion, see Hansen.

heraldic mode, and the contingent masculinity of competitive athletics (see Chapter 3.3), I argue for an interpretation of Kyniska's epigram that is generated from the poem itself. Through its assertive use of the heraldic mode – to represent an impossible ritual – the epigram points to the centrality of the *angelia*, as well as its discursive, and ideological nature. Therefore, my examination of the epigram's rhetoric of identification, its modulation and modification of the heraldic *angelia*, and its breach of generic conventions reveals the potential of Kyniska's epigram as an implicit instance of “dissidence”, whereby the supposedly intrinsic connection between masculinity, athletic *arete*, and poetry, is provocatively challenged.⁴

6.1: Archaeology and Onomastics

Despite a relative abundance of physical and literary evidence (fragments of the epigram were found at Olympia: *IG* 5.1, 1564a; it also survives as *Anth. Pal.* 13.16), the text of the epigram itself is not entirely certain, though most of the inscription can be read – a single letter remains debated.⁵ In Hansen's widely cited reconstruction from the *CEG*, he suggests the first person, active, singular, first aorist from ἵστημι (“to set up”), in Doric form, ἔστασα, as the finite verb of line three. This reconstruction is not without problems: the editors of the text in *IG*, for instance, record the form as third person singular (ἔστασε); manuscripts of the *Palatine Anthology* also record an Atticized third

⁴ I read “dissidence” in light of the work of Dollimore and Sinfield, self-professed cultural materialists. As Brannigan demonstrates, the cultural materialist method, like cultural poetics, is concerned with ideology and the reproduction of ideology in texts (1998: 10). Where they differ is in the hopefulness of the former: “the cultural materialist ‘regards it as his task to brush history against the grain’ (Benjamin 1992 [1968]: 257), which is to say that the cultural materialist shares the new historicist method of describing the processes and forces of ideological hegemony, but also attempts to activate the dissidence and subversion which the cultural materialist believes lies dormant in any textual manifestation of ideology” (*ibid.*).

⁵ The rest of the text of the epigram can be confidently reconstructed by collating the inscription with the version from the *Anthology*. We have no certain information as to how the epigram came to be collected into the *Anthology*.

person form (ἔσθησε: *Anth. Pal.* 13.16.2). In favour of the first person, Hansen claims that ἔστασε resulted from an error by the stone-cutter prompted by the great frequency of third person forms in dedicatory inscriptions; that is, Hansen does not dispute the reading of *IG*, but suggests an ancient scribal error based on the argument that third and first person are not to be found on the same epigram in this period.

In contrast, Ebert's edition, which includes a drawing of the inscription (no. 33; cf. Loewy 1885: 77), argues for the third person (1972: 112). While he agrees that ἔστασε is unusual following the first person ἐμοί (820.1) and the last sentence which is again in the first person, nonetheless, Ebert does not assign the "Personenwechsel" to masonry error, but rather compares *CEG* 1.399.1-2 which features a similar change (*ibid.*); he conjectures that the change of person may have been to avoid an excessive occurrence of *a*-sounds (*ibid.*). In turn, Hansen (*CEG* 2.820 *ad loc.*) considers Ebert's comparison inappropriate: he points out that *CEG* 1.399 has been corrected in antiquity, and the first person verb of the first line seems to have been "forgotten" – another error by the *lapidarius* (1.399 *ad loc.*; cf. also 2.493, which he sees as a corrupt ancient error). Kurke, in support of Ebert, offers an interpretation which accounts for the third person form and accepts the third person reading, adducing *CEG* 2.493 and 2.595 (the latter of which Hansen calls "valde inconcinnum": *ad loc. CEG* 2.820), which are prior to 300 B.C., and yet demonstrate a shift from first to third person (1993: 160 n66). Hansen's own argument is weakened, since his assertion that "nihil ex epigrammatis ant a. 300 a.Chr.n. incisio hic conferri potest" (*ad loc. CEG* 2.820) is challenged by the exceptions that he himself adduces (namely, *CEG* 2.493 and 2.595). While these may be "awkward", his emendations seem to go against his own rule to be "unrepentantly

conservative” and seem to rely on assumptions of scribal errors which, by their very nature, are impossible to prove (CEG II, p. *xii*). Ebert’s appeal to CEG 1.399 is also questionable, especially considering the epigram’s ancient history of erasures and restorations (Kurke 1993: 160 n65), but there are other examples, even though they are both some decades after Kyniska’s (CEG 2.493, fourth century; CEG 2.595, perhaps 335/4); Hansen’s theory of awkwardness in one inscription, and masonry error in two cannot be disproven, but neither can it be positively proven. When the further corroboration of the manuscript reading of the *Anthology* is added, it seems preferable to retain the third person and simply write ἔστασε, “Kyniska set up”.

Aside from the fragmentary text, little remains of the large sculptural group dedicated by Kyniska. The statue base, discovered near Olympia’s *prytaneion*, is a round black limestone, of which one third is preserved today (Serwint 1987: 432); the base is displayed in the “Women in Sport” room of the Museum of the Olympic Games in Antiquity at Ancient Olympia. On the top of the stone is the impression of a larger-than-life human foot, from which Serwint infers that the εἰκὼν of Kyniska, a victorious erect female, was placed on this base (*ibid.*). She concludes that the base was not large enough to accommodate the entire group recorded by Pausanias (a statue of Kyniska, a charioteer, chariot and horses: 6.1.6), and thus the statue of the victor must have stood separately from a larger base of its own, or as a non-extant projection from the surviving base (*ibid.*). A conjectural reconstruction of the pose of the statue is possible, thanks to the surviving impression of the foot:

“the statue was turned towards the other objects represented in the dedication... Because the front of the right foot is so near the edge of the base, it is likely that only the toes and the ball of the foot rested on the ground and the heel was

elevated; in that event... the left foot probably rested with the full foot on the ground and the statue stood in a relaxed contrapposto pose” (Serwint 1987: 433).

Our meager knowledge of the sculptor, Apelleas, suggests that Kyniska may have been portrayed praying: Pausanias reports that another Lakedaimonian victor sculpted by Apelleas, Anaxandros, whose statue stood beside Kyniska’s, was depicted praying (6.1.7) and Pliny tells us that Apelleas was known for his statues of praying women (*NH* 34.86; Serwint 1987: 434).

The statue base from Olympia is not the only dedication inscribed with Kyniska’s name to survive from the fourth-century. Excavations in the area of the Menelaion at Sparta uncovered the remains of a Doric capital and abacus clearly inscribed KYNISKA followed, probably, with [HEΛE]NAI (Woodward 1908: 87; *IG* V (1) 235). Woodward speculates that Kyniska’s name, used effectively as the end of a hexameter in *CEG* 2.820, may well have served the same function here; further evidence for the content of this potential epigram, however, is lacking (*ibid.*). In fact, there is no need to imagine a verse inscription, and all we can say confidently is that the small monument probably supported a votive offering (*ibid.*).

Another piece of dedicatory evidence comes from the pronaos of the Temple of Olympian Zeus: Pausanias reports that an under-life-size golden statue of Kyniska’s horses stood there (5.12.5). *IvO* 634, a rectangular base of white marble was found in the *pronaos* and preserves a sculptor’s signature: “Apelleas, son of Kallikles, made it”. Serwint argues that the location, size of the base, and the similarity of the signature of Apelleas to the signature on the base containing *CEG* 2.820 suggest that these are the remains of the statue of small golden horses (1987: 431-432).

The name of the Spartan princess has attracted some attention (Pomeroy 2002: 21); her sisters have names that allude to equestrianism (Eupolia, Proauga, Prolyta; Pomeroy, *ibid.*), though Pomeroy’s suggestion that this indicates “equestrian interests in the female line” is unsubstantiated (*ibid.*; cf. Kyle 2003: 194 n10); it could as easily demonstrate the equestrian interests of her father, the Spartan state, or a host of other reasons inaccessible to us. The name “Kyniska” is unusual, since the only other instance in the *LGN* is a Thessalian Kyniska known from a short inscription (the name alone) found at Larissa and dated to the third century B.C. (*IG X (2) 671a*). Etymologically, it is a straightforward, though little used diminutive of “female dog” (σ.ν. κυνίσκα, *LSJ*; *Ar. Ra.* 1360; cf. *Suda* K 2710).⁶ In the masculine, the name is associated with the Spartan royal family: Kyniska’s paternal grandfather Zeuxidamos was nicknamed “Kyniskos” (*Hdt.* 6.71).⁷ Whether Kyniska was the Spartan princess’s moniker or a given name in honour of her short-lived grandfather is uncertain – sources only refer to her as Kyniska and our knowledge of female naming practices in Sparta is incomplete.

6.2: Ancient and Modern Interpretation: the Biographical Approach

The earliest literary source for Kyniska’s story is Xenophon’s *Agesilaos*, written after the king’s death, ca. 359 (*Xen. Ages.* 10.3; Cawkwell 1976: 63), or over thirty years

⁶ Perhaps coincidentally, Lakonian hounds were a prized possession of Spartan households (*Xen. Ages.* 9.6; Cartledge 1987: 149). Aristotle adds that the *female* Lakonian hound was said to be cleverer than the male (*Hist an.* 608a25).

⁷ *Suda* (Π 2111) gives “Kynisko” as the name of the father of a Macedonian poet of New Comedy, Posidippus. “Kyniskos” as a masculine name is not entirely uncommon (*LGN* lists fourteen instances, of which eight are earlier than the Hellenistic period; cf. Tuplin 1977: 5); Xenophon knows of another Spartan Kyniskos, a general mentioned in the *Anabasis* (7.1.13; Cartledge (1987: 150) and Tuplin (1977: 7) wonder if this could be a son of Kyniska). A Kyniskos (son of Kyniskos) from Mantinea left a dedication for his victory in the boys’ boxing competition (~460 B.C.; Moretti no. 265; Ebert no. 21; cf. *Paus.* 6.4.11). On this Kyniskos, see Chapter 4.2.

after the writing of Kyniska’s epigram.⁸ Biographical and encomiastic tradition provides the context for the complex “encomium” (Xen. *Ages.* 10.3; cf. Harman 2012: 427):⁹ although Xenophon was on familiar terms with Agesilaos, the Spartan king was also his benefactor and “there was a debt of gratitude to be paid” (Cawkwell 1976: 63). The account of Kyniska, which follows the chronological narrative, is in a section which purports to “show the virtue that was in [Agesilaos’] soul, the virtue through which he wrought those deeds and loved all that is honourable and put away all that is base” (Xen. *Ages.* 3.1). Needless to say, our interpretation of what follows is informed by an understanding of what Xenophon found καλός and αἴσχροα.¹⁰

Xenophon demonstrates Agesilaos’ virtue through a series of anecdotes, which function as a direct contrast to the court, estate, and mores of the Persian king (Xen. *Ages.* 9.1: ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐρῶ γε ὡς καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὑπεστήσατο τῇ τοῦ Πέρσου ἀλαζονείᾳ “but indeed I shall state how his behaviour differed from the boastfulness of the Persian King”; Perry 2007: 82). Kyniska’s presence in Xenophon’s text is used as further evidence for this demonstration of contrasted virtue and vice (Xen. *Ages.* 9.6):¹¹

ἐκεῖνό γε μὴν πῶς οὐ καλὸν καὶ μεγαλογνώμον, τὸ αὐτὸν μὲν ἀνδρὸς ἔργοις
καὶ κτήμασι κοσμεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον, κύνας τε πολλοὺς θηρευτὰς καὶ

⁸ We can assume that Kyniska’s epigram was written and the monument erected after 396 (=Moretti no. 373), but before her second victory in 392 (=Moretti no. 381), which is not mentioned in the poem.

⁹ Xenophon’s narrative of the achievements of Agesilaos differs considerably in the *Hellenica*, an explicitly historical work. Millender points out that the Agesilaos who is “readily obedient to the state” in *Agesilaos* is not always so obedient in the *Hellenica* (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.3, when Agesilaos rather reluctantly returns to Sparta as ordered; or *Hell.* 5.2.3, when Agesilaos recuses himself from command of the army against Mantinea; 2009: 21). On the issue of the *Agesilaos* and *Hellenica*’s portrayal of Agesilaos, see Dillery (1995: 114-119).

¹⁰ Harman argues for a much more nuanced reading of the *Agesilaos* than has previously been put forward: she argues that the text positions Agesilaos as the ideal pan-Hellenic Greek while at the same time it challenges the reader to acknowledge and grapple with the problems of pan-Hellenism to Greek identities (2012: 450-451). Harman’s reading makes it even less likely that we can simply take supposed insights into Agesilaos’ behaviour at face value. In addition, on Xenophon’s complicated dialogue between virtue, vice, and leadership, though without explicit reference to *Agesilaos*, see Tamiolaki 2012.

¹¹ Millender argues that the *Agesilaos* as a whole could be read as an extensive social and political comparison between Agesilaos and his Persian counterpart, Artaxerxes II (2009: 20).

ἵππους πολεμιστηρίους τρέφοντα, Κυνίσκαν δὲ ἀδελφὴν οὔσαν πείσαι
 ἄρματοτροφεῖν καὶ ἐπιδείξαι νικώσης αὐτῆς ὅτι τὸ θρέμμα τοῦτο οὐκ
 ἀνδραγαθίας ἀλλὰ πλούτου ἐπίδειγμά ἐστι.

It is surely good and high-minded, that he adorned his own home with the deeds and possessions of a man, that he reared many hunting dogs and war-horses, but that he persuaded his sister Kyniska to breed chariot-horses and he demonstrated by her victory that such an animal is not a proof of manliness but of wealth.

Kyniska's chariot victory, therefore, becomes a mechanism by which Agesilaos proves the irrelevance of chariot racing. For Xenophon, this account characterizes Agesilaos as an ideal monarch; significantly, in the *Hieron* he also disparages the value of chariot racing and its relationship with excellence in similar terms (cf. Xen. *Ages.* 9.6-7 and Xen. *Hier.* 11.5-9; Fantuzzi 2005: 257). The androcentric character of Xenophon's story denies agency to Kyniska and offers no plausible explanation for her erection of a victory monument, her second Olympic victory four years later, nor her subsequent heroization by the Spartans (Paus. 3.15.1), facts which Xenophon omits entirely.¹²

Plutarch repeats Xenophon's account, though more briefly, and with slight modifications, in his biography of Agesilaos (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 20.1):

οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ ὁρῶν ἐνίους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπὸ ἵπποτροφίας δοκοῦντας εἶναι
 τινὰς καὶ μέγα φρονοῦντας, ἔπεισε τὴν ἀδελφὴν Κυνίσκαν ἄρμα καθεῖσαν
 Ὀλυμπίασιν ἀγωνίσασθαι, βουλόμενος ἐνδείξασθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὡς
 οὐδεμιᾶς ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς, ἀλλὰ πλούτου καὶ δαπάνης ἢ νίκης.

And indeed seeing that some of the citizens esteemed themselves and were presumptuous because of their horse-breeding, he persuaded his sister Kyniska to compete in the Olympics, wishing to demonstrate to the Greeks that victory is nothing to do with *arete*, but with wealth and resources.

In this account, Agesilaos directly responds to his perception of Spartan arrogance on account of their breeding of horses. Just as in Xenophon's version, Agesilaos persuades

¹² Kyle briefly considers her second win, though he concludes that Kyniska's second win must have (also) been at Agesilaos' beckoning, since otherwise she would not have stopped at only two (2003: 190). We have no information about entrants into the chariot race other than winners, so Kyniska's lack of further victories is not evidence of her lack of attempts.

Kyniska to enter a chariot in the Olympics; this time, however, her victory supposedly proves that athletics and *arete* are not related, in contrast to Xenophon's narrative, which distinguished between athletic victory and "manliness". Aside from this slight change of emphasis, Plutarch's narrative has a sufficient affinity to that of Xenophon to suggest a direct borrowing.¹³

In later epinician writing, Kyniska's victory gains currency, since she appears as a significant comparison for victorious royal females; for instance, in one of the new fragments of Posidippus, Kyniska is a foil for the praise of Berenike I (AB 87.3-4): τὸ Κυνίσκας / ἐν Σπάρτῃ χρόνιον κῦδος ἀφειλόμεθα "we have snatched away the long-lasting glory of Kyniska of Sparta".¹⁴ Fantuzzi argues that Kyniska is relevant specifically because of her special, and temporally unlimited, boast ("I alone of all women"), which immediately implicates future female victors in competition with her (2005: 254).¹⁵ The enduring resonance of her boast should alert us to its uniqueness and its importance to a contextualized interpretation of the epigram as the speech act of an athletic victor, not only as an addendum to a moralistic tale. Fantuzzi further observes

¹³ Stadter makes a strong claim that Plutarch was indebted to Xenophon across his writing: Plutarch cites Xenophon directly almost 50 times, and it is clear that he "had read, admired, and made notes on Xenophon's works" (2012: 44). On the direct relationship of Plutarch's *Agésilaios* and Xenophon's *Agésilaios*, see Shipley (1997: 46-51) and Bresson 2002.

¹⁴ Golden notes the lexical and syntactical similarities in the following epigram, AB 88, and Kyniska's: "in both, βασιλῆες, 'kings, monarchs', appears in the same place in the first line; the technical term for winning a chariot race or races, in the second; and forms of μόνος, 'only, alone', proclaim the distinction of the victor" (2008: 22). In AB 87.1-2, the horses, which won Berenike I's victory, are explicitly mares; it is unclear why this was so, or whether she competed in an otherwise unattested chariot race for mares at Olympia. Kyle compares Kyniska's story with the anger of Antilochos during the Funeral Games for Patroklos: "during the race Antilochus threatened his male team lest they be beaten by a team of mares. What a shame they would bring" (2003: 190; cf. *Il.* 23.407-409). I wonder if the mares in Berenike's epigram add to the eclipse of Kyniska's fame: not only has Berenike, a woman, ruined Kyniska's claim to be the *only* female to win at the Olympics, but she has further passed her by winning with female horses (I thank the students in my "Ancient Greek Athletic Culture" class at Mount Allison University in the Fall of 2013 for this keen suggestion).

¹⁵ The boast places Kyniska, so Fantuzzi argues (2005: 254-255), in a troublesome position, since her fame comes out of her uniqueness; thus, Berenike "snatches away" Kyniska's glory by the mere fact of equaling her feat.

that Kyniska's importance to Berenike (and Posidippus) comes from her victory *qua* princess (2005: 261); thus, the victory of the Spartan woman Euryleonis, sometime after Kyniska (~368 B.C.; Paus. 3.17.6; Moretti, 418), is ignored because she was not royal.¹⁶ Furthermore, the posthumous heroization of Kyniska may have been a model for Berenike's own desired apotheosis (Fantuzzi 2005: 261; cf. Mitchell 2012: 17).

Kyniska's last textual appearance is in Pausanias' description of dedications at Olympia (5.12.5; 6.1.6) as well as his discussion of Spartan history in relation to local dedications (3.8.1-2, 15.1). In the former, Pausanias provides a simple description of the statue, and mentions the existence, although he does not quote it, of the epigram ("there are also inscriptions relating to Kyniska": Paus. 6.1.6). He also describes the dedication of the models in the pronaos of the Temple of Olympian Zeus (5.12.5; cf. *IvO* 634 above). This double dedication of an enormous chariot group (of a size probably without precedent) likely points to the involvement of the Spartan state in the celebration of her athletic victory (Hodkinson 2000: 320-323).

Pausanias' description of these Olympian dedications echoes his discussion of Kyniska in the Spartan section of his work. There, Kyniska's story is placed within the history of the kings of Sparta; Pausanias' information seems derived from either his own interpretation of the epigram's content or an alternative tradition lost to us (φιλοτιμότητα δὲ ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα ἔσχε τὸν Ὀλυμπικόν "she was exceedingly ambitious to succeed at the Olympic Games" [3.8.1]), since he does not mention Agesilaos' supposed intervention.¹⁷ Rather, he notes that Kyniska's epigram (along with the

¹⁶ The stories that accrued are comparable: he would only compete in the *stadion* if his competitors were also kings (Plu. *Vit. Alex.* 4).

¹⁷ Kyle implies that Pausanias' failure to record the role of Agesilaos in his narrative makes him "the latest and least credible of our sources on Kyniska" (2003: 186). While I am not unsympathetic to the view that

subsequently erased epigram of Pausanias on the Delphic tripod: see Thuc. 1.132.2 = *FGE* ‘Simonides’ 17a) is the only poetic commemoration of the royal house of Sparta (3.8.2). In his later description of the city of Sparta itself, Pausanias describes a hero-shrine to Kyniska in the Plane-tree grove (sacred to Helen), near the shrines to other Spartan heroes (3.15.1). For Pausanias, this passes without comment, but as Mitchell notes, “Cynisca was... the first woman to receive hero cult in her own right” (2012: 17; on athletes and hero-cult, see Currie 2005).¹⁸ The location of her shrine in the Plane-tree grove, where ephebic contests were held, might point to her as an *exemplum* for young men (Mitchell 2012: 17). If Helen of the Plane-Tree were the propitiated goddess of Alkman’s *Partheneion*, as has been suggested (Calame 1977: 122-128), Kyniska may have been an *exemplum* for Spartan youth of both sexes and soon associated to athletic contests of a ritual and initiatory nature (Ducat 1999: 168; Millender 2009: 24).¹⁹

Kyniska – the Spartan princess, her victory, her epigram – changed through time and in genre: for Xenophon’s *Agésilaios*, she is a means to a moralistic end; for Posidippus, her epigram serves to praise his patroness; for Pausanias, she is a piece of Olympic, and Spartan, trivia. Despite this varied reception, the longevity of her name and achievement, as well as their polyvalent potential, demonstrate the resonance of Kyniska beyond athletic, Spartan, and Olympic confines. Her epigram, therefore, is deserving of

Pausanias’ impressions on Kyniska’s intentions should be dismissed, I do not accord any more weight to Xenophon’s opinions. It is certainly true that Pausanias lived in “a sporting world quite different from that of Classical Greece” (Kyle 2003: 186), but this only explains his lack of wonder at Kyniska, whom he sees as simply the first in a long line of female athletic victors. This lack of contextualization does not bring into question her heroization, nor immediately validate Xenophon’s impressionistic account of the Kyniska story.

¹⁸ In fact, Mitchell argues that we can substantiate Kyniska *alone* as receiving heroic cult prior to the Hellenistic era (2012: 18).

¹⁹ On the evidence for female athletics in the Classical period, especially at Sparta, see Chapter 3.3. For a close parallel at Athens, in which female heroes serve as examples for male “recruits” in a martial context, see Steinbock (2011: 299-306, especially 301-302).

more than cursory recognition as the dedication of the first female athletic victor; rather, it is the catalyst for a tradition of adopting and adapting Kyniska that persists for centuries.

After Pausanias, Kyniska appears, as far as we can tell, to have been forgotten.²⁰ The modern re-discovery of her epigram and, especially, the burgeoning interest in women in antiquity and the cultural context of ancient athletics have returned her to the limelight.²¹ Kyniska appears in many textbooks or popular treatments of ancient women and sports (Miller 2004: 78; Swaddling 2000: 41; Tyrrel 2003: 85-86; Crowther 2007: 148), though in these she is simply an interesting piece of history, rather than a contextualized personality; her epigram is quoted for evidence and effect, instead of analysis.

In the few critics to engage directly with Kyniska *per se*, the biographical approach, inherited from ancient testimonia, has been maintained. Pomeroy, for example, constructs an optimistically feminist narrative from exiguous evidence: Kyniska's name alone indicates to her "an especially tomboyish woman" or "an interest in hunting" (2002: 21). Since Kyniska entered her horses soon after the Eleans lifted a ban on Spartan participation in the games, Pomeroy agrees with Pausanias' assessment that she was ambitious: "[she] must have been champing at the bit herself for several years, hoping she would have an opportunity to race her horses at Olympia before she died" (*ibid.*). Unfortunately, the epigram, our only primary evidence for Kyniska's victories, offers no support for such a reading of her intentions. Furthermore, Pomeroy suggests that the

²⁰ It is unclear how or when her epigram entered the *Palatine Anthology*.

²¹ Thanks to vanity presses, even poetically (see the poem "Kyniska" in Brown 2000) and romantically (see Schrader 2005, in which a "Kyniska", ostensibly based on the actual Spartan princess, appears). The modern Olympics have prompted her resurgence too: Kyniska appears under the heading "The Kyniska Scandal" in Faulkner 2012 (206-207), which was published in time for the London, 2012 Games.

choice of Apelleas indicates that Kyniska “had done some research to find a sculptor from an allied city who specialized in images of women” (2002: 22). While Apelleas may have been known for this in the first century AD, our knowledge of the procedure involved in commissioning a statue is slight; there is little evidence for Kyniska’s search for a supposed specialist.²²

If Pomeroy’s biography of Kyniska is too optimistically feminist, Kyle’s 2003 article differs entirely. He argues at length that Kyniska’s victory is part of a complex game of politics between Sparta, Athens, and Elis; he reads her victory as a reaction to the activities of Alcibiades at Sparta in the late fifth century (2003: 184). Kyle’s approach has gained some ground in further writing on Kyniska or on fourth-century Spartan history: Perry (2007: 84) offers enthusiastic support; Golden finds Kyle’s approach, with reservations, “attractive” (2008: 11); Kyle repeats a truncated account in his 2006 work, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (2006: 188-196). I consider Kyle’s account as the latest, and most comprehensive, interpretation of Kyniska in the long tradition of biographically and historically-minded methodologies, which stretch back to Xenophon’s *Agesilaos*. As such, a critique of his argument acts as well as a critique of the tradition of biographical criticism as a whole. Since his account has gained some contemporary currency, I think it relevant to summarize its premises and assumptions, as well as the argumentation involved. As will become clear, I interpret Kyniska, the epigram, and the nature of the evidence, from an entirely different perspective.

²² Smith surveys the evidence for statues and the commissioning process at Olympia (2007: 101-103). His suggestion that statue-makers were probably on hand at Olympia, ready to offer their services, is speculative, but plausible (2007: 103). Moreover, he is correct to remark that sculptor’s signatures might imply a desire to advertise the sculptor hired, that there was some caché to famous sculptor’s names (2007: 101; cf. Steiner 2001: 27-32).

Kyle begins by dismissing the epigram as simply “formulaic” (2003: 185), implicitly agreeing with the oft-used, though debunked, argument that the conventionality of *some* epigrams is evidence for the non-literariness of the genre as a whole (cf. Baumbach et al. 2010: 5).²³ He remarks on the probable male authorship of the epigram as evidence against Kyniska’s own involvement in the celebration of her victory (*ibid.*; Paus. 3.8.2), but this argument ignores recent scholarship on dedicatory epigrams of all genres: Stehle persuasively argues that the obscure background of epigrams is inaccessible to us, but regardless some epigrams present women as actors and agents for themselves (1997: 116). We would not, for example, characterize epigrams of elite males as representing the voice of the *lapidarii* who inscribed them.²⁴ Instead, inscriptions and epigrams can only be read as mediated, modified, or diluted representations of the perspectives of those who commissioned them. Without such a methodological conceit, our ability to understand almost anything of the literary, social, and historical context of epigrams would be impossible.

Kyle self-consciously writes from the perspective of political and military history, not literary and athletic context (2003: 184), and his complaints of unwarranted speculations in other accounts are on point.²⁵ The main evidence for his narrative is the story given by Xenophon in the *Agesilaos*.²⁶ Kyle is sensitive to the fact that Xenophon was “harmonizing this incident [i.e., Kyniska’s victory] with his characterization of

²³ See my discussion of epigrammatic scholarship and readers, in particular Baumbach and Day, in Chapter 2.1.

²⁴ Kyle dismissively states “at best, the epigram was commissioned with instructions by Kyniska (or by her brother)” (2003: 185). This, however, was likely the process by which the vast majority of athletic epigrams (not to mention epinician poetry) were composed; the fact that Kyniska was not the composer of the epigram, like most victors, does nothing to alter the effect of the epigram.

²⁵ Particularly, his criticism of Pomeroy with respect to Kyniska’s chariot riding experience and her possible progeny is correct (2003: 184; cf. Pomeroy 2002: 20-24).

²⁶ He has mere sentences to offer to Plutarch, and Pausanias’ account is dismissed as the “latest and least credible” source (Kyle 2003: 186).

Agesilaos as virtuous” (2003: 185), but he does not sufficiently question the placement of the anecdote outside of Xenophon’s quasi-historical narrative; that is, the Kyniska anecdote is part of Xenophon’s characterization of Agesilaos’ morality, not a part of the more historically-minded biographical history. While he acknowledges the growing “legend” of Kyniska throughout antiquity, Kyle refers to Xenophon’s account as “near contemporary” (2003: 186) at the same time as he relegates the only actual piece of contemporary evidence – her dedicatory epigram – to the periphery. Xenophon’s account is accepted as historical fact by Kyle, despite Ducat’s salutary and skeptical warning: “on se gardera de prendre au sérieux cette présentation moralisante” (1999: 168). In any case, Xenophon’s narrative provides only a broad structure to Kyle’s narrative: Agesilaos’ didacticism, while understood as historical fact rather than biographical fiction, is not central to Kyniska’s entry into the Olympics. Instead, Kyle situates the victory in the context of a game of political gamesmanship (2003: 186-187).

Thucydides (5.49) reports that the Spartans were banned by the Eleans from participation in the Olympic Games of 420, a ban which extended, possibly, to 400.²⁷ Beyond this slight, the Eleans, long Spartan allies, had provoked hostility by adopting a democratic constitution and aligning themselves with Athens in a treaty that was inscribed at Olympia (Thuc. 5.47); Kyle speculates that this act provided Sparta with more than one reason “to want revenge” (2003: 187). In the context of this inter-city (and inter-alliance) hostility, Kyle conjectures that Alcibiades, dead by the time of Kyniska’s victory, was still relevant to Spartan politics. He picks up the ancient rumour that Alcibiades had seduced the wife of then-Spartan king Agis and was, in fact, the real

²⁷ Hornblower argues that the ban applied only to the games of 420 themselves (2000: 221-223). In any case, Spartan-Elean hostility was fueled by conflicts over access to the athletic festival.

father of Leotychides, who ought to have succeeded to the throne on Agis' death (2003: 188; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.1-3). For Kyle, this familial slight, inherited by Agesilaos along with the rest of Agis' estate, prompted Agesilaos' desire to mock the value of chariot races (2003: 189), especially since Alcibiades had famously won a great victory in the chariot race at the Olympics of 416, coming in first, second and fourth in the four-horse race (Thuc. 6.16; Plut. *Vit. Alc.* 11.1-2).

Kyle claims that Alcibiades' victory was promoted "beyond any Pindaric or Spartan sense of modesty" and that "his self-advertisement (and self-adulation) included a commissioned victory ode by Euripides applauding his record 'which no other Greek has had,' a record won 'without labor'" (755 *PMG* = T 91a Kannicht; Kyle 2003: 188). He emphasizes these two elements of Euripides' epinician, although they are not unique to Alcibiades' ode, but commonplaces in the vocabulary of athletic, and Pindaric, praise (cf. Smith 2009: 371-378; Swift 2010: 115);²⁸ the Euripidean fragment praises on a different scale than Pindar, but it is hardly out of line with epinician sentiment (cf. *P.* 1.49; Bacch. 8.22-25).²⁹ Moreover, there remains at least some question about the authorship of the Euripidean epinician (Bowra 1960: 68-69), though Kyle largely omits this, and writes as if the epinician is contemporary, and certain evidence, when it is actually not quoted by Thucydides at all, but rather appears in Plutarch's centuries-later

²⁸ Bowra remarks on the conventional style of this epinician: Euripides uses the same rhetoric as Pindar when he tells Alcibiades that he has won that "which no other Greek has won" (2-3; cf. *P.* 1.49; Bowra 1960: 75); to be crowned by "the olive crown of Zeus" is perfectly Pindaric (cf. *O.* 3.13, 4.14, 11.13, et al.; Bowra 1960: 75). It is only ἀπονητί ("without effort") which Bowra questions (1960: 77), since it alters the Pindaric motif of trading toil for praise. Nonetheless, it is, I think, a reconfiguration of Pindar's mode, rather than a clear deviation from epinician convention.

²⁹ We ought to read Alcibiades' victory within the epinician rhetoric of *megaloprepeia* (see Kurke 1991: 171). Swift adds further discussion about this ode, in particular the tension inherent in praising individuals in democratic Athens (2010: 117-118).

Life of Alcibiades (11.3 = 755 PMG) and *Life of Demosthenes* (1.1 = 756 PMG).³⁰

Regardless of the issue of authorship, context, and performance (all unclear), the fact that Alcibiades won without labour should not be seen as an arrogant snub of Spartan athletic desires, but as a reconfiguration of the typical Pindaric motif of praise as recompense for athletics (Kurke 1991: 99; cf. *O.* 5.15-16; *N.* 6.24, 10.24; *I.* 1.42, etc.). As Kyle himself notes earlier (2003: 185; citing Young 1996), claims to be “first” or the “only” are tropes of athletic epigrams; thus, we might place Alcibiades’ claim in the context of competition with past (and future) victors – in any case, it does not qualify as a purposeful attack on Spartan *hippotrophia* in particular.³¹

Kyle argues that Agesilaos, fueled by anger over the Elean-Athenian treaty, Spartan exclusion from the games, Alcibiades’ seduction of his brother’s wife, and his subsequent victories in the chariot race, decided to settle scores with the dead man and inscribe a permanent mockery of both Alcibiades and the value of Olympic chariot victories themselves at the site of the inscription recording the traitorous Elean-Athenian treaty (2003: 189-190). He declares the spectral Alcibiades “gone but not forgotten” in the early fourth century, and cites the younger Alcibiades’ use of his father’s Olympic achievements in oratory as evidence of this (Isoc. 16.33), although the significance of this forensic speech remains unclear in the context of Spartan internal politics (2003: 189). Agesilaos’ plan, (according to Kyle), was to have his sister prove that money alone wins

³⁰ Bowra concludes that it is genuinely Euripidean (1960: 69), though he remains unclear of the performance context (1960: 71) and the dating of the poem (1960: 70).

³¹ As I have indicated above, Kyle’s characterization of Kyniska’s boast as commonplace and conventional ignores the ramifications of sex and gender to athletic epigram; in Alcibiades’ epinician, however, he underlines the most conventional aspect of the short poem. The inherent competition across eras in athletic epigrams, especially through claims to the “first” or the “only” is highlighted by Young (1996: 188-191), who considers the development of Greek running records, in dialogue with each other.

aces and, even more humiliating, that a woman too could win an Olympic victory (2003: 191).

By dismissing Xenophon's moralizing argument and instead situating the victory in a game of politics, Kyle reinforces the androcentric bias of Classical authors such as Xenophon, and ignores the possibility that Kyniska's victory was as it seems: the entry of chariots by an aristocrat for the purpose of obtaining the glory of Olympic victory.³² Young implicitly comments to this effect as well, pointing out that regardless of the story of Agesilaos and Kyniska, the epigram, statue, heroic shrine at Sparta, and the longevity of Kyniska's accomplishments, all point to a victory conceived and celebrated in the same fashion as the victories of Pindaric patrons (2004: 114). Millender too concludes that "the archaeological and the epigraphic sources for Cynisca... provide no definitive evidence for either her subservience to Agesilaos' agenda or her own aspirations" (2009: 26). Golden provides a similar warning as he concludes a summary of Kyle's argument: "who or what motivated Cynisca's entries cannot be safely ascertained today" (2008: 11). These conclusions should, therefore, steer us away from biographical reconstructions and, instead, towards the contextualization of the only primary evidence for the victory, the epigram itself.

The two main trends of ancient and modern criticism concerning Kyniska (i.e., whether she was "ambitious" or a political "pawn") reveal the limitations of a purely biographical approach to her victory. The creation of a narrative from a series of possibly unconnected events may be ingenious, but we are left with the distinct possibility that it is

³² Millender briefly suggests instead that Kyniska's victories were part of Agesilaos' interest in solidifying his rule at home, and emphasizing his pan-Hellenic aspirations (2009: 24). In her interpretation, this does not mean Kyniska was a simple pawn, but possibly involved in these political objectives. Chariot events are the archetypal event of aristocrats, especially in epinician poetry: cf. Hieron (*O.* 1; *P.* 1, 2), Theron (*O.* 2, 3), Arkesilas (*P.* 4, 5).

more modern fiction than ancient fact; the multitude of alternative, and contradictory, reconstructions of Kyniska's story should indicate the impotence of these attempts. Instead, in the remainder of this chapter, I propose to approach Kyniska's epigram from the perspective outlined in my introduction: as a piece of athletic verse, *CEG* 2.820 begins from the representation of the herald's proclamation, and modulates and modifies this speech-act to prefigure the praise of the victor.³³ Kyniska's epigram also reveals the ideology of identity in Greek athletics and athletic verse, which, as I have outlined in Chapter 3.3, appears as if it were inherently masculine; the athletic opportunities for women in the fourth century were, as I observed, largely initiatory, and largely restricted to young, unmarried women. Kyniska's participation, let alone victory, stands as a significant intrusion into a masculine domain; her epigram replicates this intrusion, and underscores the ideologically constructed masculinity of athletic verse, even as it simultaneously subverts it.

6.3: Dissidence: Unbalanced Fame

Gender plays an important role in the structure and content of dedicatory epigram broadly across its subgenres; Page contends that a dedicatory gender (not the biological sex of the person who wrote or inscribed the epigram) influenced self-fashioning. For example, he points to the case of an epigram in honour of Xanthippe, a descendant of the Corinthian tyrant Periandros (*FGE* 'Simonides' 36; Page 1981: 251):

μνήσομαι, οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν ἀνώνυμον ἐνθάδ' Ἀρχεναύτεω
 κεῖσθαι θανοῦσαν ἀγλαὰν ἄκοιτιν
 Ξανθίππην, Περιάνδρου ἀπ' ἐκγονον, ὅς ποθ' ὑψιπύργου
 σήμαινε λαοῖς τέρμ' ἔχων Κορίνθου.

³³ While I am indebted to Day's compelling thesis about the "re-presentation" of the herald's proclamation (2010: 200 ff), as I have argued in Chapter 2.1, athletic verse is a *representative* mode, in which the herald's proclamation configures the identity and praise of the victor.

I will tell (of her), for it is not suitable that she lie here nameless,
 having died, the glorious wife of Archenautes,
 Xanthippe, granddaughter of Periandros, who once ruled the people
 of high-towered Corinth, holding the highest power

“[L]adies in the sixth century were not as a rule famous in their own right”, argues Page, accordingly, “descent from Periander will remain her principal (indeed her only) claim to glory” (*ibid.*).

In a more nuanced analysis, Day also concludes “thus, female dedicators almost always... presented themselves in relation to their families” (2010: 187). His prime example is the early epigram inscribed on the skirt of a *kore* found on Delos, in which the dedicator, Nikandre, framed her identity by reference to her male family members, in this case, father, brother, and husband (CEG 1.403; Day, 2010: 187-194):

Νικάνδρη μ' ἀνέθεκεν ἡεκηβόλοι ἰοχεαίρηι,
 φόρη Δεινο | δίκηο τῷ Ναησίῳ, ἔησοχος ἀλήον,
 Δεινομένεος δὲ κασιγνέτη, | Φηράησο δ' ἄλοχος ν(ῶν).

Nikandre dedicated me to the far-shooting arrow-pourer,
 the daughter of Deinodikēs of Naxos, preeminent beyond other (women),
 the sister of Deinomenēs, but now wife of Phraxos.

This framing does not preclude importance from being attached to Nikandre herself since “[she] is presented as the link between two families” (2010: 191). For Day, however, Nikandre’s *kore* and its epigram are best understood within the context of social and religiously effective rituals involving women (2010: 193). While the identity of *korai* is a vexed question, Day remarks that dedications of such craftsmanship “presented the dedicator as head of a family rich in prestige-generating and religiously-charged resources such as a marriageable daughters” (2010: 194). Although Nikandre is the active dedicatory agent in this epigram, her identity and, especially, the emphatic temporal

deictic ν(ῶν) stressing the “newness” of her wedding, demonstrate her family’s wealth, particularly the named father (Δεινομένης), who probably arranged the marriage.³⁴

Stehle also highlights epigrams featuring female dedicators: for example, CEG 1.413, a dedication to Artemis set up by Τελεστοδί[κη]:

Ἄρτεμι, σοὶ τόδ’ ἄγαλμα Τελεστοδί[κη μ’ ἀνέθηκεν]
Ἀσφαλίῳ μήτηρ, Θερσέλεω θυγάτηρ.

Artemis, to you, Telestodike dedicated me as an *agalma*,
the mother of Asphalios, the daughter of Therseleos.

Stehle correctly identifies the way in which this woman presents herself not as a wife (an identity predicated on the existence of a husband), but as a mother: “she is a link in a vertical kinship chain passing down generations” (1997: 116). Although I agree with Stehle’s contention that even in this context of masculine identification, a woman as dedicatory agent must be accounted for, it is crucial that Τελεστοδί[κη] still couches her identity in her male relations: the “kinship chain” which Stehle identifies is a patriarchal one, which saw women as signifiers of birthright, inheritance, and citizenship.

Based on these examples, we might understand Kyniska’s familial boast in a similar vein: as a typical feminine mode of identification. This approach, however, obscures an important function of Kyniska’s boast; moreover, it misleads us into assuming that the sex of the dedicator mandates an essentialist method of self-identity. Identification through patronymics, a universal phenomenon in the Classical period, privileges male ancestry; the relative fame of the ancestor, however, regardless of

³⁴ Hansen calls our attention to CEG 1.378 as well, for the example of νῶν at the end of a hexameter. In that inscription, the νῶν is clearly visible on the stone, and acts as an emphatic addition to an athlete’s victory boast. The other example, FGE Sim. 110, is less comparable: while νῶν ends a hexameter there, it does not end a poem or even offer a syntactic break.

biological sex, is important too.³⁵ An epigram of Posidippos, while later than the sources under discussion, supports this argument: in AB 88, the son of Ptolemaios I Soter and Berenike I, celebrating his own victory in the chariot race, acknowledged the prior victories of his father, but the epigram's conclusion stresses the special fame of his mother, since she won an Olympic victory. Significantly, the younger Ptolemaios refers to himself as the "namesake" of his father (88.3: [Π]τολεμαίου ὁμώνυμος), and uses a periphrastic metronymic for his mother (3-4: ἐκ Βερενίκας / υἱ[ός] "son from Berenike"). Berenike's special fame affects customary practice; that is, famous ancestry might fundamentally change the mode of identification.

I think it highly likely that a similar notion is at work in Kyniska's epigram: she stresses her ancestry not only as a form of identification, but also because of the fame it lends her – after all, her father as well as two brothers had been or *currently were* kings of Sparta: "Spartan kings are my fathers and brothers" (CEG 2.820.1).³⁶ As Mitchell puts it, "as descendants of heroes, women could also participate actively in their heroic heritage and be empowered by it" (2012: 17); Spartan kings were in fact given hero-cult after death (Xen. *Lac.* 15.9). Pan-Hellenic victories, such as those of Kyniska, like military victories, contributed to an individual's accumulation of *arete*, and to their claim to heroic status (Currie 2005:120-157). The importance of ancestry to fame is clear, especially in athletic poetry, when one considers what Kurke has called the "familial quality of *kleos*" (1991: 35). As she argues, even for Homer, fame and achievement are hereditary

³⁵ Skinner comments briefly on the existence of matronymics, and postulates that they may have been used more frequently in female-to-female discourse than we are lead to believe (1987).

³⁶ Father: Archidamos II ?469-427; brothers: Agis II, 427-400, Agesilaos, 400-360. Consider also the importance of characterizing oneself as an aristocrat in athletic poetry (e.g., *O.* 8.59-84; Bacch. 1.140; Day 2010: 187).

possessions of the *oikos*, “treasures for the household” (1991: 35; cf. *Od.* 1.232-243).³⁷ In athletic poetry, the familial and hereditary quality is prominent: Pindar connects the “more beautiful end of black death” (*P.* 11.56-57: μέλανος {δ’} ἀνέσχατιάν / καλλίονα θανάτου) to the willing of the best of possessions, a good name, to offspring (*P.* 11.58: εὐώνυμον κτεάνων κρατίσταν χάριν “the *charis* of a good name, best of possessions”). This relationship between glory and family can act causally across time, whether forwards or backwards; for instance, the victory of the grandfather of the subject of *N.* 6 (Praxidamas, grandfather of Alkimidas) retroactively alters the fame of his previously obscure father (*N.* 6.20-22: ἔπαυσε λάθαν / Σαοκλείδα, ὅς ὑπέρτατος / Ἀγησιμάχοι’ ὑέων γένετο “he stopped the oblivion of Saokleidas, who became the best of the sons of Hagesimachos”): “though he has accomplished nothing notable himself, he has become in retrospect ‘the best of the sons of Hagesimachos’ *because* his house possesses the largest share of prestige from athletic victories” (Kurke 1991: 37; emphasis in original).

This forwards and backwards movement of fame, especially athletic fame, is present in Kyniska’s epigram as well: while the practice of using patronymic identity may be part of the rationale for the inclusion of family members, the relationship between family and praise is also important. Kyniska’s boast operates in a reciprocal manner, magnifying the praise that comes from a family of kings and at the same time increasing the aristocratic credentials of that family by sharing, literally by inscribing them on the victory monument, the special power of athletic victory. This reciprocal character, however, does not necessarily imply a balanced approach to the sharing of fame. Unlike Ptolemaios II, whose epigram (AB 88) names him and his parents, establishing a

³⁷ Kurke traces the relationship of *nostos* and *kleos* in her opening chapter, with special emphasis on the function of the two in the *Odyssey* (1991: 14-19).

dialogue between the victories, magnifying praise on both sides of the equation, Kyniska's epigram establishes instead an unbalanced reciprocity. The opening line ("Spartan kings are my fathers and brothers": CEG 2.820.1) establishes her relationship to her male relatives, but fails to identify specifically the kings to whom she refers.³⁸ Thus, the epigram reveals the discursive and representative mode of athletic verse, since the literal proclamation of the herald likely included Kyniska's father's name.

Not to include the name is a decisive act on the part of Kyniska, who presumably had some say in the phrasing of the epigram's text. The only name to which the text refers, regardless of the reconstruction of *ἔστασ- in verse three, is Κυνίσκα, placed emphatically at the end of the verse.³⁹ The ambivalent sharing of fame in this epigram, Kyniska's presence as part of the epigram's narrative ("Spartan kings were my fathers and brothers") and her status as dedicator ("Kyniska set up this statue"), may well explain the change in grammatical person: Hansen found no comparable contemporary epigrams, but this is perhaps not surprising, given Kyniska's singular status as a Spartan royal celebrated in epigram, and as a female Olympic victor. If epigrams posit a version of

³⁸ πατέρες does not even necessarily refer to a specific person or persons, but can simply mean "forefathers" (e.g., *Il.* 6.209; *O.* 2.7, *P.* 4.117, *P.* 5.75-76, etc.; s.v. πατήρ (VIII), *LSJ*). The generality about her ancestry might cause a reader to paraphrase the opening line, prosaically, "I come from royal lineage". I suggest this in contrast to Millender (2009: 25), who more optimistically claims that "any glory she attained... redounded to the glory of her brother". Two other epigrams of famous women indicate a similarly unbalanced approach (Fantuzzi 2005: 256): *FGE* 'Simonides' 26a, for Archidike, daughter of Hippias, mentions only her father (2), while generalizing her relations in a way that reflects their glory on to her, without specifying their names (3-4: ἦ πατρός τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὔσα τυράννων / παίδων "her father, brothers, and children were tyrants"). An epigram for Olympias, preserved in Plutarch's *Moralia* is similarly ambiguous when it comes to specifying her ancestors (Plu. *Mor. Quaest. conv.* 747 F = *SH* 1146): τῆσδε πατήρ καὶ ἀνὴρ καὶ παῖς βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἀδελφοί, / καὶ πρόγονοι "her father, husband, and son are kings, and both her brothers and her ancestors". The epigram suppresses even Alexander's name in παῖς.

³⁹ The importance of names to hereditary glory is clear in the Greek tradition: Hector's wish for Astyanax is not only that the boy will become a great warrior, but that someone will know the child *as his son* (*Il.* 6.479). Similarly, Glaucon's long story of his ancestry works, or at least hopes to work, reciprocally (*Il.* 6.145-211): Glaucon's aristocratic lineage improves his own character, but he also hopes to benefit his ancestors (hence, the speech ends on his father's injunction to be the best and to not shame his ancestors (*Il.* 6.208-209). The desire for glory to be attached to names and families is, of course, what provokes Odysseus to finally reveal his name to Polyphemos, with disastrous consequences (*Od.* 9.502-505).

truth, especially partial to the dedicator's perspective (Petrovic 2010: 212; see further, Chapter 2.2), then the "truth" of Kyniska's poem, built into its rhetoric and shifting grammatical structure, is a largely impartial sharing of fame.⁴⁰

While we can suppose that the epigram dates to sometime soon after 396 and before 392, the date of the story of Agesilaos' role in Kyniska's victory has only a *terminus ante quem*, that is, the writing of the *Agesilaos* shortly after the king's death in 359 (Cawkwell 1976: 63). Thus, for over thirty years – compressed and ignored in Kyle's account – the only positive evidence of her victory was her epigram, the only narrative of her accomplishment was that of an aristocratic Greek athlete celebrating a chariot racing triumph. As such, the epigram and the story from the *Agesilaos* could be regarded as in dialogue: in the former, Kyniska's fame is obviously paramount, while in the latter, the importance of Agesilaos is emphasized.⁴¹ Whatever *arete* existed in athletic victories reinforced Agesilaos' claim to rule, and despite the king's supposed dismissal of it, the story as Xenophon presents it still associates Agesilaos and Olympic victory. If Cartledge correctly correlates Kyniska's Olympic victories and Agesilaos at his "most actively panhellenist" (1987: 150), then the *arete* of the Olympic victory may have been of great importance in buttressing Agesilaos' hegemonic agenda. In Xenophon's posthumous portrait of the king, completed at a time when his reputation, along with the fortunes of

⁴⁰ That is, to know to whom she refers, we must go outside the text of the epigram. In contrast, Pindar constantly refers, by name, to his patron's ancestors (whether simply periphrastic patronymics, e.g. *O.* 3.9, 6.9; or slightly more elaborate references, e.g. *O.* 7.17; at *O.* 8.15-23, when the victor's possible brother, Timosthenes, receives his own extensive praise within the epinician; or as in *O.* 13.97-113, when Pindar numbers the victories of the entire family of the victory in a grand finale to the ode). The lack of specificity is not an epigraphical convention limited by space, since dedicators frequently name family members directly (considering only athletic epigrams, e.g., *CEG* 1.302, 1.350, 1.362).

⁴¹ Fantuzzi conjectures that Agesilaos may have instructed Xenophon in how to present Kyniska's victories (2005: 257). Certainly, there is no evidence to support such a supposition, but Fantuzzi is correct to notice the discrepancy between Xenophon's narrative, the evidence of the epigram, and its Hellenistic reception. As Golden points out, we can at least say that men (whether Xenophon *and* Agesilaos or just one or the other) found some way in which to use an equestrian victory to denigrate all equestrian victories (2008: 12). This, however, offers us very little when it comes to interpreting Kyniska's epigram itself.

the Spartan state, may have been in decline, a different agenda was in force: a particularly heroic characterization of the king (morally upright, militarily successful and associated, though not too closely, with athletic glory) was desirable. Therefore, Xenophon's narrative constructs an Agesilaos to fit literary, and historical, context.

In Kyniska's epigram, however, the generality of the first line and the lack of any other proper names in the poem as a whole emphasize instead her glory – Spartan kings past and present are marginalized through namelessness; they underscore the function of the heraldic mode as a way to modulate, and perhaps further burnish Kyniska's victory through reflected divinity and royalty. The implicit claim of the poem is to a heroic status in keeping with the religious status of her ancestors, all worshipped on death as heroes to the Spartan state. In contrast to the narrative preserved in Xenophon, the Kyniska of the epigram shares nothing of her athletic victory and presents herself as a powerful, heroic personage. Her athletic victories, their uniqueness only adding to the *arete* of victory, support her own claim to heroic stature (a stature institutionalized perhaps before her death: Hodkinson 2000: 328). The reference to her descent underscores Mitchell's observation that "rulers became heroes because they were born from heroes" (2012: 16). Kyniska appropriates the efficacy of heroic descent, but exchanges, only minimally (and only in unequal measure), the transfiguring and enduring power of athletic *kleos*, a talismanic "*mana*" (Kurke 1993: 133). The discursive *angelia* allows Kyniska's epigram to evoke the authoritative speech-act that guarantees and identifies the victor, but also, to modify the re-telling of that speech-act so as to emphasize, particularly, her own glory.

6.4: Dissidence: Unreal Ritual

If the unbalanced nature of fame and praise in Kyniska's epigram signals the poem's singular approach to memorialization, the structure of Kyniska's dedication, the contradictory nature of the feminine boast along with its generic reliance on the conventions of athletic poetry, discloses its implicit subversion. Aside from victor's name, ancestry, and event, the structural significance of the *angelia* to athletic poetry included ways of expanding the praise of the victor, such as adding victory lists or supplementary boasts or "records" (Day 2010: 205-212). Young argues that since the ancient Greeks had no access to meaningful time-keeping technology, their records typically took the form of "x was the first to do y" (1996: 180; cf. *O.* 13.30-31).⁴² These "firsts" seems to be tied directly to, or generated from, the constituent elements of the *angelia*, whether confined to a specific family (CEG 2.795iv), a specific city (CEG 2.795ii), or first to win a certain combination of events, or some number of times at a certain festival (CEG 2.844; see Day, 1994: 65-69). Significantly, however, Kyniska's "first" does not fit within this paradigm: it is not related to family, city, or a combination of events, none of the components of the *angelia*.

Commentators have of course noticed that Kyniska's seems to be the first gendered record in athletic epigram (e.g., Scanlon 2002: 22); ironically, blinded by the novelty of a female athlete, they overlook the importance of gender to the epigram's

⁴² Despite arguments that the ancient Greeks were not interested in record-keeping, Young is correct to argue that "x was the first to do y" is still a record, just of a different type than our own (1996: 177). While modern records are interested in absolute competition across time and space, Greek competition was focused on the present: who won each day was important. Thus, records do not take the form of "fastest 100m dash" or "longest discus throw", and instead reflect the athlete's victory against particular people at a specific time and place (cf. Young 1988a: 177, on the similar regard for records and competition at 1870 Olympic Games in Athens). The lack of access to "meaningful time-keeping technology" does not explain everything, since Greek competitors could have, but did not, measure their javelin and discus throws (Young 1996: 180; *contra* Tod 1949: 112); even a rudimentary time for the *stade* run could have been established. Rather, the different type of record-keeping points to a fundamentally different concept of athletic competition.

structure.⁴³ The uniqueness, however, is critical: her “first” does not reflect the *angelia* because the herald’s proclamation did not record biological sex. The epigram simply grafts another category onto the *angelia* and embeds it in the typical language of athletic boasts; again, we are faced with evidence that athletic verse does not simply replicate the herald’s proclamation – the representation of the proclamation permits the management of identity, the modulation of praise, and, especially here, the implicit presence of dissidence.

Kyniska’s epigram emphasizes her gender (“I alone of women from all of Greece”: CEG 2.820.3-4), but it also foregrounds generic necessity, generating her boast in the same manner as other athletes generated their own record breaking achievements. These are not, however, unproblematic alterations: the emphatic gendered element affects the generic function of epigram, that is, to replicate ritual: Kyniska’s dedication cannot present a true ritual moment as it is based around a category, biological sex, that the proclamation, the ritual moment, lacked (as a result of the implicitly masculine athletic *ethos*: see Chapter 3.3).

My identification of this ritual problematic reveals a subversive thread in the text’s insistent use of the first-person; Kyniska the proper noun, first-person verbs and possessives are palpable on hearing the epigram.⁴⁴ This grammatical construction diverges from the more typical formula of athletic epigrams, which faithfully replicate the *angelia* by announcing the victory or record-breaking boast in the third-person. The use

⁴³ Golden notes that Kyniska “likewise echoes male visitors in taking pains to present her victory as special” (2008: 11), but he does not further query *how* she emphasizes her victory, or the effect of gendered boasts to the structural elements of athletic poetry.

⁴⁴ Mitchell notes the first-person forms and argues that they “[show] her own sense of strength and personal superiority” (2012: 18). This may be true, but only insofar as all athletic dedications demonstrate personal superiority. The first-person forms of Kyniska’s dedication are important to its interpretation, but only when analyzed in concert with the unreal ritual which the epigram posits.

of first-person forms is not solely a consequence of gender, since male dedications also sometimes utilize the first-person (e.g., Ebert nos. 11, 35; CEG 2.826). Epigrams for men, however, continue to evoke and represent the ritual of heraldic proclamation, since they simply record the *angelia* as if the athlete himself were announcing.

With Kyniska's epigram, however, meaningful re-presentation of the heraldic ritual was impossible: while the audience could simply hear the first-person forms of male dedications as indirectly reporting the herald's speech, such a semantic switch was unbelievable in the case of Kyniska. Not only would she have not been present at Olympia to hear the proclamation or receive her victor's crown, more importantly, no proclamation of victory would have included the sex of the victor. In this way, Kyniska's epigram is not simply a sort of generic transvestitism, whereby the epigram obscures sex through the use of a masculine poetic device. Rather, Kyniska's epigram emphasizes sexual difference as *the* special component of victory – her competitive athletic victory is paradoxically gendered feminine. The centrality of femininity establishes an unreal scenario: her boast replicates the structure of the *angelia*, but it implicitly subverts the importance of re-presenting an actual ritual event and thus effects a breach in the generic convention of dedicatory epigram.

In this context, Stehle's observations on CEG 1.169 are relevant:

[- ∞ -] | ι τόδε σ[ῆ]μα μήτη | ρ ἐπέθηκ | ε θανόν | τι :
 Φανοκ | ρίτη παιδὶ | χαρίζομ | ἐνη.

[...] this marker a mother dedicated to her dead child;
 Phanokrite, showing kindness.

This epigram mentions only a woman's name (Φανοκρίτη) and her child, who was probably named in the lacuna in verse one. In her analysis of the epigram's faulty metre,

Stehle argues that the couplet does not scan properly because “its author has wrested the language adapted to expressing men’s relationships to her use as a woman” (1997: 117). In the first line, μήτηρ substitutes for πάτηρ, a long syllable for a short; in the second line, since she does not include an epithet for herself or the word παιδί, the line is too short (*ibid.*). The possible reasons for these metrical errors are speculative, but Stehle’s idea that a woman would have “no model of a line with a name of the same metrical shape as her name” is suggestive; the metrical errors expose, to Stehle’s thinking, “the subversion necessary for a woman to use . . . conventional language” (*ibid.*).

Modern critics also comment on the reactionary, and implicitly patriarchal, aspect of convention and tradition: famously, Butler goes so far as to lament the constraints of grammar itself as a limiting factor on alternative gendered perspectives (1999 [1990]: *xix*). While Kyniska’s epigram is not faced with a grammatical constriction, the generic conventions of athletic epigram and its presumed masculinity *could have* restricted the epigram’s boast, excluded her gender, and maintained the apparently essential masculinity of athletic victory and dedication. Instead, the epigram’s reliance on the *angelia* structure, while generically plausible, in concert with the gendered content of the boast, underlines contextual and social impossibilities. In her epigram, the masculinist generic trappings of athletic epigram are utilized, but instead of being deployed to replicate a ritual referent, the trope of the victor as heraldic announcer serves to stress, rather than conceal, biological sex and social gender, despite (or perhaps because of) Olympic prohibitions against the very presence of women.

One of the objectives of my approach in this chapter has been to free Kyniska’s epigram from a tradition of biographical and reductionist interpretation stretching back to

antiquity. While modern critics have contextualized Kyniska in contemporary political and military affairs (especially Kyle 2003), cultural and literary contextualization of her epigram have been overlooked. The approaches rooted in ancient biography privilege (and presume) an understanding of the motives and intentions of Kyniska, Olympic authorities, Agesilaos, Alcibiades, Isocrates, and more – in contrast, I have situated Kyniska’s epigram first and foremost as a text within the literary and social context of its production: dedicatory epigrams imitate ritual, and thus the ritual referent is an important aspect of interpretation; athletic poetry and athletic *kleos* are heroic and familial, and thus the rhetoric of fame and heroism is fundamental; most importantly, athletic verse represents the heraldic proclamation, and thus identity and praise intertwine on ideological and generic levels. More broadly, Foxhall has indicated the gendered character of the typically Ancient Greek practice of what she calls “monumentality” (1994: 137). Indeed, considering the patriarchal and masculinist nature of dedicating objects or inscribing *anything* at an athletic sanctuary, the very fact of Kyniska’s dedication implies dissent.⁴⁵

Mitchell refers to “an audacity and subversiveness about the portrait Cynisca erected of herself, giving her a permanent presence, as it were, where her actual physical presence had been prohibited” (2012: 18). As Kurke has it, victor statues and their accompanying epigrams are, implicitly, all about presence: “the combination of epigram and victor statue elicited from its beholder a perfect re-creation of the original announcement and coronation” (1993:145). She argues, with respect to Kyniska, that the

⁴⁵ Irigaray’s contention that a female subject cannot be imagined within the masculinist discourse of Western civilization comes to mind (1985: 69): the fundamental masculine character of inscriptions and dedications is such that a feminine voice is almost a contradiction-in-terms – the example of CEG 1.169 speaks to the difficulties of feminine expression.

epigram “[calls] our attention to the erecting hand, now absent, of the victor” (1993: 147). Kyniska’s fragmentary statue base and epigram, however, far from indicating the absent victor, force the reader (and viewer) to the opposite relation: the statue and epigram present a ritual that did not, and *could not*, have happened.⁴⁶ Contrary to Kurke’s analysis, Kyniska’s epigram begins from a state of absence (that is, her own absence from her Olympic victory) and her dedication explodes her presence, a palpably heroic and feminine presence, into one of the most masculine (literally full of men, both real and statuary) of Greek landscapes. The εικῶν, the epigram, the boast, are a physical and literary intrusion into a landscape (real and generic) of hegemonic patriarchy and celebratory masculinity.

⁴⁶ Kurke refers more broadly to the enduring presence of the monument after the victor’s death, and I take no issue with this conclusion (1993: 147); I simply argue that in Kyniska’s case, the relationship between presence and absence is not so straightforward.

Chapter 7: Truth, Desire, and Masculinity in *Olympian* 8

Pindar's *Olympian* 8, written for the boy-wrestler Alkimedon, is the only *Olympian* ode for a victor from the island of Aigina.¹ The ode has been called subpar (Peuch 1970: 102), a rapid composition (Fennell 1893: 66), and an improvisation (Donaldson 1841: 52; Farnell 1965: II 59); the central myth, Aiakos' assistance to the gods in the building of Troy's walls, has provoked much discussion, especially the generations of the descendants of Aiakos to which Apollo allusively refers (Peuch 1970: 103-108; Farnell 1965: II 64; Robbins 1986: 318-321; Hubbard 1987: 18).²

In this chapter, I focus on one explicit (the age-category of the victor) and one implicit (biological sex and social gender) component of the heraldic *angelia*. These two categories are revealed as intrinsically relevant to the ode's construction of praise, especially insofar as the body of Alkimedon is a primary component of *O.* 8's

¹ *P.* 8, *N.* 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, *I.* 5, 6, 8, 9 are also for Aiginetan victors. Hamilton goes so far as to categorize the Aiginetan odes as their own epinician sub-genre (1974: 41). Burnett notes that there were earlier Olympic victors from Aigina, beginning with Praxidamas in 533 BC (2005: 208 n1; cf. *N.* 6.15).

² The crux of the problem is the number of generations at 8.45-46: the Teubner prints τετράτοις ("third") instead of the manuscript τετράτοις ("fourth"), even though, as Farnell mentions, the former is an "unknown word" (1965: II 64). The manuscript reading appears throughout the Pindaric corpus, while the invented Aiolism is, if it is correct, a *hapax*. Scholars have turned to emendation because of the apparent impossibility of interpreting Apollo's prophecy, which, on the evidence of the manuscript, seems to say that Troy will be destroyed with the "first... and fourth" generations of Aiakos' children. This passage had already caused problems for the scholiasts, who thought that Pindar used a combination of inclusive and exclusive counting (cf. *schol. ad O.* 8.60a-c): in the first instance, Aiakos is not included, hence the generation refers to Peleus and Telamon as companions of Herakles; in the second instance, Aiakos is included and the fourth generation refers to Neoptolemos (cf. Peuch 1970: 108; concurring also, Donaldson 1841: 65; Gildersleeve 1885; Race 1990: 151). Robbins offers a persuasive argument for retaining the transmitted text: he regards the "first" generation as referring to Aiakos himself, whose work on the walls will be the entry point for the Achaian army (*O.* 8.42; 1986: 318). Robbins points to *P.* 4.47-48 and 143-144 as examples of figures counting themselves, inclusively, when referring to generations of their own family (1986: 319). This permits us to retain the manuscript reading for the number; it also solves another disputed point in this passage, the meaning of ἀρξεται ("it will begin"), which has often been emended to ῥάξεται ("it will be broken") to make sense of the destruction of Troy (conjectured by Gildersleeve). By Robbins' reckoning, however, the fall of Troy *begins* with Aiakos' work in the first generation, and concludes in the fourth, with the sack of Troy by Neoptolemos; that is, the oracle speaks to a *single* taking of Troy: "the taking of the city will be a work of *συνεργία*, as was the building of its wall" (Robbins 1986: 319). The theme of *synergia* permeates the ode, of course, and the exclusion of the first sack of Troy permits Pindar to draw his *laudandus* and the myth closer together in analogy (Robbins 1986: 321).

encomiastic program; thus, nudity and sexuality (particularly Greek pederasty) combine with the heraldic mode of representation to support, augment, and extend the possibilities of athletic praise.

Through the vivid description of a beautiful boy entangled in the limbs of other boys (*O.* 8.18-20, 8.67-70), and transformed through his victory, Pindar situates himself and his audience as witnesses to Alkimedon's achievement. In doing so, he configures the audience's relationship with Alkimedon as one of attraction and desire: the ode transforms the audience into witnesses of victory and desiring subjects.

Beginning with an overview of athletic nudity, I briefly consider the significance of naked bodies in early Classical athletics, especially the connected topics of male-male desire, pederasty, and pervasive nude male imagery. Building on Frontisi-Ducroux's argument for intersubjectivity in nude, especially sexually-charged, scenes in Attic Red-Figure, I interpret Pindar's descriptive verisimilitude in this ode as a visual language akin to "frontality" on Greek vases, where the audience is brought into a relationship with human figures. Thus, I argue for a space for sexual desire in the ode's configuration of praise: Alkimedon is praiseworthy because he is beautiful and victorious, but this praise is further extended through Pindar's establishment of an infinite and continuous audience of desiring and witnessing subjects.

7.1: Nudity, Desire, and Athletics

Displays of male nudity in Greek art have traditionally been interpreted as heroic (Ridgway 1981: 90-91; Himmelmann 1990), idealizing (Stewart 1990: 79) or simply coincidence (Boardman 1985: 238-239; on these diverse interpretations, see Osborne

1997: 505).³ Temporal and geographical context, however, are crucial to understanding artistic nudity. Osborne summarizes the diachronic development of nudity from the Geometric period onwards: in the early period, “the unclothed body marks gender difference” (1997: 508). That is, clothing, not nudity, at least in early figured art, is what requires explanation: to represent a man unclothed is to offer no context in which to place him (*ibid.*). Beginning with the widespread development of the *kouros* statue in the Archaic period, however, Osborne argues that nudity lost its contextual ambiguity (1997: 510); while it is difficult to pinpoint the referent of *kouros* statues, nonetheless, there is a potential contextualization – “the male body lost its semiotic innocence” (Osborne 1997: 512) – and actual occurrences of nudity in particular contexts, especially athletic, afforded the viewer a perspective from which to view the *kouros*’ nudity (Osborne 1997: 512).⁴ The lack of clothing no longer simply sexed human representation; instead, the viewer brought to sculpted male nudes a host of meanings for nudity, especially those centred on elite practices.

In this rich symbolic landscape, reading the nudity of a sculpted athletic figure as simply heroic or ideal is to “disregard its other semantic registers” (Steiner 1998: 132; 2001: 228). In fact, Scanlon convincingly argues that “eroticism is never wholly absent from the nude figure, whether in art or athletics (2005: 72). Furthermore, the meaning of

³ Ridgway addresses this issue in the context of discussing the frieze on the Temple of Athena Nike; on this building, she understands nakedness to imply a generalizing force, but not a complete heroization (1981: 90-91). Spivey reads the bodies of *kouros* as idealized, and while indebted to athletics, not representative of it (1997: 112); nonetheless, he concludes that nakedness in *kouros* and on funerary sculpture is “men aspiring to be something (or someone) on a higher level” (*ibid.*). He claims that Greek men did not “normally walk around with no clothes on” (*ibid.*), but this disregards the rather important fact that Greek men did go without clothes in the gymnasium and at athletic competitions. Boardman picks up on this fact when he differentiates the reception of nude sculpture in antiquity and the modern world: “in Greek art, therefore, the nude could carry no special ‘artistic’ connotation, nor could it exclusively designate a special class, such as hero or god” (1985: 238).

⁴ For an up-to-date consideration of the *kouros*’ nudity, with relevant bibliography, see Hurwitt (2007).

nudity in artwork need not be constrained to one interpretation: *kouroi* are certainly ideal, in that their combination of youthfulness and mature musculature appears as something of a “biological *adynaton*” (Steiner 1998: 132), but such idealizing does not remove their erotic appeal, nor translate their nudity to a supernatural level.⁵ Rather, the perfect bodies of male statuary appeal to a double desire of their projected viewers: an aesthetic fantasy of one’s own body, and the erotic appeal of a desirable male body (Steiner 1998: 132).⁶ Steiner situates Pindar, who describes athletes in a “monumental” manner (Steiner 1998: 124), in this semiotic context. The perceived reaction to nude statues can provide a framework for understanding the reaction to Pindar’s own depiction of male athletes: “like the maker of the victory monument... [Pindar] too constructs the victor as a source of visual pleasure, and surrounded him with a dense network of myth and imagery, which casts him in the role of object of desire” (Steiner 1998: 136).⁷

Both Pindar and statue-makers frequently depict the moment of coronation: terms for the receiving of crowns abound in Pindar (e.g., *O.* 7.15-17, 8.10, 11.10-14, etc.), and the coronation was the moment when the athlete was “the focus of the concentrated

⁵ By the fifth-century, Greek artists seemed to have reconciled themselves to the rejection of realism and preferred to depict a naturalistic “body beautiful”, which involved an impossible combination of youthfulness and developed musculature (Steiner 1998: 132). As Steiner reports in a note, older athletes do appear on vases, but never in implicitly or explicitly erotic contexts: “youth and beauty... go hand in hand with nudity” (1998: 132 n53; cf. 2001: 213). On *adynata*, she suggests that statues operate simultaneously as crafted, artistic object, and representative icon (Steiner 2001: 27); as a result, verisimilitude can be rejected in favour of artistic virtuosity (for examples, see Steiner 2001: 26-32).

⁶ A *kylix* attributed to the Kiss Painter (Johns Hopkins University Archaeological Museum B5 = ARV² 177.3; ca. 500) offers a good example of the erotic appeal of statuary: on the tondo of this cup, an adult male citizen gazes at an adolescent, who stands on a podium and appears to be a victorious athlete (he is crowned with a wreath). It is unclear whether this is meant to depict an actual victor, or a statue (Day 2010: 220); in fact, the ambiguity reinforces the point that statuary and actual athletic bodies could elicit an erotic gaze (Steiner 1998: 130; 2001: 226). The *kalos* inscription on the vase (ΛΕΑΓΡΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ) underscores the amorous context. Steiner points to another example, in which the young athlete, while demonstrably alive, is “inscribed” with a *kalos* inscription along his thigh, just like contemporary statuettes and statues (ARV² 336.14; 2001: 227).

⁷ Pindar uses vocabulary that describes the visual appeal of his poems: “the terms *kosmos*, *agalma*, and *kalliston* attest to the ornamental and precious quality of the song-turned artifact, its ability to delight the eye no less than the ear” (Steiner 2001: 261).

mimetic desires of spectators” (Steiner 1998: 134). The continuity of representative tropes implies a concomitant visuality for both sung and plastic manifestations of athletic victory. Spectatorship in early Classical art was such that the viewer was encouraged to collapse the distinction between image and victor; epigrams even united text and image in a continuous manner, which sometimes called on the reader and viewer to gaze at the perfect body of the represented athlete (e.g., Ebert 1972 no. 12).⁸ As such, the concept of the athlete and the athlete’s image as representations of the “body beautiful”, a doubly desired and erotic object, can inform our readings of Pindar’s represented athletes.

Athletic nudity, of course, cannot be separated from the widespread pederastic practices of Archaic and Classical Greece (see Chapter 3.3).⁹ Considering the integration of praise poetry with the athletic context, Hubbard looks for pederastic structures in epinician; his prime example is *O.* 10 (2005). In this poem, the trainer Ilas is mentioned side-by-side with the young victor (*O.* 10.16-21), Hagesidamos of Epizephryian Lokris. While trainers are common in epinicians for young athletes, Hubbard problematizes this relationship in the context of gymnastic pederasty. For Hubbard, the contemporary

⁸ This epigram is apposite for a discussion of desirable athletes, as it too describes a young boy, a wrestler, who is “most beautiful to look upon” and whose beauty and victory are correlated (cf. *O.* 8.17-20):

Γνωθι Θεόγνητον προσιδών, τὸν ὀλυμπιονίκαν
παῖδα, παλαιμοσύνας δεξιὸν ἠνίοχον,
κάλλιστον μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἀλθεῖν δ’ οὐ χείρονα μορφῆς,
ὅς πατέρων ἀγαθῶν ἔσρεφάνωσε πόλιν.

Know Theognetos as you look at him, an Olympic victor
as a boy, nimble charioteer of wrestling,
at once beautiful to behold, and also not worse than his figure in competition,
he who crowned the city of his worthy ancestors.

In fact, both boys are praised for their physique at the age of a beloved in a pederastic relationship (Scanlon 2002: 205). This Theognetos may in fact be the boy who won in the Olympics of 476, in which case he hails, like Alkimedon, from Aigina (Scanlon 2002: 205). In this context, the allusive description that Plato gives when Charmides enters in his eponymous dialogue is a propos: ἀλλὰ πάντες ὥσπερ ἄγαλμα ἐθεῶντο αὐτόν : “all of them stared at him *as if he were a statue*” (154c).

⁹ Steiner, for example, draws our attention to the analogous moral characteristics of statues and *eromenoi* (2001: 204-205).

reassessment of the relationship of Achilles and Patroklos through an erotic lens (2005: 139; cf. Aesch. fr. 135-37 *TrGF*), as well as the concluding comparison of Hagesidamos to Ganymede (10.99-105), assert the possibility that trainer-praise is frequent across epinician because of the tendency of trainer-pupil relationships to be amorous (2005: 140). For my broader interest in the implication of desire and epinician, Hubbard's analysis is important because of the compelling evidence he brings forward for the erotic tenor of the gymnasium and palaestra more generally (2005: 141-143).¹⁰ He goes beyond epinicians with trainers in uncovering the pederastic mode, and points to *Pythian* 10, whose honoree is the Thessalian boy-victor Hippokleas, but whose commissioner was Thorax, a Thessalian elite; this example demonstrates the possibility that erotic relationships might prefigure athletic ones (2005: 145): "Pindar's ode [e.g., *P.* 10] and its public celebration could be viewed as an extravagant love gift from Thorax".

Hubbard points to an array of examples from the corpus of Attic Red-Figure vases to illuminate erotic trainer-athlete relationships (2005: 146-158); he concludes that such iconographic and literary evidence characterizes the palaestra as "a sanctuary of pederastic culture" (2005: 158). Whether Ilas was the *erastes* of Hagesidamos or not, the rhetoric of the poem suggests that such a characterization would not be negative, and, within the confines of elite culture, in which Pindar composed his epinicians, it was perhaps preferable to a purely mercantile relationship between trainer and athlete (Hubbard 2005: 159; cf. Nicholson, 2005); indeed, it was likely an ordinary and expected

¹⁰ Scanlon adduces the probably Archaic Solonic law prohibiting slaves from having freeborn boys as lovers, and from exercising at the gymnasium as indicative of the early connection between pederasty and athletics (2002: 212-213). As he argues, from that point to the early Christian period, athletics and pederasty are entwined in an 800-year history (2002: 213-219).

aspect of the education, upbringing, and lived experience of a young man.¹¹ Nicholson demonstrates the probable anxiety about monetary exchanges between poet and patron (2005), and in such an atmosphere pederasty offered another structure through which the poet could disguise any economic exchange as a familial relation (2000: 238).

Beyond the management of actual relations, however, Nicholson argues that a poem structured on pederasty and desire offered a mode by which the poet could refine, validate, and extend his praise of the victor. He too begins with *O.* 10, which he observes ends with poet and victor in a relation of desire: “the final picture we are left with is of the poet admiring the victor’s beauty” (1998: 29). In contrast to modern (and later antique) estimations that truth is inherently connected to perceived objectivity, Nicholson stresses that late Archaic culture marked desire, especially pederastic desire, as “contributing to (and not simply not detracting from) the poet’s truthfulness” (1998: 30). That is, a pederastic structure for praise-song is one mode through which the poet can amplify the magnitude of praise that he offers to his *laudandus*. In *O.* 10, then, the perceived pederastic relationship is not only a reflection of the reality of the palaestra (per Hubbard 2005) or even a convenient way to mask an anxiety-filled professional relationship (per Nicholson 2000), but rather desire and witnessing victory go hand-in-hand (Nicholson 1998: 30). The intimate relationship between pederastic desire and veracity is further evidenced through the group of odes for youths in the epinician corpus (*O.* 8, 10, 11, 14; *P.* 8, 10, 11; *N.* 4, 5, 6, 7): Pindar’s praise of youthful beauty and desirability allows him to underline the aristocratic belief in inherited excellence (Nicholson 1998: 31), which might explain the use of the pederastic mode even beyond

¹¹ Scanlon remarks on the erotic nature of Pindar’s athletic descriptions (2002: 272), but he characterizes them as overwhelmingly heterosexual, and thus misses the explicit homoerotic description of boy-athletes.

odes for youths.¹² In *O.9*, for example, Epharmostos “is only rendered young by the poet’s words” (Nicholson 1998: 31); *I. 4* ends with an image of the victor as youth (Nicholson 1998: 32); or most aggressively, *P.6*, in which the son of the *laudandus* replaces the victor as the focus of the ode (*ibid.*). Nicholson adumbrates the connection between pederasty and desire in order to complement Foucault’s genealogy of desire in *History of Sexuality* (esp. “The Care of the Self”, 1990). He argues that the implication of pederasty and truth stands in contrast to Plato’s conception of truth as self-denial (1998: 36), and is likely the aesthetic to which Plato reacts (*ibid.*). Desire and truth as conceptually connected, however, can also work to illuminate the relationship of beauty and praise in a contextualized examination of Pindar’s odes. In particular, there are ramifications for praise in *O.8*, especially in light of Pindar’s ideal audience of men who embody pederastic desire; in such an audience, truthfulness and praise are consequentially affected by connections among veracity, encomium, and desire.

7.2 Visuality and Homoerotic Frontality in Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painting

“For the Greeks, love was born at the sight of beauty”, claims Frontisi-Ducroux: beauty emanates from an object and infects the viewer (1996: 81; cf. Stansbury-O’Donnell 2006: 64-67). Hubbard also remarks that in fr. 123, Pindar foregrounds the visual dimension of desire: “it is when he ‘looks upon’ (11: ἴδω) the fresh-limbed youth of boys that the poem’s speaker melts like beeswax” (2002: 266). Hubbard considers vase-painting as the place to explicate the dynamics of vision in Pindar’s poetry as well: both poetry and vase-painting, he argues, are “discourse[s] of ideal and symbolic

¹² *O. 8, 10, 11, P. 10, 11, N. 5, 6, 7* are universally regarded as odes for boy victors (Hamilton 1974: 106). In addition, I consider *P. 8* an ode for a boy victor, following the invocation $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}$ (*P. 8.33*), as well as the parallel passage on losers (*P. 8.81-87*; discussed below). Hamilton adds *N. 4* to the above list, since it praises a trainer, and he concludes, that trainer praise indicates a boy-victor when the event is boxing, wrestling, or *pankration* (1974: 108).

representations rather than... direct transcription[s] of social reality as lived and experienced” (2002: 283). Steiner demonstrates that audiences were drawn to “collapse the distance” between athlete and aesthetically pleasing *agalmata* (1998: 124), and in this way, the context for Pindaric composition and reception is one in which audience identification of athlete and representation of athlete was complete – vase-painting offers a particularly important resource for our understanding of the visuality of desire and athletics, because of the loss of so much original statuary, and the vast quantity of painted material (Steiner 1998: 128; 2001: 225).¹³ Frontisi-Ducroux’s persuasive evocation of “interpellation”, the way in which vase-painting, through frontally-facing characters, can appropriate the viewer of the vase to the figured scene (a literary apostrophe), is a compelling explanatory tool for visuality, desire, and beauty, and one which I suggest can be profitably expanded to include the representation of athletes in Pindar.¹⁴

Frontisi-Ducroux defines “frontality” as when a figure, “rotating a quarter of a turn... presents himself or herself full face and establishes another visual relationship, perpendicular to the others, with the viewer” (1996: 85; cf. MacKay 2001: 19).¹⁵ As she

¹³ Steiner argues persuasively that statues are desirable, not only because of their likeness to the absent subject, but also because the subject displays, in the first place, properties that belong to finely crafted objects (2001: 195).

¹⁴ MacKay offers a compelling comparison of apostrophe in Homer and the front-facing figure in Black-Figure pottery, but I am unaware of any earlier extension of this approach to the language and style of Pindar. MacKay concludes that apostrophe and front-facing figures breach the narrative conventions of their form, in which the audience is supposedly watching and listening to a distant (spatially and temporally) tale (2001: 18-19). Narrative apostrophe in Homer, she writes, “instantly breaks down the otherwise clear distinctions between his story and the context in which he is telling it...” (2001: 18). Similarly, frontal-figures engage with the viewer and challenge their relationship with the painted scene, as well as configure their emotional reaction to the painted scene in front of them (2001: 31). MacKay’s illumination of Homer through vase-painting provides a useful critical context for my own use of vase-painting to highlight and interpret the visual language of Pindar. Korshak 1987 remains the most complete study of the frontal-figure in Archaic vase-painting; she finds a “state of diminished control over the self” as the defining characteristic of front-facing figures (1987: 23). As she points out, there is a weakening of this convention in the late Archaic period, and early Classical frontality may have more in common with a new developing artistic style than a specific emotional and narrative quality (1987: 40-41).

¹⁵ Frontal faces appear in vase-painting first on Black Figure, in depictions of Gorgons in the middle of the seventh century (MacKay 2001: 21). Korshak catalogues front-facing figures on Archaic vases (1987: 45-

argues, this simple rotation, a breach of the convention of profile portraiture, changes the dynamics of the viewing of vase-paintings: “l’impersonnalité du récit iconique en est trouble. L’image cesse d’être totalement autonome” (1995: 157). The viewer of the vase-painting then has a different relationship, a personalized relationship, with the frontally facing figure (*ibid.*); the figure views him and he views the figure in a reciprocal relation. For Frontisi-Ducroux, this personal relation “signifies a narrative digression... an interpellation” (*ibid.*).¹⁶ This interpellation is not predetermined, and the age and social status of the viewer might influence the possible identifications; the seemingly infinite possibilities can be curtailed when we consider the context for such figured pottery, the symposium, and the ideal audience, the elite male.

Frontality is especially common in homoerotic contexts in the late Archaic and early Classical period; no instance of frontality has been recorded in heterosexual courtship scenes, and Frontisi-Ducroux suggests that the frontality of female figures is still structured around an objective relationship with a male viewer, that is, the front-facing female is either vulnerable, sleeping, or a sexual object (1996: 86-87). For male viewers, however, both Hubbard and Frontisi-Ducroux contend that a sort of ambiguity results from front-facing figures in homoerotic scenes (Hubbard 2002: 283; Frontisi-

70), and she lists over 250 instances of front-facing figures: 98 satyrs, 44 combat figures, 50 symposiasts, eleven athletes, four centaurs, seven mythical women (e.g., Muses, Maenads), nine deities, five women, nineteen miscellaneous men. There is no comparative study of the early Classical material, but Frontisi-Ducroux asserts an increase in the gymnastic, sympotic, and homoerotic scenes (1997: 199-22; 281-297). In terms of the Gorgon, Frontisi-Ducroux explicates the frontal-face of the Gorgon in terms of its mask-like appearance and as a forbidden face (1999: 65-75; cf. Korshak 1987: 18-21); Korshak regards the helmet as a type of mask, and thus explains the use of frontal-faces for dying soldiers as well (1987: 23). The François vase includes a frontal face of a Muse, as do contemporary Black-Figure vases, which seem to associate frontality with the syrinx player (MacKay 2001: 22-24; cf. Korshak 1987: 26-28). By the middle of the sixth-century, front-facing satyrs are extant on Black-Figure (MacKay 2001: 25), and the motif of the front-facing dying warrior follows soon afterwards (ca. 540 BC: MacKay 2001: 26; Frontisi-Ducroux, 1995: 167-198). MacKay’s study ends with Black-Figure, but Frontisi-Ducroux points out that gymnastic, sympotic, and homoerotic figured scenes, which include frontal-figures, appear early in the Red-Figure tradition (1995: 199-224, 281-297).

¹⁶ Frontisi-Ducroux presumably borrows “interpellation” from the vocabulary of Althusser.

Ducroux, 1996: 85). While one might assume that an adult would gaze at front-facing youths as an *erastes* to *eromenos*, configured in an objective relationship of desire, this need not be so definite: “reciprocity is indissoluble here from reflexivity, for if he is an adult, the Athenian spectator remembers having been pursued, and if he is still in that youthful moment, he knows he will soon be in the other camp” (Frontisi-Ducroux 1996: 85; cf. 1995: 292). In other words, the gaze of frontally-facing figures creates a relationship of desire, confuses subject-object relations, but also prompts a temporal discourse of nostalgia or anticipation.¹⁷

The interpellating visuality of these front-facing figures also constructs a material type of vision: as Frontisi-Ducroux explains, for the Greeks, there is not a clear distinction between the optic and haptic: “vision –whatever its object- is thought to be a long-distance touch” (1996: 86 n33).¹⁸ The very terminology of Greek vases belies the blurring of the lines between material vase and figured scene, but also real personal interactions: “what we call the bottom of the cup the Greeks call its ‘face’ – *prosopon*; a face-to-face encounter translates as *kata prosopon*” (1996: 86). *Prosopon*, to which Frontisi-Ducroux dedicates a chapter of *Du masque au visage* (1995: 39-76), is a term used to describe the bottom of a cup, actual faces, and even ritual masks. *Prosopa* were lucid: the *prosopon* is a transparent record of the feelings, expression, and character of an

¹⁷ Steiner suggests that a double objectification takes place, in which the athlete in reality is the object of everyone’s attention, after which he is actually reified as a statue, which further acts as the object of the gaze (1998: 130). In what Steiner calls a “reverse Pygmalion effect”, the living body of the athlete is turned, by the plastic artist and the audience’s gaze, into the objectified and fossilized representation of the statue (1998: 131). In a later recapitulation of this analysis, Steiner adds that the statue maintains power, even in its objectified state: a common *effect* of viewing a statue is to suffer a sort of self-reification, whereby viewers are frozen – “wonder-struck” – upon gazing at the object of their desire, or a statuary representative of it (2001: 199). In this later analysis, then, reciprocity has a greater role to play in the relationship of viewer and object (2001: 198-204).

¹⁸ On Greek theories of vision, which “presume a much more intimate contact between the viewer and the viewed object than modern optical theory”, see Stansbury-O’Donnell (2006: 61-64; quotation from 61).

individual: “le visage, par contraste avec le corps plus ou moins caché sous le vêtement, c’est le visible” (Frontisi-Ducroux, 1995: 39). Frontisi-Ducroux points to the reciprocity built into Greek conceptions of sight as well, which is “un principe de réversibilité, le voir n’étant pas séparé de l’être vu” (1995: 41). In this way, the relationship of viewer and frontal figure can also be conceived as a reciprocal interaction of sight: each looks at the other, and it is this engaged reciprocity that most clearly marks frontal figures as breaching the narrative confines of painted scenes (Frontisi-Ducroux, 1995: 155ff; cf. Korshak 1987: 42).

The intertwining of subject and object, gaze and gazed upon, thus, is built into the vocabulary of vase-painting, and thence into inter-personal relationships. Considering the erotic context of these vases (the symposium) and the erotic context of the homoerotic scenes in which front-facing figures often appear, the interpellation of viewers is a complex of desire, *eros*, and visibility. In the following, I apply this set of ideas, derived from vase-painting, to the visual language of *O.* 8; here, I consider the vivid description of Alkimedon’s beauty as a kind of poetic “frontality”, in which Pindar too “interpellates” his audience.

7.3: Testimony, Autopsy, Praise

Alkimedon’s beauty is important from his first appearance in *O.*8. Pindar connects his victory to the special status accorded to Alkimedon through his family’s association with Zeus Genethlios (8.16).¹⁹ It is this close connection to Zeus Genethlios which has made Timosthenes πρόφατον (“famous”) at Nemea (8.16), and Alkimedon, in a more

¹⁹ Zeus Genethlios presides over childbirth, and some conjecture a special relationship between this iteration of Zeus and the Blepsiadai clan. Farnell, however, more simply (and persuasively) argues that Zeus Genethlios is appropriate because both victors have conquered at a festival in honour of Zeus (Nemea, and Olympia; 1965: II 60).

expansive two-line description, an Ὀλυμπιονίκαν (“Olympic victor”, 8.19).²⁰ Proceeding immediately from this compound adjective, Pindar moves backwards in time, and describes his autopsy of Alkimedon’s victory at the Olympic Games (8.19-20):

ἦν δ' ἔσορᾶν καλός, ἔργω τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων
ἐξένεπε κρατέων
πάλα δολιχήρετμον Αἴγιναν πάτραν·

He was beautiful to behold, and in action he did not discredit
his looks, and by winning in the wrestling match
he proclaimed long-oared Aigina as his fatherland,

Alkimedon’s victory is explicitly figured in the language of proclamation (ἐξένεπε); the first appearance of the victor and the details of the proclamation are delayed until 8.18. Pindar ties the heraldic mode of representation, in which Alkimedon “proclaimed” his victory, to the movement backwards in time to the poet’s autopsy of the wrestling victory. With the use of the imperfect, Pindar places this description in the past, when, as a witness to Alkimedon’s victory, and its proclamation, he was simultaneously a witness to the boy’s beauty (cf. *O.* 10.100-105). καλός, despite sometimes being translated ambiguously as a moral or ethical quality, refers here to physical attractiveness, as the

²⁰ Timosthenes’ identity has provoked the usual sort of biographical criticism. Carey discusses the possibilities (1989: 1-6), though he insists that Timosthenes’ victory preceded Alkimedon’s: in the ode, Timosthenes’ victory acts as a sort of cap to the praise of Alkimedon (see Race, 1990: 147, who remarks on the relative quality of the introduction of each personality). The scholiasts call Timosthenes Alkimedon’s brother (*schol. ad O.* 8.16); as Carey notes, the certainty of this identification has led to speculative reconstructions of Timosthenes’ own supposed relationship with the trainer Melesias (1989: 2). Since the scholiasts are unclear about the relationship of Iphion and Kallimachos, who are mentioned later in the ode (8.81-82; *schol. ad O.* 8.106a-h), they are likely to have had no certain information about the identity of any of Alkimedon’s family (Carey 1989: 2). The dates of Nemean victories were hopelessly uncertain, even in antiquity, so this could not contribute to any reliable information about the relative dating of Timosthenes and Alkimedon’s victories and thus their relationship (*ibid.*). Carey concludes, contrary to the scholia, that Timosthenes is the victor’s grandfather, since he is otherwise unnamed, although mentioned at 8.70, an anathema to the configuration of praise in epinician (1989: 3). Carey ingeniously connects the importance of the grandfather’s victory to the Aiakos myth, in which inter-generational cooperation is crucial to the downfall of Troy (1989: 5). In contrast, Kurke thinks that the grandfather is unnamed because his name, following standard Greek practice, was Alkimedon (1991a: 293-298); this is intriguing, but in light of Carey’s persuasive integration of Timosthenes and Alkimedon’s inter-generational victories into the mythic narrative of the poem, it must be dismissed.

Suda and other ancient lexica attest (*s.v.* καλός, *Suda*; cf. Robinson and Fluck 1937: 15).²¹

As the second half of 8.20 makes clear, beauty does not solely exist on the surface for the athlete (Scanlon 2002: 201); rather, Pindar’s eye-witness gaze correlates interiority and exteriority.²² More specifically, Pindar identifies beauty and character and signifies the former as a causal agent in the boy’s victory – in other words, beauty is not only an aesthetic category, but a moral one as well as an active force in the athletic world (see Chapter 5.3-5.4). The relationship of interior and exterior focuses our attention on the importance of Pindar’s visual language; while Frontisi-Ducroux says the face is the key visual element in vase-painting, Alkimedon’s *whole body* is exposed in athletic competition. His naked form, as depicted by Pindar, becomes a locus for his interior self and his ability, as well as prophetic of his victory.²³ The ambiguity of Greek participles offers some further support to this causality, since ἐλέγχων can have a causal relationship to the main verb of the clause (i.e., “and *because* he did not discredit his looks, he proclaimed...”), and provides a more explicit correlation between appearance and action.

²¹ Robinson and Fluck even point to this instance in Pindar as an example of *kalos* as physical beauty; they remark that when Pindar wishes to make *kalos* ethical, he qualifies it as such (1937: 16; cf. *N.* 3.19).

²² Steiner observes that the correlation of aesthetics and morality is operative in statuary as well (2001: 42). She adduces Bourdieu’s bodily *hexis* to underscore how physical actions both reflect and enact moral and social qualities (on which, see Bourdieu 1990).

²³ Nicholson suggests that Pindar’s identification of Alkimedon’s “fine physique” (among other attributes) is a skillful obfuscation of the role of the trainer in Alkimedon’s victory (2005: 145). He argues that this purposeful downplays the actual *training* provided by Melesias, in order to diffuse the anxiety produced by the professional relationship. I agree that skill is absent in the ode, though Nicholson’s explanation does not exclude the relationship of desire that I posit; in fact, Pindar’s engagement with the pederastic mode may complement Nicholson’s argument for anxiety about professional trainers. We ought to consider, as well, Pindar’s appropriation, through the rhetoric of vision, of the place of the prophet, which opened the ode. While the outcome of those prophecies is unclear (*O.* 8.8), Pindar seemingly denotes his own prophetic ability, and that of any audience present at Olympia, through the identification of the external qualities of Alkimedon and his victory.

In describing the young man's appearance, Pindar develops a temporal discourse: he does not describe the appearance of the young man at the coronation ceremony, or at the present occasion of the ode. Instead, he visualizes Alkimedon during his wrestling matches: he does not simply record that he saw a beautiful young man at the Olympics, but ἔσορᾶν καλός evokes the vision of a bronzed, naked young man, entwined in the limbs of another naked young man.²⁴ This description offers a paradigm through which the audience is encouraged to view the athlete as well; just as vase-painters often frame naked youths with “*kalos*-inscriptions” (e.g. the *kalos*-inscription of the Onesimos Painter explains the sense of the scene and the desired response in *ARV*² 332.36; Fluck and Robinson 1937: 1-15; Richter 1946: 15-16; cf. Chapter 3.3), Pindar also provides a model perspective.²⁵ In this context, Steiner's recognition of the “collapse of distance” between athletes and their representations, and her identification of the “monumental” mode of athletic representation in Pindar, is compelling: the representation is a figurative one in poetic form, but the “collapse” nevertheless occurs, and the poem presents its audience with a desirable, eroticized young man in his moment of triumph.

While athletic nudity was the expected norm, this by no means removed the potential erotic appeal that might have accompanied the prominent display of the naked bodies of youths. In this light, Frontisi-Ducroux's explication of a *kylix* (1995: 282-284; fig. 97 = *ARV*² 1254.80), dated to the second half of the fifth century, is apposite: the exterior of the vase is decorated with young athletes, the background indicates the

²⁴ In contrast to Race (1990: 148), who opines that the initial appearance of the wrestler is simply to indicate the stages of audience response; he compares this to a modern wrestling match, at which an audience member may see a challenger and judge the probable outcome of the contest on his appearance.

²⁵ Only Fluck and Robinson are interested in “the conditions which led to the use of the inscription” (1937: vi).

gymnasium.²⁶ Intriguingly, on one side of the vase, two naked youths are framed by the watching eyes of two other young men, although one “se détourne pour solliciter le regard du spectateur de l’image” (Frontisi-Ducroux 1995: 284). As Frontisi-Ducroux remarks, the posture of both young men shows off their muscular physique, and the right-hand pair of posed young man and watcher appropriately demonstrates the relationship that the viewer of the vase should have towards the frontally-facing youth (*ibid.*). In this instance, there is an implicit erotic element and a relationship of desire between the figures on the vase and, importantly, the viewer of the vase, predicated on the use of frontality.

An amphora from the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (*ARV*² 3.1, 1617 = Korshak 1987 fig.42), dated to the late sixth century and attributed to the Andokides Painter, to which Hubbard (2005: 281-283; fig. 5) and Frontisi-Ducroux refer (1995: 289; fig. 103), offers a similar perspective: on the exterior of this amphora we are faced with another scene from the palaestra. Separated by a neck-handled amphora are two sets of athletes (a mix of bearded and beardless men) practicing their wrestling under the watchful eye of a beardless trainer-figure on the far left. Again, the gaze of the trainer prefigures our own gaze, and again, the gaze of the viewer is interpellated by the frontally-facing athlete, who looks out at us as he is lifted into the air by his youthful competitor. Hubbard argues that the bearded man offers an identity for the viewer: we too could be “helplessly lifted up and carried away by the beauty of the younger man who holds him/us captive” (2002: 283). Frontisi-Ducroux similarly acknowledges that the image evokes a complex of

²⁶ The so-called athlete’s kit is ubiquitous in vase-painting scenes, though Miller remarks that a comprehensive study of the strigil, for example, has never been completed (2001: 85 n170). Frontisi-Ducroux states that the strigil’s presence is indicative of the importance of the scraping and collection of oil; she notes that scenes of eating are never included in vase-painting, but strigil and scraping are extremely common (1995: 282).

masculinity and desire, though not necessarily Hubbard's speculation (1995: 29): the man instead, she conjectures, offers a variety of identities to the viewer of the vase, who can see in him his own past, present, or future status as a citizen, *eromenos* and *erastes* (*ibid.*).²⁷ In other words, such frontal-facing individuals, especially given the erotic context of athletics and the palaestra, offer multiple potential identities to their viewer, diachronically distributed and multivalent in their possibilities.

In *O.8*, I argue, Pindar positions Alkimedon in a similar relationship to his audience: we can read Alkimedon as figuratively turning towards the viewer through Pindar's highly visual description. Just as frontally-facing figures on Attic Red-Figure breach the narrative convention of their scenes, so too does Pindar's depiction of Alkimedon, "beautiful to behold", breach the narrative convention of epinician, and thus force a relationship between the audience and the represented athlete. Pindar even goes so far as to include his own metaphorical *kalos*-inscription (8.19), instructing his audience in the appropriate response: Alkimedon becomes, like the figures in the vases above, a specimen of masculine beauty, and we the audience have, through Pindar, a paradigmatic perspective on which to model our own interaction with this desirable athletic body.²⁸

By the end of the ode, Pindar has, characteristically, taken us through a mythic journey to Troy, a geographical journey from Aigina to Asia Minor and back, though he

²⁷ Within this erotic context, one should bear in mind Korshak's interpretation of the front-facing figure as the "loser" or "victim" in the scene (1987: 17). The use of frontality with the victim figure resonates well with the use of frontality in combat scenes (*ibid.*). Judging by the scene, however, the characterization of front-facing figures with "victimhood" had already begun to wane at this point.

²⁸ *kalos* inscriptions appear in athletic contexts as well. Scanlon particularly draws our attention to the graffiti at Nemea that possibly testifies "to a homoerotic attraction of athletes to one another literally at the competition site" (2002: 206). All of the graffiti on the entrance tunnel to the Nemean stadium are early Hellenistic, dating from 330-270 BC (Miller 2001: 85). Miller concludes that the eight inscriptions attaching *kalos* to a proper name are probably instances of athletes admiring the beauty of other athletes (2001, 86). *Kalos* inscriptions of a similarly homoerotic, though more obscene nature, occur near the gymnasium on Thera (Miller 2001: 86; cf. *IG* XII.3.536-553).

returns, following the praise of the trainer Melesias, to the victory of Alkimedon and the display of the boy himself.²⁹ On its own, this is inconsequential, as Pindar usually returns to his *laudandus* after the interlude of mythic narrative in his longer odes (Hamilton 1974: 65). Rather than turning immediately to family praise or a catalogue of victories, however, Pindar remarks, unusually, on the specifics of victory (8.67-69). While he never provides detailed reports (Race 1990: 147), in this instance Pindar offers one of his most vivid descriptions of the victorious athletic achievement:

ὄς τύχα μὲν δαίμονος, ἀνορέας δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακῶν
 ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις
 νόστον ἔχθιστον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶσ-
 σαν καὶ ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον,

who, with divine fortune, but also by not failing his manhood,
 put away from himself onto four boys' bodies
 a most hateful homecoming, words less respectful,
 and a hidden path.

This short passage begins twenty-one lines before the end of the poem, and occupies a similar place, formally, as the previous description of Alkimedon's beauty, which occurred from seventeen to twenty lines into the ode. Race points to structural similarity,

²⁹ The praise of trainers in epinicians for boy-victors is regular (Hamilton 1974: 104-106), though Melesias' praise goes far beyond the norm in this poem. There are, moreover, questions about the text of this section and its syntax. ἀνέδραμον (8.4) is unattested in the transitive sense of "retrace" or "recount", which seems to be required here (Farnell 1965: II 65), and which is suggested by, among others, Gildersleeve (1885: 197). Farnell suggests "cause to mount up", which he parallels with *Il.* 18.56: ὁ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνει ἴσος ("he shot up like a young tree") (1965: II, 65). If this clarifies the meaning of the verb, the exact thing being counted is unclear: the syntax ἐξ ἀγενείων ("from beardless youths", 8.54) leaves it vague as to whether these are Melesias' victories on account of boys he has trained (as in the present instance: Gildersleeve 1885: 197), or victories he won *from* boys, when he himself was competing (Farnell 1965: II 65). Carey refers to the vocabulary of victory, i.e., κῦδος, as indicative of Melesias' *own* victories (1989b: 289); the connecting vocabulary at 8.56, καὶ... γὰρ ὁμῶς, seems to imply two distinct categories, Melesias' victories as a youth (ἐξ ἀγενείων) and those he won as an adult (8.56: ἐρέω ταύταν χάριν "I will likewise declare a glory of this sort"). Pindar worries about the threat of envy from praising the trainer within an epinician for his patron (8.55: μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος: "let no ill will cast a rough stone at me"), and Race argues that the justification of Melesias' praise is victor praise: "the praises of the trainer are praises of the athlete and vice versa" (1990: 156). In any case, we know Melesias from three of Pindar's odes (*O.* 8, *N.* 4, *N.* 6), which should point, alongside this ode's report of his thirty victories, to him as famous in his own right (Nicholson 2005: 135). Nicholson remarks that the praise of Melesias in *O.* 8 is the fullest of his three appearances, so much so that scholiasts conjectured that he might be the co-honorand of the ode (2005: 136).

in that both passages contain three elements of increasing length, the third of which contains the main verb (1990: 159); in both instances the first element contains natural and divine endowments, the second concentrates on action, and third the effect of that action (*ibid.*). While the action is relatively allusive, it seems clear that a contemporary audience would understand the defeat of four boys as a noteworthy feat (Race 1990: 67), since this implied that Alkimedon drew no lot to ensure a bye and to avoid a match (Crowther 2004: 215-221).³⁰

Perhaps most importantly, this description completes the representation of the heraldic proclamation, since it is only now that we find out the age-category (*paides*: 8.68) of the victor; the name of the father, the final element of the *angelia*, comes later in the ode, likely because of the narrative of a report of the victory reaching even to Hades (8.81-85). The two passages, structurally connected through their description of victory, and further linked through the representation of the *angelia*, equally bridge the mythical section and continue the description of Alkimedon's feat, which began at 8.19.

Alkimedon is the *geras* of his trainer (8.65) and wins his victory, unsurprisingly, with divine favour (Race 1990: 163).³¹ As in the first description, Pindar indicates the identity of appearance and interiority, since it is Alkimedon's victory that is demonstrative of his masculinity, *anorea*.³² In the process of victory, he “pushes away

³⁰ Race observes that the successive defeat of four opponents was remarkable enough to be recorded on inscriptions (1990: 67 n25): *CEG* 2.825, *CEG* 2.827, Ebert no. 76.

³¹ Considering the victory statue can be considered a *geras* of the victorious athlete (Steiner 2001: 18), it is suggestive that Alkimedon is explicitly described as the *geras* of his trainer, as if the athlete himself were the material instantiation of thanks – *charis* – to his successful trainer.

³² Slater glosses “manliness, courage” and gives as examples *I.* 8.25, *P.* 8.91, *N.* 3.20, *I.* 4.11 (*s.v.* ἀνορέα). Only in *P.* 8.91 and *N.* 3.20 does a personal usage of ἀνορέα (or related words) occur in non-mythical narrative. Graziosi and Haubold point to the existence of this word (i.e., ἠνορέη) in Homer, and its obvious derivation from ἀνήρ (2003: 60). They demonstrate that the word is gendered masculine in Homer, and in Pindar this gendered association continues, as the examples above attest (2003: 62). Graziosi and Haubold further show the importance of collective action and solidarity in the Homeric definition of “manliness”

from himself” the worst of endings for an athlete, an unhappy homecoming, insults, and a skulking return to his city (8.69). The athletic victory, while always causally related to the epinician ode, is here explicitly so, since Alkimedon’s epinician homecoming – a spectacle of dance and music – contrasts entirely with the “hidden path” for the boys whom he defeated;³³ Pindar connects not only the athletic victory, but also the demonstration of masculinity as elements in the performance of the epinician.

If the recognition of Alkimedon’s masculinity and the identity of his interior with his athletic victory are integral to the production of the ode, the continued importance of these elements further interpellates the audience, who, since Pindar placed them as witnesses to the victory in the structurally parallel opening sequence, remain visually engaged with the boy-victor. That is, despite the mythic and geographical digressions that comprise the middle of the ode, the audience remains situated, through the visual relationship began at 8.19, the appeal to autopsy, and the construction of a desirable object, as witnesses to Alkimedon’s victory, inasmuch as they are audience to the epinician.³⁴ The relationship of the audience, however, and the possible identities offered by the figurative gaze of Alkimedon, have changed in the course of the ode: while at the onset, Alkimedon was characterized passively as an object of erotic desire (“beautiful to see”), like a boy named on a metaphorical *kalos*-inscription, by the return to the visual

embodied in ἠγορέα (2003: 68); the collective definition at the core of masculinity retains its substance in a context of epinician performance and athletics, which both posit a male audience.

³³ “Losers” in Pindar are rare, though a parallel passage occurs at *P.* 8.83-87 (cf. Race 1990: 65). In that ode too, ἀγορέα characterizes the victory of a victor from Aigina (*P.* 8.91), though whether *P.* 8 is for a boy-victor or not has been disputed (Hamilton 1974: 106; he concludes that, because of a lack of trainer praise in *P.* 8, it is not for boy victor, 1974: 108). To Farnell, these lines are “almost borrowed” from *P.* 8, though he concludes that this is due to the improvised nature of our ode (1965: II 66). In any case, since such images of loss are unusual in Pindar, the coincidence of homeland, sport, and the evocation of ἀγορέα, a rare word in Pindar, probably points to *P.* 8 as an ode for a boy-victor as well.

³⁴ The completion of the heraldic representation at this point further solidifies the continuing audience interpellation.

depiction of the boy, his activity and demonstrable masculinity disturb a straightforward relationship between audience and victor.³⁵

Instead of only an objective relationship, Alkimedon's shifting description underlines the multiple identifications possible in intersubjective frontal-figures. Hubbard notes the possible "frailty" of the supposed *erastes* in the face of the objective gaze that emanates from the supposedly passive, desired object (2002: 283-286). As with the figured scenes, Pindar's description of a powerful and masculine Alkimedon belies the presumably passive role of the erotically desirable youth; instead, a multitude of relations appears: "the desired object may become a projection or mirror image of the subject's own idealized self: the self as it once was or wishes it had been, or perhaps it wishes it still were" (Hubbard 2002: 286). Central to any subjective response, however, is the desirable object of the athlete himself, whom Pindar's ode freezes in his transcendent, yet ephemeral moment of triumph. The audience is positioned to be both the erotic desirers of Alkimedon, as well as the erotic object of a fully masculine young man of superlative strength; they can live in the poem, relative to Alkimedon, as helpless victim of the erotic gaze, or erotically gazing subject – the multitude of subjectivities available speaks to the potent quality of Pindar's visual language.³⁶

The consequences of Pindar's frontality in this ode, however, do not stop simply at the interpellation of the audience. Rather, the generic and contextual possibilities of

³⁵ The quality of Alkimedon's appearance, and the magnetic character of his beauty, should be regarded in the context of Frontisi-Ducroux's claim that the Greeks "définissent l'œuvre d'art comme un *thauma idesthai*, une «merveille à voir», chose qui sidère, stupéfie, frappe le spectateur d'une admiration empreinte d'inquiétude, voire de terreur, le *thambos*, et qui le paralyse."

³⁶ By placing the audience in a relationship of desire with Alkimedon, Pindar also diffuses any "mimetic desire" generated by the collective envy of athletic success (Scanlon 2002: 295). Steiner reflects on the possibility that statues, since they confused subject and object gazes, might embody "representations of those whom law and normative values often deemed out of bounds" (2001: 211). I suggest just as much here with the visual description of Alkimedon: the visual aspect of Pindar's epinician permits a host of relations of desire that were outside the bounds of social norms.

epinician underscore a new potential for this direct, interpellating visuality. By figuratively turning Alkimedon toward his audience, by situating the audience as present at the moment of Alkimedon's victory, Pindar transforms the audience from passive receivers of the epinician rhetoric of praise to actively testifying to the reality of this praise itself. Along with Pindar, the audience also attests to having seen Alkimedon, a wondrous sight of beauty, demonstrating his masculinity, defeating his enemies, and fully deserving of the present act of praise. Pindar's ode implicitly situates his audience in the role, not only of witnesses, but of desiring witnesses, to Alkimedon's victory, and the audience is doubly-interpellated in the complex of beauty and desire: they wish to be with Alkimedon and also to be taken by him. While Kurke argues persuasively for the "re-integrative" function of epinician, which brings an athlete back into the community (1991: 29), in this ode re-integration is effected through the erotic relationships provisioned by victory; praise and desire conjoin to dismiss envy, reify victory, and translate Alkimedon's ephemeral victory to eternity.

Nicholson radically claims that to desire one's subject does not invalidate praise in the Pindaric mode: "late Archaic (aristocratic) culture marked pederastic desire as contributing to (and not simply not detracting from) the poet's truthfulness" (1998: 30). He argues that in *O.* 10, for example, Pindar does not separate the boy's victory and the boy's attractiveness, but "rather the two acts of testifying to the victory and declaring his attraction are inseparable" (Nicholson 1998: 30). In *O.* 8, then, Pindar's own rhetoric of praise is implicated in this conjunction of desire and truth; furthermore, by engaging the audience subjectively, doubly-embroiled in a dialectic of desire, the audience becomes affective and effective witnesses to Alkimedon's victory. Pindar's praise of boy-victors,

founded in a complex of masculinity, truth, and desire, appropriates his audience to this perspective, through the configuration of a visual relationship between audience and Alkimedon. Beyond simply appreciating a beautiful boy whose manhood was on display, the visual language situates the audience as witnesses to Alkimedon's beauty, who, like Pindar, since they too desire the boy, act to further validate his victory. If truth is implicated in homoeroticism, then Pindar's creation of an infinite and continuous audience of desiring witnesses serves to amplify beyond all measure the magnitude of Alkimedon's praise.

Chapter 8: Status and *stasis* in Ergoteles' Victory Monuments (*O.* 12 and *CEG* 1.393)

O. 12 and *CEG* 1.393 place scholars of ancient athletic representation in the rare position of having two dedications by the same athlete. Despite this rarity, the two texts have been little studied in tandem, except insofar as the epigram has been used to fill in some of the details of the interpretation of the epinician ode (e.g., Barrett 1973). In Chapter 3.4, I remarked on the implicit presence of socioeconomic status in the heraldic mode of representation: despite the absence of any formal constraint on participation by non-elites, the cost and prohibitive travel time made their participation at Olympia highly unlikely. These two poems, one oral and one inscribed, offer an insight into the Pindaric and epigrammatic representation of athletic participation, especially with respect to class and status, since the same ambiguous presence of socioeconomic status in the *angelia* exists in the selective and ideologically-inflected representation of aristocratic behaviour in *O.* 12 and *CEG* 1.393. Furthermore, given the different representations of the home *polis* of Ergoteles (in *O.*12, both Knossos and Himera; in *CEG* 1.393, only Himera), these texts underscore the appropriation of the *angelia* in athletic verse as part of the representation of socio-economic identity. Despite the fact that we have no knowledge of how Ergoteles was actually proclaimed at the Games (i.e., whether as a Himeran or Cretan), we are left with two representations of the proclamation that offer very different identities for the athlete.

By focusing on the effacement of the realities of factional politics, as well as the importance of performance context (i.e., Himera versus Olympia; *O.* 12 versus *CEG* 1.393), I uncover the ideological and classist assumptions that frame athletic praise in these poems. Since my project has argued for a generic continuity (indeed, an identity)

between epinician odes and epigrams (i.e., through their shared use of the heraldic mode of representation), these dedications, commissioned by the same aristocratic victor in the same time period, offer a final and comprehensive case-study of the benefits of my methodology.

In order to begin my analysis of *O.* 12 and *CEG* 1.393, I investigate in detail the notion of *stasis*. *Stasis* is inextricably connected to this Olympic victor, since Pindar includes *stasis* in his narrative of Ergoteles' life, and even Pausanias, despite the absence of any reference to *stasis* in *CEG* 1.393, knows that civil discord caused the victor's exile and emigration to Himera (6.4.11). Since *stasis* is a crucial component of the life and the representation of Ergoteles, I examine *stasis* and exile in verse prior to the fifth century, with a focus on Alkaios, Solon, and the Theognidea. As these poets, traditions, and political strife itself (at least in the Archaic and early Classical period) are largely restricted to elites, an implicit connection between poetry and politics highlights *stasis* as an intrinsically aristocratic activity.¹ The tradition of poetry on civic life in lyric and elegiac genres indicates the disruptive nature of *stasis* and its relationship with moral or economic motives – in other words the entanglement of moral and economic debasement with an aristocratic activity.²

¹ In Greek constitutional thought, Aristotle contends that while “inequality is everywhere at the bottom of faction” (*Pol.* 1301b26; cf. *Pol.* 1303b6 where division of any sort, specifically, is singled out), it is the drive for “profit and honour” (*Pol.* 1302a22; the ‘final cause’, Kalimtzis 2000: 124), particularly aristocratic motives, that are the main causes for *stasis*.

² Kalimtzis offers a cogent analysis of the problems of *modern* renderings of the word *stasis*: revolution, civil strife, and sedition are imprecise, since they include only a fraction of the semantic range of *stasis* (2000: 4). Revolution in particular is troublesome: “the images that the modern notion of revolution conjures, that of the destruction of an obsolete political, social, and economic order and its replacement by a new, causally necessary system, are completely absent from the ancient view of *stasis*” (*ibid.*). Kalimtzis, following the lead of A.E. Taylor, describes the persons involved in *stasis* as “factionaries”; this term has the advantage of “limiting the types of misconceptions that would rise...from the use of popular renderings such as ‘revolutionaries’” (2000: 6).

8.1: Managing *stasis* in Political Poetry: Alkaios, Solon, the Theognidea

While internal political strife is part of the Greek political and poetic tradition from its inception (e.g., Achilles and Agamemnon in *Il.* 2; Hes. *Op.* 180-184, 190-194), the historical context of Ergoteles' ode and epigram, the middle of the fifth century, makes the Archaic tradition particularly important.³ Despite the temporal and geographical distance of Alkaios, Solon, and the Theognidea from Pindar and Olympic epigrams, these poets (and corpora) are important to the reception of *stasis* in the fifth century. They each manage *stasis* as a political and poetic problem, and each characterizes *stasis* differently, though still pejoratively: either as an activity of the *kakoi* (Alkaios), an equivalent to foreign warfare (Solon), or, most plainly, a destroyer of society and *polis* (Theognis).

In later antiquity, Alkaios' poetry was read as political rhetoric (Dion. Hal. *De imit.* 421; MacLachlan 1997: 144) and Strabo recognized Alkaios as a factionary (Strab. 13.2.3).⁴ Alkaios' inclusion in fifth century books of Attic *skolia* (Ath. 15.694a-c; MacLachlan 1997: 137), citations in Attic comedy (Ar. *Thesm.* 160-162), and the popular iconographic pairing of Alkaios and Sappho on Attic vases (MacLachlan 1997: 140) indicate the interest of elites of the fifth-century in his poetry. When we turn to the fragments of Alkaios for a representation of *stasis*, however, the picture that emerges is unclear, and in his self-representation, Alkaios' relationship to factionality is not straightforward. Throughout the preserved fragments, Alkaios associates his opponents, not him and his circle, with *stasis* and political ambition: ὤνηρ οὗτος ὁ μαιόμενος τὸ

³ On *stasis* in *Works and Days*, see van Wees 2007. Edmunds connects Hesiod's bleak picture of the race of iron to Thucydides' depiction of *stasis* on Coreyra (cf. 3.81.5, 3.82.4, 3.82.7; 1975: 82-88).

⁴ This observation follows the other relevant fact, that Strabo knew Alkaios' poetry as τὰ στασιωτικὰ καλούμενα τοῦ Ἀλκαίου ποιήματα "the poems of Alkaios called the *stasis-poems*" (Strab. 13.2.3).

μέγα κρέτος / ὀντρέψει τάχα τὰν πόλιν (“this man, who desires great power, will soon overturn the city”) (fr. 141 Voigt; cf. also, fr. 72.8); μοναρχίαν δ / μηδὲ δεκῶμ (fr. 6.27-28 Voigt: probably “let us not accept *monarchia*; cf. Rösler 1980: 134).⁵ In one famous fragment (fr. 208.1 Voigt), Alkaios employs the double-meaning inherent in *stasis* in his opening line (ἀσυννέτημι τῶν ἀνέμων στάσιμ “I stand away from the strife of the winds”); while the literal meaning refers to the movement of the winds (though, cf. Rösler 1980: 137-139), the phrase could obliquely point to the ignorance of the “I” of the *persona loquens* to the very notion of *stasis* as political factionalism.⁶ Considering the allegorical fashion in which ancient and modern readers have read the “ship of state”, the speaker of Alkaios’ fragment seemingly disavows any connection with factional politics.⁷

Kurke points to the distinction between the self-representation of Alkaios and his circle and the representation of Pittakos, the object of Alkaios’ invective, in the fragments. She highlights the way in which Alkaios’ ejection from what is his perceived “suitable” social situation to the position of outsider, factionalist, and exile, affects genre and speech (1994: 68, 76). Kurke uses Bourdieu’s concept of *doxa*, which can be summarized as “what... goes without saying because it comes without saying” (Bourdieu 1977: 167; quoted by Kurke 1994: 78); in Alkaios, Kurke reads an attempt to confront the disturbance of the accepted *doxa* (“orthodoxy”) with the new and developing socio-

⁵ It is unclear who the “us” of fr. 6 is. Rösler mentions the incongruity of Alkaios’ address (1980: 37-45): he must be speaking to the members of his aristocratic *hetairie*, yet he implies at times an audience of the whole *demos* (cf. Kurke 1994: 79).

⁶ The “ship of state” metaphor was recognized in antiquity: for example, by Heraklitos in a work on allegory in Homer (MacLachlan 1997: 142). Bowie argues that the ship can be read allegorically and literally (1986: 17), a reminder of past experiences on board ship, rather than a literal performance *during a storm*, while Page is unconvinced by either alternative (1955: 185). MacLachlan is probably correct to suggest that a storehouse of metaphor developed from the common set of biographical and performance circumstances of the lyric poets (1997: 142).

⁷ In his review of Rösler 1980, Parker makes the observation that if Rösler’s argument is correct – that Alkaios composed for his own group of *hetairie* only – the metaphor should be the “ship of party”, or, perhaps *faction* (Parker 1981: 160).

political situation (“heterodoxy”). Alkaios’ conjunction of the style of melic poetry with bitter or vulgar vocabulary and imagery is not only the infiltration of iambic into melic, but it is also representative of an ideological struggle contested in poetic vocabulary (Kurke 1994: 69). The juxtaposition of a hymn to the gods and an insult in fr. 129 Voigt is one example (129.21: φύσκων “pot-belly”), as is the implied comparison between Pittakos’ marriage into a noble family and his characterization as a savage beast (fr. 70.6-7 Voigt; Kurke 1994: 74).⁸ Kurke argues that generic slippage in Alkaios is not simply a literary problem, but that the subversion of genres and categories is a reality for the poet because of Pittakos’ actions: “by his betrayal of the oath, Pittacus subverts the possibility of absolute speech and confounds the distinctions of friend, enemy, noble, and base” (Kurke 1994: 76).⁹ The confusion of distinction forms the basis of Alkaios’ invective against Pittakos: Alkaios views the dangerous movement of Pittakos, from noble to base-born, as an affront to aristocratic essentialism (Kurke 1994: 81), the persistent idea that nobility is innate and permanent, passed from generation to generation among aristocrats.¹⁰ As Kurke points out, this is the reason that Alkaios and his *hetairai* would not call themselves factionaries – “let loose from strife and internecine war” (fr. 70.10-11

⁸ Gagné, while he cannot specify in what form we are to read the pollution associated with the Atreidae at this point, concludes that the inclusion of the ancestry of Pittakos’ bride in this poem is “an element of invective” (2009: 42).

⁹ This underscores the personal element to politics in Alkaios’ poetry: Pittakos has betrayed Alkaios and his circle, and in doing so he becomes the object of vitriol. In another poem, Pittakos is the object of a curse (fr. 129.13-16 Voigt), and denigrated specifically for his “trampling of oaths” (fr. 129.23 Voigt). Alkaios employs an intertextual arsenal to further denigrate his adversary: in fr. 129 Voigt and fr. 70 Voigt, verbs of consumption describe the relationship of Pittakos to Mytilene (70.7: δαπτέτω πόλιν “let him devour the city”, 129.23-24: δάπτει / τὰν πόλιν “he devours the city”). Page indicates the strictly pejorative connotation: “the verb suggests Pittacus is no better than a lion [*Il.* 11.480], wolf [*Il.* 16.159] or dog [*Il.* 23.183]” (1955: 167). Alkaios can, of course, be more direct in his condemnation of Pittakos, memorably calling him “pot-belly” (φύσκων) in fr. 129.21 Voigt. Kurke calls attention to the bitter and colloquial noun as a “shocking anomaly” (1994: 71). Brown draws our attention to the connection between the imagery of consumption and invective more generally (2006).

¹⁰ Kurke argues persuasively that Alkaios’ perspective, based on a fundamental essentialism of people and concepts, is adversely affected by the perceived change in Pittakos’ character (1994: 81).

Voigt: χαλάσσομεν δὲ τὰς θυμοβόρω λύας / ἐμφύλω τε μάχας – a claim taken seriously by Rösler 1980: 168-169), he implores at one point – since they seek to maintain what they see as meta-historical truth (the identification of morality and authority with aristocracy) against the threat of a man who would not only trample oaths, but gain *kudos* from *ate* (70.13: Φιττάκῳ δὲ δίδοις κῦδος ἐπήρατον “would you give lovely *kudos* to Pittakos?”).¹¹

For Alkaios, *stasis* is tied to a dangerous confusion of the signs of friendship, trust, and belief; it is a disruption in the aristocratic world brought on by the *kakoi*, whose participation in *stasis* identifies them as such. In its representation in these fragments, *stasis* is tied to the base elements of the *polis* and of human beings more generally; Pittakos cannot be noble if he is involved in civil strife and despite his prior association with Alkaios' circle, his actions have proven revelatory of his true nature. In contrast, by their ardent desire to maintain the status quo (as they see it), Alkaios and his circle are not, from their perspective, engaging in *stasis*. In such a polarized context, where any agitation against the status quo is proof positive of one's lowly nature, there is no possibility, in Alkaios' representation of reality, of aristocratic *stasis*; rather, the management of *stasis* and aristocracy in Alkaios' fragments acts to characterize one (*real* aristocratic birth) as fundamentally incompatible with the other (factional politics). While we are not obliged to accept Alkaios' political rhetoric, his forceful disassociation of himself and his circle from *stasis* indicates the radically negative character of *stasis* among sixth century aristocrats (or, at least, one circle of them) on Lesbos.

¹¹ Alkaios' idiom for *stasis*, ὀντροπεῖν τὸν πόλιν, emphasizes this type of conceptual revolution: by “upturning the city”, Pittakos upsets not only the concrete relationships between citizens and citizen groups, but also the conceptual relationship between such important abstracts as madness and glory. To readers and audiences well-versed in Homeric epic, nothing could be as upside-down as the granting of *kudos* for bringing the city to madness.

Solon's fragments, like those of Alkaios, have, since antiquity, been used as a source for historical and political development in the sixth century: the poems have been intimately connected with the political career of a historical Solon, whose activities can, it is claimed, be substantiated through other literary and historical sources (e.g., Herodotus, the Attic orators, Aristotle, Plutarch, etc.; Gerber 1997: 116).¹² Irwin, however, argues for a more contextual approach to Solon, which situates his poetry in its own political, performance, and poetic context: she draws our attention to Solon's appropriation of his predecessors in the elegiac mode, and the consequences of this appropriation, especially insofar as it affects his representation of *stasis*.¹³

Stasis pervades Solonic poetics, and this pervasion is most explicit in fragment 4 *IEG*², which ends with an emphasis on *eunomia*, and which has been called "Solon's *Eunomia*" by modern commentators (Gerber 1997: 115).¹⁴ Irwin contends that in this poem, Solon appropriates both epic and prior elegiac models to depict the dangers to the *polis*: he dismisses the potential involvement of deities (4.1-6 *IEG*²), the standard threat to cities in epic (Irwin 2005: 92-94), and instead recasts the imminent threat of civic destruction as coming directly from the citizen body (*ibid.*; also, see Blaise 2006: 124-126).¹⁵ The description of this threat, however, participates in Solon's appropriation of

¹² Recent criticism has either pursued this thesis (e.g., Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010) or argued strenuously for a strong distinction between Solon the historical Athenian politician and "Solon" the character in the Solonic fragments (e.g., Stehle 2006, Lardinois 2006). Stehle reads Solon's fragments as the products of a particular historical context; she does not attempt to read the events of the tradition into his poems. In fact, she argues that the poems "demonstrate no engagement with their ostensible context" (2006: 81).

¹³ Irwin argues strenuously against our acceptance of the teleological narrative of Athenian political development that sees Solon as a precursor of democracy, and she states that in reading Solon as fourth century Athenians received him, we implicitly agree with the narrative which Aristotle and others were attempting to construct, and the teleology at the heart of this narrative (Irwin 2006: 45).

¹⁴ Though as Gerber remarks, there is no ancient authority for the title (1997: 115). Blaise accepts the title uncritically in her recent discussion (2006: 114).

¹⁵ Consider the opening lines, which claim that the city will never fall thanks to the contrivances of the immortals, whose will (4.2 *IEG*²: φρένας) is both "blessed" (μακάρῳ) and eternal (ἀθανάτῳ); Solon specifies the protection, describing the "great hearted watcher", Athena, who holds her hands over her

the language and imagery of epic and elegy, since he characterizes *stasis* “as virtual πόλεμος within the *polis*” (Irwin 2005: 91). While Alkaios reconfigured the social status of those who participated in *stasis*, Solon instead manages the representation of *stasis* through imagery evocative of the world of epic and martial exhortation, though devoid of any of the meaning and glory which qualifies warfare in the Iliadic mode.

Solon's appropriation takes its most explicit form in 4.17-29 *IEG*², when he correlates *stasis* and foreign war: ἢ στάσιν ἔμφυλον πόλεμόν θ' εὕδοντ' ἐπεγείρει (“which rouses kindred *stasis* and sleeping war”).¹⁶ Irwin argues that this verse does not refer to two possibilities (i.e., *stasis* and *polemos*), but to the blurring of any distinction between *stasis* (internal strife) and *polemos* (external warfare) (2005: 97). Distinctions are further blurred through allusions to Homer, such as the use of the verb ἐγείρω (“to rouse”), which is usually coupled with war and battle with foreign opponents (e.g., *Il.* 2.382, 2.440, 7.531, 11.836). Using the Homeric vocabulary of warfare for *stasis* implies an “equivalence of this condition [i.e., *stasis*] to war” (Irwin 2005: 97), and at 4.21 *IEG*² as well, Solon's use of *δυσμενέες* is more appropriate to external than internal enemies (Irwin 2005: 98-99).¹⁷ The loss of distinction between internal and external strife, however, does not only move in one direction and Solon uses terms closely related to the domestic sphere to characterize the *stasis* that endangers the *polis*. At 4.22 *IEG*², τρύχω

favoured city (4.3-4 *IEG*²). In contrast, the following lines focus on what will (or may) destroy the city, the easily corruptible will of mankind, which is tempted by money (4.6 *IEG*²: χρήμασι πειθόμενοι “obedient to money”) and tainted by folly (5 *IEG*²: ἀφραδίησι). The stylistic device of this line, which leaves the complement to αὐτοί until the following line posits a tension in the identity of “these”, until the prominently placed ἀστοί (“townspeople”) of line 6 relieves this tension and completes the correlation of immortal and mortal.

¹⁶ Slavery – δουλοσύνη – is the antecedent of ἦ and the generative principle behind the most visible and damaging consequences of *koros* and *hybris*. In this manner, the regular *effect* of foreign war (enslavement) becomes the *cause* of internal strife.

¹⁷ Irwin compares a conceptually similar verb, ἐνόρυσμι (“to arouse”), to refer to the beginnings of internecine conflicts in Alkaios (fr. 70.12 Voigt; 2005: 98).

(“to wear out”) evokes the domestic world, especially the upset and internally-disordered household of Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 1.248, 16.125, 19.133; Irwin 2005: 99); in the same verse, *συνόδος* (“meeting”) clearly refers to the same gatherings of leaders who did not, at 4.8-10 *IEG*², know how to restrain themselves in their festivities and feasts (Irwin 2005: 99).¹⁸ Even the way in which these feasting (and conspiratorial) people are called *ἡγεμόνες* (“leaders”, 4.7 *IEG*²) is more at home in a description of the leaders of opposing armies than different groups within a *polis* (Irwin 2005: 100).

Through his appropriation of the language of martial exhortation, Solon uses the figure of war to prioritize *stasis* as the most important danger facing the Archaic *polis* (Irwin 2005: 104). Despite the ambiguities of when, where, and to whom Solon’s poems are addressed (on this question for sympotic elegy generally, see Aloni 2009: 171-178), the consequence of the appropriation is clear: by using martial exhortation to describe internal civic strife, Solon dismisses the power of martial elegy, and, what is perhaps most striking, he makes the subjects of martial elegy (the aristocracy) the subjects of his rebuke for their participation in *stasis* and political factions (Irwin 2005: 104). The reconfiguration of the role of the elite comes across most clearly in Solon’s description of the worthless deaths of the city’s “lovely youth” in internal warfare (4.20 *IEG*²). The directly associates *stasis* with the Homeric (and elegiac) commonplace of the “beautiful death”, the elevated and highly valued status of the elite youth who dies protecting his city (Vernant 1991); by making those deaths a consequence of the *polemos* that has become *stasis*, Solon disconnects death and glory from warfare in the political realities of his *polis* and time (Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 249). The striking rejection of the epic and

¹⁸ The conceptually similar verb *δάπτω* used by Alkaios to refer to the effects of civil strife indicates the same use of domestic verbs of consumption to characterize internecine violence (*Alc.* 70,7, 129.23-24; Irwin 2005: 99).

elegiac model most clearly emphasizes the negative representation of *stasis* in Solon's poetry.

In contrast to Alkaios and Solon, whose poetic identities seem to have a connection to specific times and places, the historicity of Theognis and the Theognidea are problematic (Fisher 2000: 98; most recently, see Selle 2008: 20-38): the poems generalize situations and characters, avoid local references, and the corpus appears to be an aggregation of elegiac poetry collected around the name Theognis and dating from the sixth to the fifth century (Gerber 1997: 117-120).¹⁹ Nagy has influentially suggested that Theognis' poetry exhibits, to a greater degree than other Archaic poets, the generalizing and universalizing tendencies associated with pan-Hellenism: "local idiosyncrasies of the *polis* are shaded over, and the universal aspects of any given situation, such as the advent of a tyrant, are highlighted" (1985: 50). The inability to date the poet or poetry successfully, combined with this notable generalizing tendency, makes any historical use of the Theognidea difficult.²⁰ For my purposes, however, the generalizing tendency and problematic dating of the Theognidea are not an issue; the Megara of the Theognidea has been called "a paradigmatic homeland for all Archaic Greeks" (Figueira and Nagy 1985: 3), and the universal and pan-Hellenic aspect of his depiction of civil strife, *stasis*, and aristocratic values highlights the corpus as especially important in the later poetic representation of conflict and turmoil. Aloni regards the Theognidea as ideological poetry, and the verses themselves as "spokesmen" for a historically generalized oligarchic and conservative political group (Aloni 2007: 175). In stark contrast to Lane Fox who,

¹⁹ Parts of the Theognidea that seemingly allude to the Persian invasions of the early fifth century must be spurious (757-764, 773-82 *IEG*²; Gerber 1997: 122).

²⁰ Forsdyke makes this clear, remarking the problems of authorship, date, preservation, and genre (2005: 49). Her method is to rely on the anecdotal evidence of much later authors (Aristotle and Plutarch) for information about the early history of Megara.

when questioning the influence of the Theognidea on Pindar, cites Jaeger's outmoded perspective (2000: 45-46), I see the Theognidea as a crucial source of representative strategies for depicting and managing *stasis* in verse.²¹

The representation of *stasis* in the Theognidea synthesizes the representation that we see in Solon's elegies; the synthesis is probably as much a product of shared poetic tradition as of the direct intertexts between the two corpora.²² While Solon's *stasis* is at least ostensibly specific to sixth century Athens, the Theognidea, despite its apparent setting in Megara, generalizes the representation of civil strife.²³ In many ways, the Theognidea contains the most explicit condemnation of *stasis*, since within the historical context of the corpus, *hybris* and *stasis* have *already* destroyed (and are *always* destroying) cities (1103-1104 *IEG*²): ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα / καὶ Σμύρνην (“*hybris* destroyed both Mangesia and Kolophone and Smyrna”) (cf. Theog. 603-604 *IEG*²; Archil. 20 *IEG*²).²⁴ The perspective of the narrator is that factionality,

²¹ Lane Fox can only cite Jaeger, who wrote of Pindar's class perspective: “at this height we can forget the problems and conflicts of Theognis's world and be content to marvel at the power and beauty of that noble and distant ideal” (1939: 205).

²² In five places (Solon 6.3-4=Theog. 153-154 *IEG*²; Solon 13.71-76=Theog. 227-232 *IEG*²; Solon 15=Theog. 315-318 *IEG*²; Solon 13.65-70=Theog. 585-590 *IEG*²; Solon 24=Theog. 719-728 *IEG*²), fragments attributed to Solon in ancient sources appear in our manuscripts of the Theognidea. Noussia-Fantuzzi argues for a historical connection between the two: Solon's poetry “became the object of reformulations and intense reuse within the Theognidean corpus, and so proved ‘legible’ outside the particular context of early sixth-century Athens and acquired a panhellenic relevance” (2010: 55-56). In contrast, Nagy suggests a reciprocal rather than hierarchical relationship between the two: “the sharing of doublets in the textual tradition... cannot be dismissed as merely a matter of textual transposition” (1985: 84). Irwin adds that Nagy's argument moves interpretation away from obscure relationships between poets and historical priority to “a larger social and political debate” (2005: 218).

²³ Lardinois makes a strong case for the generic quality of Solon's verses (2006: 18), and questions whether we even have poetry written by a historical Solon. Nonetheless, even with this critical perspective, he agrees that 4 *IEG*² was written for an Athenian audience specifically (Lardinois 2006: 17).

²⁴ Magesia's destruction was proverbial (van Groningen 1966: 404-405). Mimnermos gives us some evidence for the destruction of Kolophon (Mimn. 9.3-4 *IEG*²), although it too was proverbial for its luxury. Van Wees points to the clever rhetorical use of these cities: “Theognis predicted doom for Megara with reminders of famous cities which had been destroyed in the past, but whereas other traditions reported that these were all sacked by external enemies, he insisted that it was the result of their own *hybris*” (2007: 3). Athenaios interprets Mimnermos' reference to Kolophon as an indicator of tyranny and *stasis*, not foreign conquest (12.526).

synchronically and diachronically, is a danger to the *polis*.²⁵ Despite its consistent pejorative characterization of *stasis*, the narrator's perspective is not absolute, and the depiction of a disrupted society has great resonance with Kurke's interpretation of Alkaios' poetry, in which genre and vocabulary were destabilized by the political situation. The narrator of the Theognidea, however, unlike Alkaios, is aware that *stasis* and factionality by their very nature deny absolute judgments: at one point, the speaker is amicable towards exiles (e.g., 332a-b *IEG*²: οὐκ ἔστιν φεύγοντι φίλος καὶ πιστὸς ἑταῖρος / τῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἔστιν τοῦτ' ἀνηρότατον "there is no dear and trusted friend to an exiled man; this is the most grievous thing about exile") and at another, he advises against helping exiles (333-334 *IEG*²): μή ποτε φεύγοντ' ἄνδρα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, Κύρνε, φιλήσης / οὐδὲ γὰρ οἴκαδε βὰς γίνεται αὐτὸς ἔτι ("never, Kyrnos, love an exiled man hopefully; for he will not again go homeward").²⁶ Elsewhere, he remarks on the ability of poor people to be worthy, although their worth is simply hidden by their poverty (1059-1062 *IEG*²); this flies in the face of many condemnations of the poor, throughout the corpus, because of their poverty (e.g., 31-32 *IEG*²; 53-68 *IEG*², etc.). In the *stasis* of Theognis' poetry, friends and enemies change quickly (811-814 *IEG*²) and, even more troublesome, there is no way to determine who is to be trusted and who is not (cf. 75

²⁵ Lane Fox contrasts Theognis with Alkaios in this respect: Theognis does not want to "counter *stasis* with *stasis*" but instead advocates an agenda of aristocratic "super non-involvement" (2000: 44). His is a belief in the universal and eternal quality of those whom he labels ἀγαθοί; all he has to do is wait for their inevitable return and success.

²⁶ Van Groningen deals with the proximity of these verses, one distich lamenting exile and the other condemning the exile (1966: 134-135). His conclusion is unsatisfying: he simply sees the theme of exile as the reason for their inclusion near one another. For my purposes though, such disparity on this important topic reflects the vagueness of the traditions surrounding *stasis* and the instability of a society in civil discord.

*IEG*²: παύροισιν πίσυνος μεγάλ' ἀνδράσιν ἔργ' ἐπιχείρει “a trusting man attempts great deeds with few men”).²⁷

The Theognidea presents *stasis* as a disruption in the world of the *polis*, but the motivations for factional strife limit the participants to a particular subset of the *polis*, that is, aristocrats. Nowhere in the Theognidea do we have the image of a larger, more egalitarian political class, and factionality, despite its negative quality, is an activity of the elite. Even in the face of uncertainty during internal political strife, the Theognidea clearly correlates economic and honorific motives with the rise of internal quarrels: ἐκ τῶν (i.e., 46 *IEG*²: κερδέων... καὶ κράτεος) γὰρ στάσιές τε καὶ ἔμφυλοι φόνοι ἀνδρῶν / μούναρχοί τε (“for from [profits and power] *stasis* and kindred murder of men, and monarchy”) (51-52 *IEG*²). This comes close to Solon's own condemnation of the *hegemonēs* of the people, who were also χρήμασι πειθόμενοι (“obedient to money”; 4.6 *IEG*²), and at one point the Theognideac narrator adduces three decidedly elite motivations for civil strife, τιμή (“honour”), ἀρετή (“excellence”), and ἄφνεος (“wealth”) (29-30 *IEG*²).²⁸ Unrestrained desire as the motive for civil discord connects the Theognidea with Solonic rebukes (e.g., 4.8 *IEG*²), but it also foreshadows the Aristotelean conclusion on the reasons for *stasis*, which is always sparked by a desire for “profit and honour” (*Pol.* 1302 a22). In this most explicit condemnation, *stasis* is unequivocally the domain of the elite, and, more than in the Solonic descriptions, *stasis* is

²⁷ The same sort of denial of essentialism that Kurke suggests Alkaios and his circle found most troubling in Pittakos' betrayal. Notably, the dangerous consequences of unclear friendship and enmity are dealt with in *Ajax*, cf. *Soph. Aj.* 679 ff.

²⁸ While the last is clearly physical, van Groningen suggests that the first two are also “les témoignages matériels de respect” (τιμή) or “de preuves objectives, de manifestations visibles d'excellence” (ἀρετή) (1966: 22-23).

a universal problem in Greek society, not something specific to the situation of sixth-century Athens.

The Theognidea provides the most explicit condemnation of *stasis*, inasmuch as the corpus does not seek to modify, manipulate, or rehabilitate factionality. Instead, the perspective of the narrator is that *stasis* is driven by economic and political motivations, but restricted to those groups that had access to wealth and social and political power in the late Archaic and early Classical period. Despite Alkaios' disavowal of involvement in *stasis*, there is nonetheless a consistent characterization of civil strife in Archaic poetry as disruptive and as an activity endemic to the elite, but simultaneously unworthy of them. In Solon and the Theognidea, the association of aristocracy and *stasis* is explicit, while in Alkaios, we can discern this association through the pleading voice of his poetry: in other words, the lasting representation of *stasis* in the Archaic tradition is of a peculiarly aristocratic activity, driven by the worst excesses of greed, and with lasting, negative repercussions for the entire *polis*.

8.2: Ideology at Work in Olympian 12

Near the end of an analysis of *O.* 12, Nisetich observes, "Pindar has taken his major theme, the incalculability of events, from the career of Ergoteles himself" (1977: 261). Nisetich's concern with form, however, prevents any interrogation of the assumptions behind Pindar's elaboration of a general notion, the inscrutability of events, from the historically contingent career of one fifth century aristocrat. This elaboration has been identified by Race, who writes,

"the events in Ergoteles' life constitute a typical *λόγος* found in epic and drama as well as in lyric: a man suffers exile from his native land... but fortune (or destiny) turns this disaster all to the good by establishing him in a new city, where he gains distinctions he could otherwise not have won" (2004: 390).

Race draws our attention to the schematizing of Ergoteles' life, the modulation of the general from the specific, although he does not address the very act of schematization that he identifies.²⁹ At the end of his recent commentary on *O.* 12, Silk contends that Pindar's poetry "aristocratic to the end, calls for readers, as it once called for listeners, attuned to a configuration – of the physical, cultural, symbolic, and poetic" that assumes an elitist perspective (2007: 197).³⁰ Silk argues for the elitist character of Pindaric poetry and its (implied) audiences, but he does not address the ramifications of this presumption: the details of Ergoteles' career, *stasis*, exile from his homeland, settlement and citizenship in tyrannical Sicily, and, finally, pan-Hellenic victory, do not necessitate such schematization – as I have detailed above, the received notion of *stasis* does not characterize its participants particularly well. In this analysis, I invert the supposedly causal relationship between generality and biography, and reveal the classist ideology at work in this ode: Pindar's re-configuration of *stasis* and his universalization of Ergoteles' life is not simply poetic design, but elitist mentality. In other words, *Olympian* 12 serves not only as the vehicle for the praise of a single aristocrat, but also as an act of ideology for a class of aristocrats.

Before explaining the ideological content of the final stanza, in which *stasis* explicitly appears, I examine the introduction of the generalizing narrative in the two opening stanzas of the poem (*O.* 12.1-12a):

²⁹ Most points out Pindar's common technique of moving from the general to the specific, which confirms the truth of the generalization by using the specific details of the individual occasion (1985: 136). He even points to this technique's occurrence in *O.* 12 (1985: 137 n2). The recognition of this formally, however, has not resulted in a critique of its ideological position.

³⁰ Silk's judgment is, seemingly, that only those attuned to aristocratic and elitist perspectives, both in antiquity and today, can understand Pindar's poetry. The reductionist approach to the odes ignores the varied character of audiences for Pindar's poems throughout history. As I indicate below, I suggest that Pindar is aware of the multi-faceted audiences for which he writes, and part of his ideological program is the foreclosure of alternative perspectives.

Λίσσομαι, παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου,
 Ἰμέραν εὐρυσθενέ' ἀμφιπόλει, σώτειρα Τύχα.
 τὴν γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ κυβερνῶται θοαί
 νᾶες, ἐν χέρσῳ τε λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι
 κάγοραὶ βουλαφόροι. αἶ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν
 πόλλ' ἄνω, τὰ δ' αὖ κάτω
 ψεύδη μεταμῶνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ' ἔλπιδες·

σύμβολον δ' οὗ πῶ τις ἐπιχθονίων
 πιστὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἔσσομένης εὔρεν θεόθεν.
 τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί·
 πολλὰ δ' ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμαν ἔπεσεν.
 ἔμπαλιν μὲν τέρψιος, οἱ δ' ἀνιαραῖς
 ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις
 ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πήματος ἐν μικρῷ πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ

I entreat you, child of Zeus the Deliverer,
 preserve the might of Himera, Saviour Fortune.
 For it is you who on the sea guide swift
 ships, and on land rapid battles
 and assemblies that render counsel. As for men's hopes,
 they often rise, while at other times they roll down
 as they voyage across vain falsehoods.

No human has yet found a sure sign
 from the gods regarding an impending action;
 their plans for future events lie hidden from view.
 Many things happen to men counter to their judgment—
 at times to the reverse of their delight, but then some
 who have encountered grievous storms
 exchange their pain for great good in a short space of
 time.

Péron convincingly argues that the first stanza is suffused with maritime symbols.

Fortune, addressed by Pindar as “saviour *Tyche*” (12.2), has a marine genealogy: she is the daughter of Ocean and Thetis in the *Theogony* (Hes. *Theog.* 360; Péron 1974: 124); that specific epithet appears again in a maritime context at Aesch. *Ag.* 663 (τύχη δὲ σωτήρ ναῦν θέλουσ' ἐφέζετο “savior *Tyche* willingly sits aboard ship”, Péron 1974: 127). *Tyche* has a comprehensive dominion: “tous les domaines où il y a du danger, où il y a lutte, soit contre les éléments (v. 4: νᾶες), soit entre les hommes (v. 4: πόλεμοι; v.4:

ἀγοραὶ) (Péron 1974 : 125). This broader domain is signaled by the poem's evocation of the multiple areas of *Tyche*'s competence: "for it is you who on the sea guides swift / ships, and on land rapid battles / and assemblies that render counsel" (*O.* 12.3-4). The first geographical reference of the poem is inextricably connected with the sea: Himera was the site of Hieron's victory over the Carthaginians (*P.* 1.79-80; Péron 1974: 124).³¹

Péron further develops the poetic possibilities (1974: 127):

"Si la présence du vaisseau s'y explique en premier lieu par le souvenir du voyage d'exil d'Ergotélès, de Crète en Sicile, ce n'est là qu'un point de départ pour une imagination portée à généraliser et toujours prompte à saisir derrière l'objet l'immensité de ses possibilités symboliques: la navire d'Ergotélès devient le vaisseau des espérances humaines et le voyage d'exil la traversée de la vie"

What Péron explicitly describes here is that the schematization of Ergoteles' life forms the basis of the ode: the particulars of Ergoteles' biography, removed from their context, are generalized as destiny, which "n'est pas une force inconstante et aveugle, mais au contraire un pouvoir réfléchi et conscient" (Péron 1974: 132).³² For Péron, this generalizing forms part of the underlying structure of the poem – indeed, Péron contends that for Pindar, "il est vain... de chercher une explication [for fortune and chance]" (1974: 133).

³¹ The relevance of the Carthaginian defeat to Himera rests, of course, on the accurate assessment of the ode's date. *Pythian* 1 is dated by the manuscripts to 470; the Carthaginian sea battle is traditionally dated to 480 (Hdt. 7.165-167). *O.* 12's date is complicated by the lack of any date for the victory in the manuscripts, corrupt scholia, and lacunae in the relevant sections of the Olympic Victors' list. Barrett persuasively argues that Ergoteles' ode should be placed in the mid-460s (1973); he elucidates the corruption of the scholia's dating of Ergoteles' Pythian victories (both mentioned in *O.* 12), which he combines with the available dates for his victory in the nearby Olympiads (1973: 26-28). He concludes convincingly that the four victories mentioned in *CEG* 1.393 are 472 Olympian, 470 Pythian, 466 Pythian and 464 Olympian (1973: 28).

³² Nisetich offers a cogent analysis of *elpis* and fate/destiny in the poem (1977: 243 ff). He makes three observations about hope: first, that it can be contrasted with the outcome and usually emphasizes the futility of human beings (1977: 243); second, that hope can be opposed to humanity's impending death, and can appear "poignant or ironic" (1977: 245); third, that hope has a distinctive relationship with *tyche*, "the dichotomy between what men perceive at the moment and in the way things turn out in the end" (1977: 247). Nisetich conjectures that this last relationship, between *tyche* and *elpis*, may be Pindar's original contribution to Greek thought on the subject (1977: 248).

The universalizing impulse enunciated in this poem is, however, political. While critics have read Pindar's schematization of Ergoteles' life to a general principle simply as part of his poetic program, I interrogate this representation as ideology: Pindar's patron and the poet himself are part of a distinctive class in early Classical Greek society. As Marx observes, universalization and mystification of historically contingent circumstances are fundamental aspects of class ideology (see especially, *MECW* 5.60); Nicholson too remarks on this "struggle for meaning" in athletic memorial in Archaic and early Classical Greece (2005: 18). Pindar's use of a specific athletic victory of his patron signals an ideological strategy: that an activity restricted to the aristocratic class was *actually* a universal truth for all classes (the subtextual presence of class in the *angelia* adds to this ideological position). The universalization of specifics accords well with Marx's argument that the ruling class configures its *specific* situation of emancipation as *universal* (*MECW* 11.130); it is this aspect of athletic verse that most transparently reveals its ideological function, and its implication in the Gramscian notion of the "consent of the ruled" (see Chapter 3.4). The apparent "vanity" of interrogating chance and fortune in the ode is a mirage that is driven by politics: Pindar's notion of fate is generalized from the particular situation of fifth-century aristocrats, and this "universal" is actually dependent on specifics of birth, wealth, and power.

In the third stanza of *O.* 12 the ideological program of the poem becomes more apparent: both in Pindar's extension of the generalized narrative of the first two stanzas to Ergoteles himself, and in the summary of Ergoteles' career (*O.* 12.13-19):

υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἦτοι καὶ τεά κεν
 ἐνδομάχας ἄτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἐστία
 ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε(ν) ποδῶν,
 εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας.

νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπία στεφανωσάμενος
καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἴσθμοῖ τ', Ἐργότελες,
θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν λουτρὰ βαστάζεις ὀμι-
λέων παρ' οἰκείαις ἀρούραις.

Son of Philanor, truly would the honour of your feet,
like a local fighting cock by its native hearth,
have dropped its leaves ingloriously,
had not hostile faction deprived you of your homeland,
Knossos.

But now, having won a crown at Olympia,
and twice from Pytho and at the Isthmos, Ergoteles,
you take in your hands³³ the Nymphs' warm baths, living
by lands that are your own.

Despite Silk's assurance that the opening prayer and narrative develop "organically" into a series of reflections on Ergoteles' life (2007: 194), Pindar's skill at "oral subterfuge" (Carey 1981: 5, the apparent organic development of epinican narrative) deceives readers and audiences. The punctuated "son of Philanor", with which the second stanza of the poem begins, makes it appear as though the representation of the proclamation of Ergoteles' victory (which only starts at *O.* 12.13) comes naturally out of the reflections on fate and foretelling the future. Astute readers of Pindar, however, must regard this seemingly natural development as skillful poetic craftsmanship, rather than simply accept the connection that Pindar goes to such lengths to create (i.e., universalization in the first stanza, and specific case in the second): the opening of the second stanza reveals Pindar as an ideological poet at work.

Since the infancy of modern criticism on Pindar, the simile of the cock and the surrounding counter-factual condition has attracted attention: in 1841, Donaldson read the cock's significance as intricately linked with the theme of *stasis* in this stanza (1841: 81). He connects it to a similar passage in *Eumenides* (861-866), in which a cock is

³³ I follow Race's alternative translation for βαστάζεις; see further below.

expressly the bird of “inbred war among citizens” (861-863: μήτ' ἐξελοῦσ' ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων, / ἐν τοῖς ἀστοῖσιν ἰδρύσης Ἄρη / ἐμφύλιόν τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θρασύν “nor, as if seizing the feelings of cocks, should you establish in this city, kindred war and rage towards one another”).³⁴ While the Aeschylean passage seems to offer a suitable parallel to Pindar's usage, Donaldson's interpretation was abandoned; Farnell in fact discerns an “injury” to the comparison if any reference is made to *stasis*, although he does not offer an explanation for the simile except to say that it is “excellent” (1965: 87). In his short commentary on the ode, Gerber ignores *Eumenides* and attaches the simile's importance to the idea that Ergoteles' fame “would have been as obscure as that of a cock which fights only in its own barnyard” had he remained in Crete (1970: 386).³⁵ Verdenius offers only a characteristically terse rejoinder to those who would see any intimation of *stasis* in the cock simile: “it would have been rather painful to Ergoteles to be reminded of his role in the civil war” (1987: 98) – he, however, does not rationalize the explicit presence of *stasis* a mere two lines later in the same stanza. Kapsoménoš, in an otherwise idiosyncratic and problematically interventionist analysis, recognizes the virtue of

³⁴ Böckh also notes the lines from *Eumenides*, though without comment on the connection with *stasis* (1811-1821: 210). Silk argues that the *Eumenides*' passage is indebted to Pindar's close association of the rooster and civil war in this poem (2007: 189). I am disinclined to believe in such an allusion without more evidence: *Eumenides* was produced, according to tradition, in 458, probably six to eight years after *O.* 12. While we are told that Aeschylus had visited Sicily in this time period, this is slim evidence on which to base such a definite intertext. Considering the allusive use of the rooster at Aesch. *Ag.* 1671 and *Ar. Nub.* 1427-28, I see this as a traditional association, not a Pindaric novelty. Later Roman uses, such as Seneca's (*Apocol.* 7: *gallum in sterquilinio plurimum posse* “a rooster is powerful most of all in its own dungheap”), emphasize the insularity of the rooster, as well as its foulness. The song of the rooster, as indicative of early morning, not at work in Pindar's use, is prevalent as well (cf. *Ar. Eccl.* 390; *Plaut. Mil.* 689, etc.).

³⁵ In her short comment on this ode in *The Traffic in Praise*, Kurke implicitly endorses Gerber's perspective; she connects the image of the cock by the hearth to her main argument that a “loop of *nostos*” pervades epinician (1991: 26). While the latter is well-argued, the image of the cock does *not* appear to actually lend support to her main point; that is, the cock is a reconfiguration of civil strife, not an image of wasted youth. Implicit in Gerber's perspective is the idea that Cretans did not compete in pan-Hellenic games, but there are other Cretan victors in the fifth century (e.g., Krison of Himera in the *stadion*, Moretti no. 294) and Cretans even seem to have had a particular affinity for the *dolichos*, in which Ergoteles was victorious (cf. *Xen. An.* 4.7.27).

Donaldson's perspective (although without acknowledging him): "là aussi le coq est un symbole, non pas d'Athéna mais d'Arès, de la guerre même, et spécialement de la guerre civile" (1961-62 : 266).³⁶ In a short article devoted to Pindaric animals, Borthwick too cites *Eumenides* (and Donaldson): he calls the connection between *stasis* and the cock "the... most obvious point" (1976: 199) and cites a scholion to *Eumenides* (*ad loc.*), which expands the description of the cock as particularly self-destructive.³⁷ Borthwick, in particular, is persuasive, and hardly discredited by either of Verdenius' arguments: that Ergoteles would not want to be reminded of his role in the war (noted above) or that κατεφυλλοροέω "implies that Ergoteles participated in the footrace in Crete, but that the fame gained there did not flourish for a long time" (1987: 98).³⁸ The former can be discarded by the context of the stanza (which is concerned with *stasis*) and the latter

³⁶ Otherwise, Kapsoménois advocates wholesale emendation of the text to remove the reference to savior *Tyche* at the beginning. As Verdenius notes, his argument has been "convincingly refuted" (1987: 91 n12) in Péron's analysis of marine imagery (1974: 122-125); Péron calls Kapsoménois' suggestion, "une ingénieuse erreur" (1974: 125).

³⁷ μάχιμον γὰρ τὸ ὄρνειον, τῶν τε ἄλλων ζώων τὸ συγγενὲς αἰδομένων, μόνος οὐ φείδεται ("for the quarrelsome bird alone of all creatures does not spare from shaming its own kin", quoted in Borthwick 1976).

³⁸ Hornblower suggests in passing that Ergoteles could not compete while in Crete because of the political turmoil of the island (2004: 158 n109). While Crete was famous for its political strife in the fourth and third centuries (Diod. Sic. 16.62.3; Hornblower 2004: 158), *Olympian* 12 itself is our only source for the political climate in the fifth. If fifth-century Crete was a turbulent place, Ergoteles would have found no quiet in the divisive world of Sicilian politics. Tyrannies and *stasis* were a fact of life amongst the Sicilian cities. Our source for most of the history of this period, Diodoros Siculos, is late, although a general framework of events relatively dated can probably be established. In the latter part of the 480s, Himera was ruled by a tyrant, Terillos, who was expelled after a war with the city of Akragas, which was ruled by the tyrant Theron (Hdt. 7.165). After this expulsion, Himera came under Akragantine domination under the tyranny of Thrasydaios the son of Theron (ca. 476/75; Diod. Sic. 11.48.6; who ruled, says Barrett (1973: 28) "with notable harshness") and remained so until late in the decade (Diod. Sic. 11.53.1-5; Barrett 1973: 28-29). Diodoros tells us that the Himerans, seeking to escape the rule of Thrasydaios, appealed to Hieron of Syracuse to free them (Diod. Sic. 11.48.7); instead of doing so, however, the Syracusan tyrant simply reported the opposition to Theron and Thrasydaios, who put to death those involved in the conspiracy (Diod. Sic. 11.48.8). In the following years of Diodoros' chronicle, Himera is largely absent. The death of Theron, the succession of Thrasydaios and his subsequent defeat by Hieron (and commensurate loss of Akragantine power) were undoubtedly of consequence to the city (ca. 471; Diod. Sic. 11.53.1-5). In the middle of the 460s Hieron himself died and the tyranny (and presumably the Syracusan domination of the cities of Sicily) under his brother Thrasyboulos was short-lived – a democracy replaced him in 466/65 (Diod. Sic. 11.67.8-68.7).

addresses Borthwick's interpretation of the image of leaves, not the cock as a symbol of *stasis*.³⁹

While he does not comment specifically on *stasis*, Silk's analysis of a "perceptible clash of style" in the description of the cock, particular the use of elevated language (i.e., ἐνδομάχας) to describe a "lowly creature", offers a way to integrate the cock's allusive meaning (Silk 2007: 188).⁴⁰ Above, I noted Kurke's description of a failure of decorum in the poetry of Alkaios – she places these breaches in "the larger context of... ideological struggle" (1994: 69); that is, poetic language might signal a contest for meaning. As Bourdieu argues, language is formative of correct, or *orthodox*, opinion: "any language that can command attention is an 'authorized language', invested with the authority of a group", thus, "the things it designates are not simply expressed but also authorized and legitimated" (Bourdieu 1977: 170). Ergoteles' biography includes *stasis*, this much the poem tells us, but the performance of the odes's universalizing opening strophes authorizes and legitimates, but also obscures, the received significance of *stasis*: "man-contending" *stasis* and exile become instead exemplary of the transcendent law that Ergoteles' life supposedly reflects: πολλὰ δ' ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμων ἔπεσεν (*O.* 12.10).

³⁹ Nisetich convincingly argues that the metaphor of the falling leaves alludes to the similar use in Homer (*Il.* 6.146 ff). He reads an intertext: "the imagery in Homer conjures human mortality to mind; the flowering of victory deeds in the poem signifies exactly the opposite. It means that the victor's deeds now enjoy a renewed freshness in the minds of men, a life beyond the present moment" (1977: 260). That is, Pindar evokes the Homeric scene only to cancel it out and move beyond the restrictions on mortality that the *Iliad* assumes. Verdenius disapproves of this interpretation, since he interprets the Homeric passage as implying "an ironic depreciation of the value of genealogies" (1987: 99). Rather than wade into this Homeric debate, I cite Kirk on the relevant passage: "the likening of human generations to the fall of leaves in autumn and their growing again in spring carries no suggestion of rebirth, but means that life is transient and one generation succeeds another" (1985: 176). A passage in Mimnermos (fr. 2.1 ff) evokes a similar concept: especially identified are the brevity of youth and human life and the inevitability of death. In the context of this tradition, Nisetich's argument, that Pindar utilizes the intertext to heighten the power of victory, seems eminently reasonable.

⁴⁰ Silk adds that κατεφυλλοροέω is a further drop in tone (2007: 191).

The inclusion of *stasis*, however, opens up the possibility of alternative readings of the ode. Neither we, nor ancient audiences, are obliged to uncritically accept the re-configuration of *stasis* in this ode, nor the universalizing of Ergoteles' life. In this way, Kurke's analysis of Alkaios' language acts as an inspiration for a re-reading: her active interrogation of Alkaios pushes past the ideological veneer of the political poems and posits alternatives. In contrast to the closed, totalizing texts of much of the epinician corpus, the inclusion of a counter-factual in *O.* 12 (12.16) signals an opening for my own critical intervention; the counter-factual identifies a "crack" in the ideological façade of the poem, through which we see the ideology of the poet at work, and can make a conscious infraction against the apparent motive of the text.

My perspective on the active interrogation of ideological texts is guided by Jameson's elaboration of Ernst Bloch's utopian hermeneutics. Jameson refers to a "double hermeneutic" consisting of negative and positive poles; Rose summarizes the negative aspect of the double hermeneutic as "a rigorous, even ruthless elucidation of all the aspects of all aspects of the work of art which reveal its active ideological support for the status quo" (Rose 1992: 35); on the positive side, however, "to [restore to] consciousness those dimensions of the artwork which call into question or negate the ruling-class version of reality" (Rose 1992: 36). In fact, the universalizing notion inherent in class ideology prefigures it as potentially utopian – to persuade the oppressed of their interest in the maintenance of the status quo requires a display, as well as dismissal, of their desires (Rose 1992: 40; 2006: 103). The double hermeneutic requires that we accept

a Gramscian formulation of ideology as persuasion – whether we, or any audience, are persuaded, however, is another question.⁴¹

Pindar's inclusion of *stasis* in his universalizing narrative, as a way to preemptively configure reception of Ergoteles' biography, is exactly the class rhetoric to which Jameson and Bloch refer; the tension present in the simile and its related counter-factual are productively explained through the same hermeneutical method. My survey of poetic representation of *stasis* revealed a received character of *stasis* as disruptive, unwanted, and uncharacteristic of an aristocrat. Pindar's reconfiguration is targeted broadly, both at those audiences whose vision of *stasis* is informed by the sympotic tradition, as well as those who, like Kurke's imagined audience of Alkaios' poetry, might find in Ergoteles' involvement in *stasis* the distasteful and arrogant activity of an aristocrat. The vision of the world that Pindar presents is one in which the disreputable activity of an aristocrat is fitted into a pre-ordained, and positive, notion of fate. The idea that "all's well that ends well", an admittedly banal (but reasonably accurate) summary of the ode, is, in fact, "active ideological support for the status quo".

Reconfiguration of *stasis* and Ergoteles continues into the last line of the poem, which spatially situates the victor in his new land; the line completes the metamorphosis of Ergoteles from factionary to lawful resident (*O.* 12.19: ὀμιλέων παρ' οἰκείαις ἀρούραις "by lands that are your own").⁴² The interpretation of this final line has been complicated by scholarly dispute on the meaning of βασιτάζω in this context, as well as the meaning, function, and even the reality, of the θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν λουτρὰ. Donaldson,

⁴¹ Segal effectively considers *P.* 4 through the lens of the "double hermeneutic" (1986: 123-130).

⁴² This is despite the fact that the poem doubtless does *not* occur right after his arrival in Himera. The ideological nature of this statement is laid bare by its ahistorical character and its inappropriate place in a strictly linear narrative.

whose explanation of the cock simile was so cogent, simply argues here that the passage should be translated, “you exalt... the warm fountains of the Nymphs, dwelling... in a country now your own” (1841: 81); his only additional comment is that the Himeran springs were famous in antiquity (Diod. Sic. 5.3.4; and still famous today: Silk 2007: 193). Farnell can only add that the scholiasts' explanation of βαστάζω (*schol. ad O.* 12.27a.: ἐπαίρεις καὶ αὔξεις) is “the best that can be found” (1965: 88). Gerber, aside from noting the ancient fame of the springs, cites Fränkel: “the notion of a bath in local waters appears to have been a conventional symbol for an immigrant's settling down in a new country” (1970: 386; cf. Fränkel 1944: 293). This notion is certainly appealing, as citizenship and acceptance appear as contrasting themes, in these last lines, to the *stasis* and uncertainty of the opening two stanzas. Gerber, unfortunately, does not develop the idea, and simply offers a gloss which repeats, in substance, the earlier translation of Donaldson: “by his victory Ergoteles has brought glory to the ‘warm baths of the Nymphs’, i.e. to Himera” (1970: 387; cf. Silk 2007: 194).

While the metonymic use of the baths as a substitute for Himera is convincing, the meaning of the metaphor within the symbolic logic of the poem is left obscure. In his analysis of the end of the ode, Verdenius summarizes these opinions; he settles, rather tersely, on “exalt” as the *only* meaning of βαστάζω (1987: 101). In connection with this he cites *I.* 3.8 (χρῆ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσαι “it is necessary to touch him with gentle hands as he revels”)⁴³, a passage which does not exclude a non-metaphorical reading of βαστάζω as simply “clasp”; he does not acknowledge the other instance of this verb in Pindar, *N.* 8.3 (τὸν μὲν ἡμέροις ἀνάγκας χερσὶ βαστάζεις “you

⁴³ Translation and emphasis my own.

hold one person with gentle hands of necessity”) – in this passage the verb *clearly* has a non-metaphorical meaning.⁴⁴ Furthermore, in his criticism of Gerber’s reading of the springs as a metonym for Himera, Verdenius is needlessly pedantic: “when Ergoteles will continue glorifying the Nymphs this does not imply that he will continue bringing glory to Himera” (1987: 101).⁴⁵ Verdenius’ incessant literal-mindedness moves him to criticize Nisetich’s (and Fränkel’s) idea that a bath is implied as a sign of a new immigrant (1977: 264); his argument, however, is based on an *a priori* decision that Ergoteles emigrated to Himera during the resettlement of the city in 476 (Verdenius 1987: 101-102).⁴⁶ While this is not unlikely, there is no positive evidence for such an assertion. In addition, Verdenius ignores the poetic sensibility of the ode: the biography of Ergoteles is *universalized* from the particular – that he may have been a resident for some time does not remove the possibility of alluding to his symbolic settlement in Himera, regardless of the historical chronology.⁴⁷

The only critic to have begun to appropriately account for the internal poetic logic of the ode is Silk; he summarizes the last two lines: “E[rgoteles] belongs in his new home

⁴⁴ Other non-Pindaric examples of a literal meaning to βασιτάζω include Aesch. *Ag.* 35 and Eur. *Alc.* 917. Considering the generic affinities between the two, Simonides’ use of the literal meaning of the verb (fr. 25.6 *IEG*²) is an especially relevant and compelling comparison.

⁴⁵ This is after he declares that the use of the present tense denies Gerber’s interpretation altogether (Verdenius, 1987: 101).

⁴⁶ The relevant ancient source for this resettlement is Dio. Sic. 11.49.3: Θήρων δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἰμεραίων σφαγὴν ὄρων τὴν πόλιν οἰκητόρων δεομένην, συνώκισεν εἰς ταύτην τοὺς τε Δωριεῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς βουλομένους ἐπολιτογράφησεν (“Theron, after the slaughter at Himera, seeing the city in need of colonists, settled at the same place Dorians, and enlisted as citizens all others who were willing”). Such an action by a tyrant is of little surprise: we hear of Hieron refounding the city of Aitna (*P.* 1.31; cf. Diod. Sic. 11.49.2). In the context of interpreting this ode in its historical context, the possibility that Ergoteles himself, a Dorian, was one of these newly settled citizens is attractive (Barrett 1973: 24). The dating of *O.* 12, which Barrett established, mentioned above, at least allows speculation that Ergoteles settled in Himera in 476; nonetheless, there is no direct, positive evidence in support of this viewpoint.

⁴⁷ Gildersleeve regarded the ode’s focus on ἔγκτησις, the right to hold property, as obvious, despite his recognition that the immigration need not have taken place recently (1885: 226). νῦν δ’ (*O.* 12.17) brings us out of the fictive space of the counter-factual and to reality (cf. Verdenius 1987: 101); there need not be a strictly linear temporal relationship between the two.

(οικείαις), participates in its society (ὄμιλέων), enjoys its natural features (θερμὰ... λουτρά), has made contact (βαστάζεις). The implicit contrast is with the archetypal lonely exile” (Silk 2007: 192). Silk observes that the end of another poem about exile, *Pythian* 4, Pindar also evokes a spring in the context of a desire to return home (*P.* 4.293-294). Silk correctly points to the dual notion inherent in βαστάζω, half-metaphorical and half-literal: “E[rgoteles] ‘clasps’ the waters, i.e., greets them (cf. β. at *I.* 3.8), and actually takes them to him (in handfuls, presumably) as the expression of his feelings at being home” (2007: 194).⁴⁸ In this respect, Silk’s argument implicitly alludes to Norwood’s 1915 discussion: Ergoteles is “formally installed in his estate, entering it with a vessel in his arms containing the famous waters of the place” (1915: 4). That is, whether the water is meant to specifically evoke a bath (Silk and Fränkel), or Ergoteles’ ownership of land (Norwood), the focus is on his *physical* contact with the water of the Nymphs, rather than the extended meanings preferred by both the scholia and Verdenius.⁴⁹ This is not to say that we can discern any historical activity of Ergoteles behind this metaphor; rather, the poem advocates an interpretation of Ergoteles as having completed his transition, from factionary to lawful citizen, within the universalized framework that Pindar has given his life. As Silk points out, Pindar’s last words in the ode are “by his own lands” (*O.* 12.19: παρ’ οικείαις ἀρούραις): “E[rgoteles] *belongs*” (2007: 194; emphasis in original).

The end of this ode implicitly demonstrates Rose’s formulation on the connection between art’s function and ideology: “if one concedes that the ideological function of art is in some sense to manage potentially disruptive discontents within society, then by

⁴⁸ The contrast, Silk argues, is between warm baths and *stasis* (i.e., war); he notes a possible allusion to the pathetic disparity between the two at *Il.* 22.442-6, when Andromache prepares a bath for the already dead Hector (Silk 2007: 193).

⁴⁹ Verdenius sees the point of the last few lines as indicating that Ergoteles is worshipping the Nymphs (1987: 102).

definition art cannot manage what it does not in some way reveal and evoke” (Rose 1992: 36). Through an interrogation informed by the processes of ideology, Ergoteles’ ode is revealed as a reductive act of ideological persuasion: Pindar reconfigures *stasis*, a universally despised activity of the aristocracy, to a place in a generalizing narrative of fortune and hope, and the potential readings of his patron have been reduced from factionary and exile to fated victor and legally endowed citizen. My analysis of *stasis* in the Archaic poetic tradition revealed it as a signature and disruptive activity of the ruling class; that Pindar manages to change the disruption of society into a vision of the opposite – peaceful settlement and immigration – speaks to the ideological workings of the ode. Pindar’s universalization of the biography of his patron attempts to foreclose alternative readings: by integrating *stasis* into the universally accepted notions of the imperceptibility of fate, and the vanity of human designs, he effectively mystifies and generalizes a historical particular – he moves it to the realm of divine processes rather than human responsibilities.⁵⁰ If art is highly involved in the ideological program of the dominant class, then *Olympian* 12 demonstrates the skill of Pindar the poet (and ideologue) at work. The foreclosing of perspectives, the complex and reductive process of ideology at work in the poem – each functions to control the message that the audience

⁵⁰ This is in contrast to Silk, who, although he correctly reads the importance of “belonging” and “home”, nonetheless concludes that the universal aspects of the opening stanzas provide a context for Ergoteles’ particular case (2007: 194). Rather, Silk has been deceived by the “oral subterfuge” of Pindar (Carey 1983: 5): Ergoteles’ biography is utilized by Pindar to generate his universals – the opening prayer does *not* develop “organically into the series of reflections” (Silk 2007: 194). That this seems like the converse is merely evidence of Pindar’s rhetorical skill, and our own willingness to buy into Pindar’s (and aristocratic Greeks’) ideology.

receives and to mask, massage, and alter the received character of *stasis*, “destroyer of men” (Theog. 781: στάσις Ἑλλήνων λαοφθόρον).⁵¹

8.3: Ideology and Place: CEG 1.393 and Olympia

In the above analysis, Ergoteles and his celebratory ode were revealed to have deep connections, even if only poetic and metaphorical, with the social setting of Himera, and the physical landscape of Sicily. The overriding theme of the ode, the translation of Ergoteles from Cretan exile to Himeran citizen and benefactor, relied on the setting of the ode in the space of the *polis*. In that political and social context, citizenship and transferred citizenship and immigration loom large thematically. In contrast to Pindar's ode, the epigram celebrating Ergoteles' full complement of pan-Hellenic victories was found at Olympia; it was, by all appearances, a product of the undoubtedly flourishing workshops of bronze-workers, poets, and sculptors who would have made a living through commissioned works. In this analysis of *CEG* 1.393, I focus on the functioning of this inscribed victory monument in the Olympian landscape; I especially analyze the rhetoric of the encomium of the epigram as a result of the different physical and social landscape in which it was erected.

In an analysis of the representation of Sicilian tyrants in oral and inscribed victory poetry, Harrell remarks on a “striking disconnect between the representation of political power” in the two genres (2002: 439). She defines a discrepancy between depictions of a tyrant at home, in epinician poetry, as a benevolent king, while at pan-Hellenic

⁵¹ Silk describes Pindar's structure as so delicate that a single “cough” can make the whole construction “wobble” (2007: 197). As I have noted above, Silk stresses that the poem calls for aristocratic readers “within which the mere thought of a cough has no place” (*ibid.*). This formulation, however, ignores the probable public performance context of the ode. Pindar's clever *foreclosing* of perspectives suggests instead that his poetry is meant for public, and cross-class, performance: that is, that he is aware of the dangers of Silk's “cough”, and writes in anticipation of his readers' and listeners' attempts to read and listen against him.

sanctuaries inscribed poetry “avoided explicit articulation of the tyrant’s political status” (*ibid.*). The former can be seen in Pindar’s labeling of the Deinomenids as *basileis*, which imbues them with an “aura of traditional authority” (2002: 441), particularly, a connection with the kings of epic (*ibid.*; e.g., *O.* 1.12; *Bacc.* 3.11-12). Moreover, epinician configures its audience with the needs of its patron in mind: “the odes claim that kingship brings real benefits to those who live under it: justice, order, and tranquility” (Harrell 2002: 447). In contrast, Harrell argues for a different representation in inscribed poetry and statuary designed for sanctuary display: she describes Gelon’s erection of a victory monument as dedicated “in the guise of a traditional aristocratic victor” (2002: 451; cf. *SIG*³ 33). While not a figure with as exalted a political status as Hieron or Gelon, Ergoteles’ erection of a victory monument and commissioning of an epinician suggests Harrell’s model of aristocratic dedicatory behaviour, and prompts some questions: what guise does Ergoteles wear in the pan-Hellenic epigram? How does the setting and medium of the inscription motivate its content?

Ἐργοτέλης μ' ἀνέθηκ[ε
 Ἕλληνας νικῶν Πύθι[α
 καὶ δὺ' Ὀλυμπιάδας δ[
 ἡμέραι ἀθάνατον μν[ᾶμ(α)]⁵²

Ergoteles dedicated me...
 having defeated the Greeks at the Pythian Games,
 and twice at the Olympics, and twice...
 an immortal memorial for Himera.

Ergoteles’ epigram, while mentioned by Pausanias (6.4.11), was not cited in antiquity and remained unknown until it was excavated at Olympia in 1953; only half of

⁵² I print here the least restored version of the epigram from the *CEG*; for full epigraphic apparatus, see *CEG*.

the bronze plate was intact when it was discovered.⁵³ Although Pausanias does not quote the epigram, the biography he provides as well as *O.* 12 guide reconstruction. As with most reconstructions of epigrams, speculation has proceeded along conventional lines. It is nonetheless probable that Ergoteles' father was mentioned in the first line: suggestions have usually taken the form of Φιλάνορος ὅς ποτε (“the son of Philanor who once”), followed by δισσάς (“twice”, Barrett 1973: 24) or ποσσίν (“with feet”, Ebert 1972: 79).⁵⁴ The inclusion of the father's name is in keeping with the conventions of the heraldic mode; whether we are to follow Barrett or Ebert for the remainder is uncertain. In either reconstruction, however, the epigram focuses on the athletic accomplishments of Ergoteles.

Proposed reconstructions of the second line follow convention as well: Barrett supposes Πυθιάδας δόλιχον (“in the *dolichos* at the Pythian Games”, 1973: 25), whereas Ebert prefers Kunze's suggestion, Πύθια δις δόλιχον (“twice in the *dolichos* at Pythia”, 1972: 79; Kunze 1956: 139). In either case, the focus of the epigram is squarely on the athletic record of Ergoteles (roughly equivalent, in form, to *O.* 12.17-18); the inclusion of the event in which the victor triumphed would certainly be expected. The third line begins with the extant reference to two Olympic victories, with proposed endings covering the two victories at each of Nemea and Isthmia. The fourth line is perhaps the most interesting part of the epigram, since it is here that the author includes mention of Himera, which we know to be the adopted home of Ergoteles (Pausanis knew this too, presumably from his guides or his knowledge of *O.* 12). Once again, however,

⁵³ For drawing of the plate itself, see Ebert no. 20. Today, the plate is on display at the Museum of the Olympic Games in Antiquity (Archaia Olympia, Greece; #B 2488). There is no debate over the visible letters or the most obvious supplements, which I have included above.

⁵⁴ Kunze's Φιλάνορος ἀγλαὸς υἱός (“glorious son of Philanor”) is dismissed by Hansen as “manifeste falsa” (*ad loc.*).

conventionality is the rule of the day: the extant ἀθάντων μν[points to a verse ending such as that proposed by Ebert, ἀθάνταον μν[ᾱμ' ἀρετᾶς ἔπορεν (“he furnished this immortal memorial of excellence”, 1972: 79; cf. *CEG* 1.6).⁵⁵ Kunze interprets the absence of anything to signify that Himera was Ergoteles' homeland (πατρίς, for example) as indicative of “der Bitterkeit des Verbanntenloses” (1956: 145). As Ebert points out however, many epigrams lack *patris* without implying exile (1972: 82).

Without the narrative of Pausanias or *O.* 12, we would have no knowledge of Ergoteles' actual homeland, or the *stasis* and exile that drove him to Himera (as Pausanias says, 6.4.11, ἐκπεσῶν δὲ ὑπὸ στασιωτῶν “expelled on account of factionality”). In fact, the epigram, in any possible reconstruction, posits a completely unproblematic Ergoteles, with no indication of *stasis*, immigration, or the assumption of new citizenship.

In rehearsing the conjectured supplements, my point is to focus on this final point: the epigram, in contrast to *O.* 12, offers a very different picture of Ergoteles. In the epigram, Ergoteles is a traditional aristocrat: he dedicates a memorial to his athletic victory which blends his own glory with his family and home city (cf. Kurke 1991: 15-34).⁵⁶ The perpetual reperformance of the appropriated *angelia*, in every reading of an epigram, reciprocally affects the representation of Ergoteles: by adopting the guise of a traditional aristocrat as dedicator, he prefigures the response of his audience to read him *as such*. Harrell posits that the Deinomenids' very lack of political or military titles on their pan-Hellenic inscriptions shows “how the Deinomenids chose to express their

⁵⁵ Barrett's conjecture is similar, though the inclusion of another verb of dedicating and a second first person reference to the dedication (μ' ἔθηκ') seem needlessly redundant.

⁵⁶ If Φιλάνορος is to be read in the missing part of the first line, it may be that this name itself offers a clue to Ergoteles' birthplace: according to the *LGN*, Φιλάνωρ is found as a personal name only in connection with *O.* 12 (and thus in Paus. 6.4.11; *LGN* V1-53841), and in two other inscriptions, one in Crete (dated to 228/7; *LGN* V1-53964) and one in Kos (c. 200; *LGN* V1-16042). The same is not true of the name Ἐργοτέλης, which is attested across the Aegean islands and in Athens and the West (prior to the victor of *O.* 12, the name appears twice in Athens: *LGN* V2-23445, V2-23447).

identity within pan-Hellenic sanctuaries" (2002: 450). Ergoteles' pan-Hellenic victory monument is not only representative of a similar choice concerning the expression of identity, but it is also an ideological representation. The absence of both Ergoteles' actual homeland and exile and *stasis* delineates a very different type of victor (and victory) than *O.* 12. Ergoteles' epigram does not, as *O.* 12, foreclose potential perspectives – the tension of exclusion and inclusion that I identified in *O.* 12 is entirely absent, replaced instead by complete obfuscation of Ergoteles' historical biography. The difference of content between the epinician and the epigram simultaneously stresses the actuality of the ideological program of *O.* 12, and also emphasizes the ability of medium and context to prefigure content, whether biography, representative strategy, or ideology.

As Barrett points out, Ergoteles' victory total was not complete at the time of *O.* 12 (1973: 25); to the best of our knowledge, *CEG* 1.393 records his complete pan-Hellenic victory total.⁵⁷ Barrett associates *O.* 12 with the second Pythian victory and thus dates it to *c.* 466-464; the inscription must be several years later, presumably erected closely following the final Olympic victory of 464 (*ibid.*). By modulating the most recent victory into a victory catalogue, the current dedication claims for itself the fame of the prior victories (which become, then, strictly Himeran victories). In both cases, in the inscription and the oral performance, the victory to be celebrated was not the first victory Ergoteles gained as a Himeran athlete; if Barrett is correct in assigning Ergoteles' arrival to the period of forced Dorian resettlement of Himera (476/475; 1973: 24), then both poems fall over a decade after his arrival in Sicily. In this respect, it is notable that the epinician ode, presumably performed at Himera, reconciles Ergoteles' biography with his

⁵⁷ I follow Barrett's dates for the Olympian and Pythian victories (1973: 28): 472 Olympia, 470 Pythia, 466 Pythia, 464 Olympia. As usual, we have no way of accurately dating Isthmian or Nemean victories.

citizen status, whereas the inscription, erected at Olympia, omits any such record. Rather than the passage of time then, the rationale for inclusion or exclusion of the details of Ergoteles' political background is influenced more by the performance context and implied audience than the vagaries of praise and actual biography.

As Harrell reminds us “participation in pan-Hellenic athletic contests... and the erection of dedications in the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries were political acts” (2002: 450). While she addresses this comment towards dedications by Sicilian tyrants, the political aspect of athletics and dedication is present still in aristocratic victors such as Ergoteles (as I have detailed above, the political is a foremost concern in *O.* 12). The political consequences of Ergoteles' athletic participation and dedication, however, cut two ways: while the implied audience of *O.* 12, as I have argued above, is one for whom Pindar must foreclose alternative perspectives on Ergoteles, this tension is absent in *CEG* 1.393. In this epigram, Ergoteles, akin to Hieron and other Sicilian tyrants, takes on the guise of a traditional aristocratic victor.⁵⁸ Rather than mystify his political past, as in *O.* 12, the epigram avoids mention of the original birthplace, *stasis*, and exile altogether; this expunging of content, in keeping with the overt absence of the political from Olympic dedications in general, maintains a veneer of athletics as an aristocratic activity with no ostensible political motivation.⁵⁹ The implied audience of *CEG* 1.393 is one for whom Ergoteles' troubled past has no resonance – for Himerans, presumably, the rationalization

⁵⁸ Day posits that Himera's place at the beginning of the fourth line might be significant in view of it being Ergoteles' adopted homeland (2010: 212). Such a proposition, however, does not flow from the text itself; rather, just as Kunze's proposition that the “bitterness of exile” is present in the absence of *patris*, Day's suggestion relies on our knowledge of Pausanias and Pindar to interpret the epigram. Were we faced only with *CEG* 1.393, with no epinician or framing narrative from Pausanias, we would see no significance in the placement of Himera, except to say that the victor's city is emphasized: e.g., *CEG* 1.381, 1.383, 2.820 2.825.

⁵⁹ Harrell emphasizes the lack of titles in Deinomenid inscriptions at Olympia as a significant facet of their attempt to “resemble other pan-Hellenic athletes who act in traditional and conventional ways within the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries” (2002: 451).

of *stasis* and exile into fated victory and, importantly, citizenship, are crucial elements of the poetics of *O.* 12. In *CEG* 1.393, in contrast, the transformation is so complete as to be avoided altogether: the focus is on Ergoteles as a natural citizen of Himera – shared glory for city and victor in the spatial and metaphorical confines of a pan-Hellenic, and strictly aristocratic, setting.

Conclusion: Reality, Representation, and the Ideology of Athletic Identity

Despite being at the forefront of politics, culture, and sport in the contemporary West, social identity has been under-utilized in studies of ancient Greek athletic verse. Although Golden, fifteen years ago, regarded the “discourse of difference” a prominent and critically productive methodology for the study of ancient athletics (1998: 4-6), no work has expanded this analysis to the important body of literature associated with ancient athletics, most notably Pindar’s epinician odes, and the corpus of athletic epigrams.

In this dissertation, I have highlighted the important place of social identity in the poetics of athletic praise. As I have argued, social identity is evident in athletic verse through the presence of the herald’s proclamation, or *angelia* (Chapter 2.1). While earlier critics such as Schadewaldt (1966 [1928]), and more recent scholars such as Nash (1990), Kurke (1991), and Day (1994, 2010) had placed the *angelia* at the core of epinician and epigram, they regarded it as “Motiv” (Schadewaldt 1966 [1928]: 274), a “poetic formulation” (Nash 1990: 17), an emblematic statement (Kurke 1991: 5), or a “reperformance” (Day 2010: 199; on these critics, see Chapter 2.1); none had signaled the ideological potential of the *angelia* because none of these critics had recognized the appropriation of the *angelia*, and thus its representation in epinician and epigram. Moreover, if, as postmodern critics have persuasively argued, identities are never complete or universal, the identification in the *angelia* – based on patriarchal family and *polis* – must also be regarded as partial and unstable (see Chapter 3.1); the poetry of athletic victory presents this unstable and incomplete *identification* as a totalizing and

complete *identity*. In contrast to the works of earlier critics, the ideological aspect of athletic identity is the cornerstone of my project: I recognize that the identity in athletic verse is actually an *identification in the "heraldic mode"*, rather than a reflection, report, or otherwise-unmodified record of the ephemeral proclamation.

Nash regards the *angelia* as a statement of identity, an "objective" fact that must be accommodated in the structure of epinician (cf. Miller 1993: 111-114). Kurke focuses on the function of epinician to re-integrate victors into their families, social class, and cities; these three circles relate to elements of the *angelia*, in particular father's name and *polis*. Day too recognizes the generic continuity between epinician and epigram as a result of the *angelia*, and his argument for the function of both epinician and epigram as ritual "re-presentation" scripts is central to my interpretation of athletic verse generally. While I have built on this scholarship, my project highlights the discursive and representative core of athletic verse, whether in epinician or epigram.

The centrality of identity and the representation of athletic identity through the heraldic mode support my argument for a generic continuity between epinician and epigram. While Day (1989) and Golden (1998) had previously pointed in this direction, neither had developed a justification for this generic continuity beyond the common occasion of epinician and epigram and, in Day's case, ritual "re-presentation". While I also emphasize the importance of occasion, which is central to the very notion of what constitutes a genre in the Archaic and early Classical period, nonetheless, I have also argued that the structure and content of epinician and epigram are evidence of their common genre (i.e., Chapter 2.2): the identity of the athlete and the couching of identity in the heraldic mode indicates both the representative quality of these genres, and their

deep immersion in the contemporary ideological discourse of athletics. Occasion, while certainly the structuring principle of athletic verse (inasmuch as an athletic victory provides the reason for the poem or song), is not the only signifier of generic continuity; the historical narration of a past event (i.e., the athletic victory or catalogue of victories), and the form and content of athletic verse (i.e., focused on the representation of the *angelia*; the identification of the athlete) both highlight commonality. Therefore, athletic verse, across both media, is a genre structured around past narrative, shaped by the representation of the herald's proclamation, and centred on the identification of the athletic victor.

In order to argue successfully for the centrality of identity and the representation of the *angelia*, as well as the generic continuity of epinician and epigram, I began, in Chapter One, with an examination of the athletic scenes in the Homeric poems. Unlike Archaic and early Classical athletic verse, Homeric athletics serves a narrative function and is neither historical nor memorializing. The main contribution of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to athletic representation in the Archaic and early Classical period is ideological: participation in athletics in the *Iliad* is restricted to high-status individuals (see Chapter 1.1); in the *Odyssey*, the ideological quality of athletics is clearer, since athletic participation (and parody of such) is used to highlight the concealed social status of Odysseus, both on Scheria and Ithaka (see Chapter 1.2, 1.3).

In Chapter Two, I argued that the representation of the *angelia* is at the core of both epinician and epigram (Chapter 2.1). The highly discursive quality means that far from simply reflecting or revealing the identity of the athlete, athletic verse has a creative and productive role to play in the process of social identification (i.e. "social identity"). I

take as my focus the identity of the athlete at the ancient Olympic Games, because of the early and continually-attested focus on identity and participation at Olympia (Chapter 2.3, 2.4). In Chapter Three, I developed this focus to explicate the types of identity being claimed at the Olympic Games, namely those based on political (i.e., ethnic, civic, national: Chapter 3.2), sexual (i.e., sexuality and gender: Chapter 3.3), and socio-economic (i.e., class and social status: Chapter 3.4) factors. The Olympics' early prohibition against non-Greeks and women, along with the implicit restriction of athletics to elites (through the need to travel, the thirty-day training period, etc.), indicate the importance of identity, and the specificity of the type of identification being claimed and promulgated at the Olympics.

In Chapters Four to Eight, I presented a series of studies of individual epigrams and epinician odes, in order to demonstrate the utility of focusing on identity and representation, and the novel readings that can arise from such an approach. In Chapter Four, I analyzed the role of *ethnos* and *polis* identity in two Arkadian athletic epigrams from Olympia. *CEG* 381, for Tellon of Oresthasion, demonstrates the ideological quality of the *angelia* that is represented in athletic verse (Chapter 4.2): Tellon's epigram effectively posits a past narrative wherein the Oresthasian *polis* was visited by Elean *theoroi*, and in which an "ethnic" identifier, in this case *Arkas*, can be situated as part of the heraldic proclamation. His epigram indicates the mutability of identifications in the heraldic mode (since he can appear as Oresthasian and Mainalian in different records), and the discursive capabilities of athletic epigram for accommodating such identifications (since athletic verse helps to produce the *polis* identity through reference to the visit of the Elean *theoroi*). *CEG* 383, on the other hand, dispenses with any modification of the

represented *angelia* to include an Arkadian “ethnic” identification (Chapter 4.3); rather, the epigram underlines the Mantinean civic identity of the victor. I connected this to the contemporary Mantinean synoikism, and suggested that an epigram such as *CEG* 383, instead of simply reflecting this synoikist movement, could have been a catalyst for such a movement, by “mobilizing” a civic identity prior to its reification in the form of the new urban centre.

In Chapter Five, I turned my attention to the enunciation of civic identity through genealogy and myths of descent. My analysis of *Olympian* 9 focused on the interconnected identifications inherent in family and *polis*. Despite the likely presence of his father in the actual *angelia* at Olympia, as represented in the poem, the victor of *Olympian* 9, Epharmostos, is father-less. While the lack of a father might derail Pindar’s regular praise of *phya* and inherited *arete*, Epharmostos is instead represented as the descendent of Lokrian and Opountian founders and heroes (see Chapter 5.3, 5.4); by starting from the centrality of identification in athletic verse, I posited a new interpretation of *Olympian* 9, which explained how and why athletic praise still functions in a model of inheritance, despite the ostensible lack of athletic prowess and actual ancestors in Epharmostos’ family line (Chapter 5.5).

Chapter Six analyzed the unusual epigram of the female chariot victor Kyniska, *CEG* 820. In this chapter, I highlighted the implicit subversion in Kyniska’s text, as a result of its rupture of the relationship between epigram and the heraldic *angelia* (Chapter 6.4), and the potent, but unequal sharing of fame (Chapter 6.3). Perhaps more than any other text in this dissertation, *CEG* 820 makes clear the representative quality of the identity that is claimed in the heraldic mode: Kyniska could not be present at her victory

at the Olympics, but nonetheless, the generic necessity of representing the *angelia* persists in her victory epigram. As my analysis makes clear, this disrupts the veneer of totalizing identity in athletic verse: the presence of a female victor explicitly points to an imaginary and ideological identification, since it upsets the generic and encomiastic conventions of athletic verse, which were centred on the implicit masculine identity of the athlete.

In Chapter Seven, I stressed the place of sexuality in the identity of the victor, especially in the cultural context of fifth-century Greece (Chapter 7.1). By using an approach to Pindar's highly visual representation of his victor, the boy-wrestler Alkimedon, which I borrowed from scholarship on front-facing figures in Attic vase-painting (Chapter 7.2), I described the way in which sexuality (especially pederastic desire) acts to enhance the praise of the victor, and to enrich the sensuality of song for the epinician audience. In *Olympian* 8, Pindar situates his audience at the very moment of victory, and in doing so he uses the culturally-contingent sexual allure of young men in order to emphasize the beauty of his victor; this allure, however, also adds to the veracity of Pindar's report, since desire does not vitiate truthfulness in fifth-century Greece (Chapter 7.3).

Finally, in Chapter Eight, I examined an epinician ode and epigram together, that is, the victory memorials of Ergoteles, who commissioned an epinician ode (*Olympian* 12) and an epigram (*CEG* 393). I interpreted *Olympian* 12 as an act of reductive and ideological obfuscation: by characterizing Ergoteles' involvement in *stasis* and eventual move to Crete as an example of the universal workings of fate, Pindar generalizes the culturally and historically specific identity of his victor (Chapter 8.2). Although socio-

economic identities are not explicit in the *angelia*, since athletics is tied to upper-class status, both in participation and victory, identifications in the heraldic mode are implicitly elite. My analysis of *Olympian* 12 demonstrated the discord of reality and representation at the heart of Pindar's representation of this athlete. In the same chapter, I described the different way in which identity and praise figure in Ergoteles' epigrammatic dedication at Olympia (*CEG* 393; Chapter 8.3). I suggested that the different location and different performance context for the epigram contributed to its unproblematic representation of the victor, who appears in *CEG* 393 as if he were a native Himeran victor. In fact, the epigram posits an Ergoteles free from any involvement in *stasis*, or any emigration from his native Crete. In the conclusion to this chapter, I argued that the different audience expectations, and the different location and medium of epincian and epigram, affected the representation of identity across these two victory memorials.

Across these case studies, I have demonstrated the validity of my methodology, which is centred on the identity and identification of the athlete. Identity, in my study, emerges as the central element of athletic verse, starting from the heraldic enunciation of competitors, to the proclamation of the victor, and finally to the *representation* of this proclamation in both epincian verse and epigram.

The process of representation, however, is intricately connected to the ideology of athletics, and also of elite culture in late Archaic and early Classical Greece. As I detailed in my introduction, the social identity of the athlete in the modern Olympics has been constrained by institutionalized practices, which sought to restrict participation in athletics to a specific identity: a male, mostly Western, elite, and hyper-competitive athlete ("Introduction: "Identity Politics" in the Modern Olympics"). As this study has

made clear, such a restrictive and ideologically constructed identity also exists for the athlete in the poetry of the late Archaic and early Classical periods. In 1998, Mark Golden obliquely observed this, when he remarked that the “Greek” identity often noted as a side-effect of the ancient Olympics (and athletics more generally) came at the price of the exclusion of large portions of the ancient population (1998: 4-5).

Yet, the process of identification, while circumscribing who could participate in, and win at, athletic events, nonetheless encompasses the excluded population, if only through the fact of exclusion. Athletic participation and the Olympics were a primary stage for the establishment of the dominant identity of the late Archaic and early Classical periods (see Chapter 3): the ethnically Greek, urban (that is, the resident of a *polis*), masculine, socially prominent, and upper-class individual. Other identities, however, are an intrinsic part of this dominant ideology, inasmuch as they exist as abject identifications, whose rejection from the hegemonic identity does not dismiss, of course, their actual existence: foreigners, metics, rural residents, populations organized in *ethne*, women, slaves, and the enormous lower-class population of the Greek world. This populace, through their inability to access athletic participation, lost their ability to engage in one of the most important processes of self-identification; the Olympic Games proscribe the creative act of identification (the process) to the very identities they create, and renders them apparently universal, totalizing, and ahistorical.

One of the goals of this project has been to clarify the way in which the identities of athletic verse are in fact *identifications in the heraldic mode*; the epinician poets and the anonymous composers of epigrams cleverly appropriate this speech-act to lend a universalizing quality to what is, like every so-called identity, a contingent identification.

In the introduction to this project, I catalogued some of the provocative acts of resistance to de Coubertin's Olympics, such as the Workers' Olympics, Women's Olympics, and Gay Games; as a result of the contemporary cooption of antiquity as a basis for legitimacy, the work of disputing the notion of a particular and universal *ancient* athletic identity is, I think, a resistant reading of antiquity with relevance to the modern world. By focusing on the creative process of identification in athletic verse, we not only gain, as I have outlined above and throughout this project, a new perspective on these corpora of poetry and song, but we also expose the ideology of totalizing identity, and thus, though perhaps tardily, begin the process of imagining athletic alternatives and alternative identities, even for Antiquity.

Bibliography

- Aloni, A. 2009. "Elegy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, edited by F. Budelmann. 168-188. Cambridge.
- Althusser, L. 1971. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Translated by B. Brewster. London.
- Amy-Chinn, 2011. "Doing epistemic (in)justice to Semenya." *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* 6.3: 311-326.
- -----. 2012. "The taxonomy and ontology of sexual difference: implications in sport." *Sport in Society* 15.9: 1291-1305.
- Anderson, D. 1983. "Jim Thorpe's family feud." *New York Times* 7 February 1983.
- Anderson, E.D. 2006. "Using the master's tools: resisting colonization through colonial sports." *International Journal of the History of Sports* 23.2: 247-266.
- Asheri, D., Lloyd, A.B., Corcella, A. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus I-IV*. Oxford.
- Austin, C. and Bastianni, G. (eds). 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Milan.
- Barrett, W.S. 1973. "Pindar's twelfth *Olympian* and the fall of the Deinomenidai." *JHS* 93: 23-35.
- Barron, J.P. 1984. "Ibycus: Gorgias and other poems." *BICS* 31: 12-24.
- Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. London.
- Baumann, G. 1999. *The Multicultural Riddle*. London.
- Baumbach, M., A Petrovic and I. Petrovic (eds.). 2010. *Archaic and Classical Epigram*. Cambridge.
- Beazly, J.D. 1963. *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* 2nd Edition. Oxford.
- -----. 1978. *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters*. New York.
- Becker, O. 1940. "Pindars Olympische Ode vom Glück." *Die Antike* 16: 38-50.
- Berger, E. 1978. "Zum von Plinius (N.H. 34, 55) überlieferten 'nudus talo incessens' des Polyklet." *AntK* 21: 55-62.
- Benjamin, W. 1992 [1968]. *Illuminations*. New York.
- Bettenworth, A. 2007. "The mutual influence of inscribed and literary epigram." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edited by P. Bing and J. Bruss. 69-94. Leiden.
- Bigg, C. 2012. "Athletes switching nationalities in spotlight at London Olympics." *Radio Free Europe* 15 July 2012.
- Bing, P. 2007. "The un-read muse? Inscribed epigram and its readers in antiquity." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edited by P. Bing and J. Bruss. 39-66. Leiden.
- Blaise, F. 2006. "Poetics and politics: tradition re-worked in Solon's 'Eunomia' (Poem 4)." In *Solon of Athens*, edited by J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois. 114-133. Leiden.
- Boardman, J. 1985. *Athenian Black-Figure Vases*. New York.

- Boeckh, A. 1811-1821. *Pindari opera quae supersunt*. Lipzig.
- Bölte, F. 1929. "Zu lakonischen Festen." *RhM* 78: 124-143.
- Bonfante, L. 1989. "Nudity as a costume in Classical art." *AJA* 93.4: 543-570.
- Borthwick, E.K. 1976. "Zoologica Pindarica." *CQ* 26.2: 198-205.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. R. Nice. Cambridge.
- ----- 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Trans. R. Nice. Stanford.
- Bowie, E.L. 1986. "Early Greek elegy, symposium, and public festival." *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- ----- 2010. "Epigram as narration." In *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, edited by M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic. 313-384. Cambridge.
- Bowra, C.M. 1960. "Euripides' epinician for Alcibiades." *Historia* 9.1: 68-79.
- ----- 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
- Brannigan, J. 1998. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. New York.
- Braswell, B.K. 1982. "The song of Ares and Aphrodite: theme and relevance to *Odyssey* 8." *Hermes* 110.2: 129-137.
- ----- 1988. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.
- Bresson, A. 2002. "Un 'Athénien' à Sparte ou Plutarque lecteur de Xénophon." *RÉG* 115: 22-57.
- Brown, C.G. 1984. "The bridegroom and the athlete: the proem to Pindar's seventh *Olympian*." In *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, edited by D.E. Gerber. 37-50. Chico, CA.
- ----- 1989. "Ares, Aphrodite, and the laughter of the gods." *Phoenix* 43.4: 283-293.
- ----- 2006. "Pindar on Archilochus and the gluttony of blame (*Pyth.* 2.52-6)." *JHS* 126: 36-46.
- Brown, D. 2000. *Florida Scrub Country and Other Poems*. Lincoln, NE.
- Buchanan, I and Mallon, B. 2001. *Historical Dictionary of the Olympic Movement*. Lanham, MD.
- Budelmann, F. 2009. "Introducing Greek lyric." In *Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, edited by F. Budelmann. 1-18. Cambridge.
- Bundy, E. 1986 [1962]. *Studia Pindarica*, I-II. Berkeley.
- Burgess, J. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- Burnett, A. 2005. *Pindar's Odes for Young Athletes of Aigina*. Oxford.
- Butler, J. 1988. "Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory." In *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, edited by Sue-Ellen Case, 270-282. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- ----- 1993. *Bodies That Matter*. New York.
- ----- 1997. *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford.
- ----- 1999 [1990]. *Gender Trouble*. New York.
- Calame, C. 1974. "Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque." *QUCC* 17: 113-128.
- ----- 1977. *Les Choeurs de Jeunes Filles en Grèce Archaïque* I-II. Rome.
- ----- 2001. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: their Morphology*,

Religious Role and Social Function.

- Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds.). 2002-2011. *Brill's New Pauly*. Leiden.
- Cantelon, H. 2005. "Amateurism, high-performance sport, and the Olympics." In *Global Olympics; Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games*, edited by K. Young and K.B. Wamsley. 83-102. New York.
- Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*. New York.
- -----. 1989. "Prosopographica Pindarica." *CQ* 39.1: 1-9.
- -----. 1989a. "The performance of the victory ode." *AJP* 110.4: 545-565.
- -----. 1989b. "Two transitions in Pindar." *CQ* 39: 287-295.
- -----. 1995. "Pindar and the victory ode." In *The Passionate Intellectual; Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions Presented to Professor I.G. Kidd*, edited by L. Ayres. 85-103. London.
- -----. 2007. "Pindar, place and performance." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 199-210. Oxford.
- -----. 2009. "Genre, occasion and performance." In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, edited by F. Budelmann. 21-38. Cambridge.
- Carnes, J.S. 1995. "Why should I mention Aiakos? Myth and politics in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 [Part I]." *QUCC* 51.3: 7-48.
- Cartledge, P. 1987. *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*. London.
- Cawkwell, G.L. 1976. "Agesilaos and Sparta." *CQ* 26.1: 62-84.
- Chantraine, P. 1983. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
- Christesen, P. 2007. *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History*. Cambridge.
- -----. 2012. *Sport and Democracy in the Ancient and Modern Worlds*. Cambridge.
- Christesen, P. and Torlone, Z. 2006. "The Olympic victor list of Eusebius: background, text, and translation." *Traditio* 61: 31-93.
- Cohen, D. 1991. *Law, Sexuality and Society: the Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Cohen, R. 1978. "Ethnicity: problem and focus in anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7: 379-403.
- Cole, C. L. 2000. "One chromosome too many?" In *The Olympics at the Millennium: Powers, Politics, and the Games*, edited by K. Schaffer and S. Smith. 128-146.. New Brunswick, NJ.
- Cole, S. 1995. "Civic cult and civic identity." In *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August 24-27 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 2*, edited by M.H. Hansen. 292-325. Copenhagen.
- Cole, T. 1987. "1+1=3: Studies in Pindar's arithmetic." *AJP* 108.4: 553-568.
- Connolly, C.A. 2012. "The politics of the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEF)." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 29.9: 1311-1324.
- Cornwall, A. and Lindisfarne, N. 1994. "Discolating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology." In *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*, edited by A. Cornwall and N. Lindisfarne. 11-47. London..
- Crowther, N. 2004. *Athletika: Studies on the Olympic Game and Greek Athletics*. Frankfurt.
- -----. 2007. *Sport in Ancient Times*. Westport, CN.

- Currie, B. 2004. "Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and its Context*, edited by C.J. Mackie, 48-70. Leiden.
- ----- . 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford.
- D'Alessio, G.B. 2005. "Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic genealogical poetry." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, edited by R. Hunter. 217-238. Cambridge.
- Davies, M. 1992. *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- Day, J.W. 1989. "Ritual in stone: early Greek epigrams and monuments." *JHS* 109: 16-28.
- ----- . 1994. "Interactive offerings: early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual." *HSCP* 96 (1994): 37-74.
- ----- . 2000. "Epigram and reader: generic force as (re-)activation of ritual." In *Matrices of Genre*, edited by M. Depew and D. Obbink. 37-58. Cambridge.
- ----- . 2007. "Poems on stone: the inscribed antecedents of Hellenistic epigram." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edited by P. Bing and J. Bruss. 29-48. Leiden.
- ----- . 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*. Oxford.
- Decker, W. 2013. "Victor statues." *Brill's New Pauly*. Brill Online.
- DeMeyer, T.A. 2000. "Honor restored: Jim Thorpe's Olympic medals." In *The Olympics at the Millennium: Powers, Politics, and the Games*, edited by K. Schaffer and S. Smith. 38-50. New Brunswick, NJ.
- Derrida, J. 1988. "Signature event context." In *Limited, Inc.* Translated by S. Weber. 1-24. Evanston, IL.
- Dickie, M. 1983. "Phaiakian athletes." *Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4: 237-276.
- Diels, H. and Kranz, W. 1952. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Berlin.
- Dillery, J. 1995. *Xenophon and the History of His Times*. London.
- Dillon, M. 2000. "Did *parthenoi* attend the Olympic games? Girls and women competing, spectating, carrying out cult roles at Greek religious festivals." *Hermes* 128.4: 457-480.
- Dittenberger, W. 1883. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin.
- Dittenburger, W. et al. 1896. *Die Inschriften von Olympia*. Berlin.
- Dollimore, J. 2004. *Radical Tragedy, 3rd Edition*. New York.
- Donaldson, J.W. 1841. *Pindar's Epincian or Triumphal Odes*. London.
- Donlan, W. 1979. "The structure of authority in the *Iliad*." *Arethusa* 12: 51-70.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford.
- Dover, K. 1987 [1963]. "The poetry of Archilochus." In *Greeks and the Greeks: Collected Papers*, Volume I. Oxford.
- Drachmann, A.B. 1961. *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig.
- Ducat, J. 1999. "La femme de Sparte et la guerre." *Pallas* 51: 159-171.
- Ebert, J. 1972. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin.
- Ebert, J. and Siewert, P. 1990. "Eine archaische Bronzeurkunde aus Olympia mit Vorschriften für Ringkämpfer und Kampfrichter." In *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 11, edited by A. Mallwitz. 391-412. Berlin.

- Edmunds, L. 1975. "Thucydides' ethics as reflected in the description of *stasis*." *HSCPh* 79: 73-92.
- Eriksen, T.H. 2010. *Ethnicity and Nationalism, 3rd Edition*. New York.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2005. "Posidippus at court." In *The New Posidippus: a Hellenistic Poetry Book*, edited by K. Gutzwiller. 249-268. Oxford.
- Farnell, L. 1965. *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*. Amsterdam.
- Faulkner, N. 2012. *A Visitor's Guide to the Ancient Greek Olympics*. New Haven.
- Fearn, D. 2009. "Oligarchic Hestia: Bacchylides 14B and Pindar, 'Nemean' 11." *JHS* 129: 23-38.
- Fennell, C.A.M. 1893. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge.
- Fenton, S. 1999. *Ethnicity: Racism, Class and Culture*. London.
- Ferrante, D. 1965. "Immagini etimologiche nei poeti greci dell' età ionico-attica." *RIL* 99: 453-489.
- Findlay, S. 2012. "Olympics struggle with 'policing feminity'." *The Toronto Star* 8 June 2012.
- Finglass, P.J. 2007. *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge.
- Fisher, N. 1998. "Gymnasia and the democratic values of leisure." In *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, edited by P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden. 84-104. Cambridge.
- -----. 2000. "Hybris, revenge and *stasis* in the Greek city-states." In *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, edited by H. van Wees. 83-123. London.
- -----. 2006. "The pleasures of reciprocity: *charis* and the athletic body in Pindar." In *Penser et représenter le corps dans l'Antiquité*, edited by F. Prost and J. Wilgaux. 227-246. Rennes.
- Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.
- Forsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- Forsén, B. 2000. "Population and political strength of some southeastern Arkadian poleis." In *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, edited by P. Flensted-Jensen. 35-55. Stuttgart.
- Forsythe, J. and Wamsley, K. 2005. "Symbols without substance: aboriginal peoples and the illusion of Olympic ceremonies." In *Global Olympics: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games*, edited by K. Young and K. Wamsley. 227-248. New York.
- -----. 2006. "'Native to native... we'll recapture our spirits': the world indigenous nations games and North American indigenous games as cultural resistance." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 23.2: 294-314.
- Fossey, J.M. 1990. *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris*. Amsterdam.
- Foucault, M. 1990 [1978]. *The History of Sexuality Volume 1*. New York.
- Fowler, R.L. 1998. "Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the creation of the Hellenes." *PCPS* 44.1: 1-19.
- -----. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography*. Oxford.

- Foxhall, L. 1994. "Pandora unbound: a feminist critique of Foucault's *History of Sexuality*." In *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*, edited A. Cornwall and N. Lindisfarne. 132-146. London.
- -----. 1995. "Monumental ambitions: the significance of posterity in Greece." In *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology*, edited by N. Spencer. 132-149. London.
- -----. 2009. "Gender." In *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by K.A. Raaflaub and H. van Wees. 483-507. London.
- Fränkel, H. 1944. "The immigrant's bath." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 12.16: 293-294.
- Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E. 1987-2010. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. 1995. *Du masque au visage*. Paris.
- -----. 1996. "Eros, desire and the gaze." In *Sexuality in Ancient Art*, edited by N. Kampen. Translated by N. Kline. 81-100. Cambridge.
- Gagné, R. 2009. "Atreid ancestors in Alkaios." *JHS* 129: 39-43.
- Gardiner, N. 1910. *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. London.
- -----. 1955 [1930]. *Athletics of the Ancient World*. Oxford.
- Gehrke, Hans-Joachim. 1985. *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Munich.
- -----. 1994. "Mythos, Geschichte, Politik – antik und modern." *Saeculum* 45: 239-264.
- -----. 2001. "Myth, history, and collective identity: uses of the past in Ancient Greece and beyond." In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by N. Luraghi. 286-313. Oxford.
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.
- Gerber, D.E. 1970. *Euterpe: an Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Eleigiac, and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam.
- -----. 1997. "Elegy." In *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, edited by D.E. Gerber. 89-123. Leiden.
- -----. 2002. *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine*. Stuttgart.
- Gildersleeve, B.L. 1885. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York.
- Golden, M. 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- -----. 2008. *Greek Sport and Social Status*. Austin.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. *Prison Notebooks: Selections*. Translated by Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith. New York.
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. 2003. "Homeric masculinity: HNOPEH and ΑΓΗΝΟΠΗΗ." *JHS* 123: 60-76.
- Grenfell, B.P. and Hunt, A.S. 1899. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri II*. London.
- van Groningen, B.A. 1966. *Theognis: le premiere livre*. Amsterdam.
- Grosz, E. 1990. *Jacques Lacan: a Feminist Introduction*. New York.
- Gutzwiller, K. 2010. "Heroic epitaphs of the classical age: the Aristotelian *peplos* and beyond." In *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, edited by M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic. 219-249. Cambridge.
- Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume 3*. Cambridge.

- Hall, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- ----- 2001. "Contested ethnicities: perceptions of Macedonia within evolving definitions of Greek identity." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by I. Malkin. 159-186. Cambridge, MA.
- ----- 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.
- Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*. Cambridge.
- Hammer, D. 1997. "'Who shall readily obey?': authority and politics in the *Iliad*." *Phoenix* 51.1: 1-24.
- ----- 2004. "Ideology, the symposium, and Archaic politics." *AJP* 125.4: 479-512.
- Hannah, P.A. 1998. "The reality of Greek male nudity: looking to African parallels." *Scholias* 7: 17-40.
- Hanson, A.E. 1990. "The medical writers' woman." In *Before Sexuality; The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*, edited by J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin. 309-338. Princeton.
- Hansen, M.H. 1993. "Introduction: the polis as a citizen-state." In *The Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium on the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1-4 1992*. 7-29. Copenhagen.
- ----- 1996. "City-ethnics as evidence for polis identity." In *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and K Raaflaub. 169-196. Stuttgart.
- Hansen, O. 1988. "The memorial of Kallimachos reconsidered." *Hermes* 116: 482-3.
- Hansen, P. 1983-1989. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, I-II. Berlin.
- Harman, R. 2012. "A spectacle of Greekness: panhellenism and the visual in Xenophon's Agesilaos." In *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, edited by F. Hobden and C. Tuplin. 427-453. Leiden.
- Harrell, S.E. 2002. "King or private citizen: fifth-century Sicilian tyrants at Olympia and Delphi." *Mnemosyne* 55.4: 439-464.
- Harris, H.A. 1972. *Greek Athletes and Athletics*. Bloomington.
- Harris, J and Parker, A. 2009. "Introduction: sport and social identities." In *Sport and Social Identities*, edited by J. Harris and A. Parker. 1-14. New York.
- Harvey, A.E. 1955. "The classification of Greek lyric poetry." *CQ* 5: 157-175.
- Heath, M. 1999. Review: *Pindarus-Homericus, Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*. *CR* 49.2: 556-557
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, M. 1991. "Epinician performance." *AJP* 86.3: 173-191.
- Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
- Hermann, H. 1988. "Die Siegerstatuen von Olympia. Schriftliche Überlieferung und archäologischer Befund." *Nikephoros* 1: 119-184.
- Heubeck, A., West, S., and Hainsworth, J.B. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume 1*. Oxford.
- Hewitt, J. 1926. "The comic aspect of the Greek athletic meet." *CJ* 21: 643-653.
- Himmelmann, N. 1990. *Ideale Nacktheit in der griechischen Kunst*. Berlin.
- Hinckley, L.V. 1986. "Patroklos' funeral games and Homer's character portrayal." *CJ* 81.3: 209-221.
- Hodern, J.H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.
- Hodkinson, S. 2000. *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*. Swansea.

- Hodkinson, S. and Hodkinson, H. 1981. "Mantineia and the Mantinike: settlement and society in a Greek Polis." *ABSA* 76: 239-296.
- Hope Simpon, R. and Lazenby, J.F. 1970. *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 2000. "Thucydides, Xenophon, and Lichas: were the Spartans excluded from the Olympic Games from 420 to 400 B.C.?" *Phoenix* 54: 212-225.
- ----- 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.
- Howland, R.L. 1954-55. "Epeius, carpenter and athlete." *PCPS* 3: 15-16.
- Hubbard, R. 1990. *The Politics of Women's Biology*. New Brunswick, NJ.
- Hubbard, T.K. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind*. Leiden.
- ----- 1987. "Two notes on the myth of Aeacus in Pindar." *GRBS* 28: 5-22.
- ----- 1989. "Pindar's κύκνεια μάχαι: subtext and allusion in *Olympian* 10.15-16." *Materiali e discussion per l'analisi dei testi classici* 23: 137-143.
- ----- 1998. "Popular perceptions of elite homosexuality in Classical Athens." *Arion* 6.1: 48-78.
- ----- 2001. "Pindar and Athens after the Persian Wars." In *Gab es das griechische Wunder?*, edited by D. Papenfuss and V.M. Strocka. 387-397. Mainz.
- ----- 2002. "Pindar, Theoxenus and the homoerotic eye." *Arethusa* 35.2: 255-296.
- ----- 2004. "The dissemination of epinician lyric: pan-Hellenism, reperformance, written texts." In *Oral Performance and its Contexts*, edited by C.J. Mackie. 71-93. Leiden.
- ----- 2005. "Pindar's *Tenth Olympian* and athlete-trainer pederasty." In *Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*, edited by B.C. Verstraete. 137-171. Harrington Park.
- Huddleston, J. 2006. *The Odyssey*. Chicago.
- Hurwitt, J. 2007. "The human figure in early Greek sculpture and vase painting." In *Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by H.A. Shapiro. 265-286. Cambridge.
- Huxley, G.L. 1975. *Pindar's Vision of the Past*. Belfast.
- Hyde, W.W. 1912. "The positions of victor statues at Olympia." *AJA* 16.2: 203-229.
- Instone, S. 1990. "Love and sex in Pindar: some practical thrusts." *BICS* 37: 30-42.
- ----- 2007. "Origins of the Olympics." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 71-82. Oxford.
- International Olympic Committee. 2012. *IOC Regulations on Female Hyperandrogenism*. Lausanne.
- Iorfida, C. 2009. "Leduc remembered as Olympic champ, gay role model." *CBCSports.com* 24 July 2009.
- Irigaray, L. 1985. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Translated by C. Porter. Ithaca.
- Irwin, E. 2005. *Solon and Early Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
- ----- 2006. "The transgressive elegy of Solon?" In *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, edited by J. Blok and A. Lardinois. 36-78. Leiden.

- Jacoby, F. 1950-1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden.
- Jameson, F. 1972. *Marxism and Form*. Princeton.
- Jenkins, R. 2004. *Social Identity 2nd Edition*. London.
- Jeffrey, A. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* [revised edition]. Oxford.
- Jenner, E.A.B. 1986. "Further speculations on Ibycus and the epinician ode: S220, S176 and the 'Bellerophon' Ode." *BICS* 33: 59-66.
- Kalimtzis, K. 2000. *Aristotle on Political Enmity and Disease*. New York.
- Kapsoménos, S. 1961-62. "Un prétendant de la monarchie à Cnossos dans la poésie de Pindare." *Kretika Kronika* 15-16.1: 252-278.
- Kassel, R. and Austin, C. 1983-2001. *Poetae Comic Graeci*. Berlin.
- Keesling, C.E. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.
- Kefalidou, E. 1999. "Ceremonies of athletic victory in ancient Greece: an interpretation." *Nikephoros* 12: 95-119.
- Kidd, B. 2005. "'Another world is possible': recapturing alternative Olympic histories, imagining different games." In *Global Olympics: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games*, edited by K. Young and K.B. Wamsley. 143-158. London.
- King, C.R. 2006. "Introduction: other peoples' games: indigenous peoples and sport in North America." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 23.2: 131-137.
- Kirk, G.S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- -----. 1985. *The Iliad: a Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. 2001. "To Hellēnikon ethnos: ethnicity and the construction of ancient Greek identity." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by I. Malkin. 29-50. Cambridge, MA.
- Korshak, Y. 1987. *Frontal Faces in Attic Vase Painting of the Archaic Period*. Chicago.
- Krane, V. and Waldron, J. 2000. "The Gay Games: creating our own sports culture." In *The Olympics at the Millennium: Powers, Politics, and the Games*, edited by K. Schaffer and S. Smith. 147-166. New Brunswick, NJ.
- Krischer, T. 1985. "Phäaken und Odyssee." *Hermes* 113.1: 9-21.
- Kunze, E. 1956. "Ein kretischer Periodonike." *Kretika Chronika* 7: 138-145.
- Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
- -----. 1991a. "Fathers and sons: a note on Pindaric ambiguity." *AJP* 112.3: 287-300.
- -----. 1993. "The economy of kudos." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. 131-163. Cambridge.
- -----, 1994. "Crisis and decorum in sixth-century Lesbos: reading Alkaios otherwise." *QUCC* 47.2: 67-92.
- Kurke, L. and Dougherty, C. 1993. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
- Kyle, D. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. Leiden.
- -----. 2003. "The only woman in all Greece." *Journal of Sport History* 30: 183-204.
- -----. 2006. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. Oxford.

- Lane Fox, R. 2000. "Theognis: an alternative to democracy." In *Alternatives to Athens*, edited by R. Brock and S. Hodkinson. 35-51. Oxford.
- Lardinois, A.P.M.H. 2006. "Have we Solon's verses?" In *Solon of Athens*, edited by J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois. 15-35. Leiden.
- Lattimore, R. 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago.
- Laurendeau, J. and Adams, C. 2010. "'Jumping like a girl': discursive silences, exclusionary practices and the controversy over women's ski jumping." *Sport in Society* 13.3: 431-447.
- Lee, H.M. 1988. "The 'first' Olympic Games of 776 B.C." In *The Archaeology of the Olympics*, edited by W.J. Raschke. 110-118. Madison, WI.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. 1988. "Who sang Pindar's victory odes?" *AJP* 109.1: 1-11.
- Lelièvre, F.J. 1954. "The basis of ancient parody." *G&R* 1.2: 66-81.
- Levine, D. 1982. "Odyssey 18: Iros as paradigm for the suitors." *CJ* 77.3: 200-204.
- Lewis, S. 1996. *News and Society in the Greek Polis*. London.
- Levy, A. 2009. "Sports, sex, and the case of Caster Semenya." *The New Yorker* 30 November 2009.
- Libermann, G. 1999. *Alcée: Fragments I-II*. Paris.
- Lidov, J. 1974. "The poems and performances of *Isthmians* 3 and 4." *CSCA* 7: 175-185.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973. "Modern interpretation of Pindar: the second *Pythian* and seventh *Nemean* odes." *JHS* 93: 109-137.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parson, P. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
- Loewy, E. 1885. *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer mit Facsimiles*. Leipzig.
- Lowe, N.J. 2007. "Epinikian eidography." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 167-176. Oxford.
- Luraghi, N. 2010. "The local scripts from nature to culture." *CA* 29.1: 68-91.
- MacClancy, J. 1996. *Sport, Identity and Ethnicity*. Oxford.
- MacKay, E. 2001. "The frontal face and 'you'. Narrative disjunction in early Greek poetry and painting." *Acta Classica* 44: 5-34.
- MacLachlan, B. 1997. "Personal poetry." In *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, edited by D.E. Gerber. 133-220. Leiden.
- Maehler, H. 2003. *Bacchylides, Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.
- Mann, C. 2001. *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland*. Göttingen.
- Mantas, K. 1995. "Women and athletics in the Roman East." *Nikephoros* 8: 125-144.
- Marek, C. 1984. *Die Proxenie*. Frankfurt.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. 1976-. *Marx-Engels Collected Works*. Charlottesville, VA.
- ----. 1942. *Selected Correspondence*. New York.
- Mason, C.W. 2007. "The bridge to change: the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games, South African apartheid policy, and the Olympic boycott paradigm." In *Onward to the Olympics: Historical Perspectives on the Olympic Games*, edited by G.P. Schaus and S.R. Wenn. 283-296. Waterloo.

- McDonnell, M. 1991. "The introduction of athletic nudity: Thucydides, Plato, and the vases." *JHS* 111: 182-193.
- McInerney, J. 2001. "Ethnos and ethnicity in early Greece." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by I. Malkin. 51-74. Cambridge, MA.
- McLeod, C.W. 1982. *Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge.
- Merklebach, R. and West, M.L. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Millender, E. 2009. "The Spartan diarchy: a comparative perspective." In *Sparta: Comparative Approaches*, edited by S. Hodkinson. 1-69. Swansea.
- Miller, A. 1993. "Inventa componere: rhetorical process and poetic composition in Pindar's *Ninth Olympian Ode*." *TAPA* 123: 109-147.
- Miller, S. 2001. *Excavations at Nemea Volume 2: The Early Hellenistic Stadium*. Berkeley.
- -----. 2004. *Ancient Greek Athletics*. New Haven.
- Mitchell, L.G. 2012. "The women of ruling families in archaic and classical Greece." *CQ* 62.1: 1-21.
- Mitra, D. 2012. "I am a female, and once loved a man." *Outlook India* 30 July 2012.
- Monro, D.B. and Allen, T.W. 1963. *Homeri Opera Volume I: Iliad I-XII*. Oxford.
- -----. 1963. *Homeri Opera Volume II: Iliad XIII-XXIV*. Oxford.
- -----. 1963. *Homeri Opera Volume III: Odyssey I-XII*. Oxford.
- -----. 1963. *Homeri Opera Volume IV: Odyssey XIII-XXIV*. Oxford.
- Moretti, L. 1957. *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*.
- Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century B.C.* Cambridge.
- -----. 1993. "The origins of pan-Hellenism." In *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, edited by N. Marinatos and R. Hägg. 18-44. London.
- -----. 2003. *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis*. London.
- Morris, I. 1993. "Poetics of power: the interpretation of ritual action in Archaic Greece." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, edited by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. 15-45. Oxford.
- -----. 2000. *Archaeology as Cultural History*.
- Most, G.W. 1985. *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*. Gottingen.
- -----. 1985a. "Pindar, *Nemean* 7.64-67." *GRBS* 26.4: 315-331.
- Müller, K. 1841-1870. *Fragmenta Historicum Graecorum*. Paris.
- Nagy, G. 1985. "Theognis and Megara: a poet's vision of his city." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and Polis*, edited by T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy. 22-81. Baltimore.
- Nash, L.L. 1990. *The Aggelia in Pindar*. New York.
- Nicholson, N. 1998. "The truth of pederasty." *Intertexts* 2.1: 26-44.
- -----. 2000. "Pederastic poets and adult patrons in late Archaic lyric." *CW* 93.3: 235-259.
- -----. 2005. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge.
- -----. 2009. "Poets, doctors, and the rhetoric of money." *Neurosurgery* 64.1: 179-188.

- Nielsen, T.H. 1996. "Arkadia. City-ethnics and tribalism." In *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen. 117-163. Copenhagen.
- -----. 1996a. "A survey of dependent *poleis* in Classical Arkadia." In *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub. 63-106. Stuttgart.
- -----. 1999. "The concept of Arkadia – the people, their land, and their organization." In *Defining Ancient Arkadia*, edited by T.H. Nielsen and J. Roy. 16-79. Copenhagen.
- -----. 2000. "Epiknemidian, Hypoknemidian, and Opountian Lokrians." In *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, edited by P. Flensted-Jensen. 91-120. Stuttgart.
- -----. 2002. *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Göttingen.
- -----. 2004. "Arkadia." In *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen. 505-539. Oxford.
- -----. 2004a. "Victors in the Panhellenic games as evidence for *polis* identity." In *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen. 107-110. Oxford.
- -----. 2004b. "The concept of *patris* in Archaic and Classical sources." In *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. 49-76. Copenhagen.
- -----. 2006. "A *polis* as part of a larger identity group: glimpses from the history of Lepreon." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 56: 57-90.
- Nisetich, F.J. 1977. "The leaves of triumph and mortality: transformation of a traditional image in Pindar's *Olympian* 12." *TAPA* 107: 235-264.
- Norwood, G. 1915. "Pindarica." *CQ* 9.1: 1-6.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. 2010. *Solon the Athenian*. Leiden.
- Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton.
- -----. 1991. "Aristotle's political sociology: class, status, and order in the *Politics*." In *Essays on the Foundations of Aristotelian Political Science*, edited by C. Lord and D. K. O'Connor. 112-135. Berkeley.
- Osborne, R. 1997. "Men without clothes: heroic nakedness and Greek art." *Gender & History* 9.3: 504-528.
- Page, D. 1955. *Sappho and Alkaios*. Oxford.
- -----. 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- -----. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Oxford.
- Papakonstantinou, Z. 2002. "Prizes in early archaic Greek sport." *Nikephoros* 15: 51-67.
- -----. 2011. "Sport." In *The Homer Encyclopedia*, edited by M. Finkelberg.
- Parker, R.C.T. 1981. "The audience of lyric poets." *CR* 31.2: 159-162.
- Pavlou, M. 2008. "Metapoetics, poetic tradition, and praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9." *Mnemosyne* 61: 533-567.
- -----. 2010. "Pindar *Nemean* 5: real and poetic statues." *Phoenix* 64.1-2: 1-17.
- -----. 2012. "Fathers *in absentia* in Pindar's epinician poetry." *GRBS* 52: 57-88.
- Pelliccia, H. 2009. "Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides." In *The Cambridge*

- Companion to Greek Lyric*, edited by F. Budelmann. 240-262.. Cambridge.
- Perlman, P. 2000. *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*. Göttingen.
 - Péron, J. 1974. *Les images maritimes de Pindare*. Paris.
 - Perry, J.S. 2007. “‘An Olympic victory must not be bought’: oath-taking, cheating, and women in Greek athletics.” In *Horkos: the Oath in Greek Society*, edited by J. Fletcher and A.H. Sommerstein. 81-88. Exeter.
 - Petrovic, A. 2010. “True lies of Athenian public epigrams.” In *Archaic and Classical Epigram*, edited by M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic. 202-216. Cambridge.
 - Peuch, A. 1970. *Pindare. Olympiques*. Paris.
 - Pfeijffer, I.L. 1999. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: a Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III and Pythian VIII*. Leiden.
 - Pikoulas, Y.A. 1988. *Η νότια Μεγαλοπολιτική χώρα από τόν 8 ο. ώς τόν 4 ο.μ. Χ. αιώνα*. Athens.
 - Pleket, H.W. 1976. “Games, prizes, athletes, and ideology.” *Stadion* 1: 49-89. [=Pleket, H.W. 2010. “Games, prizes, athletes and ideology.” *Greek Athletics*, edited by J. König. 145-174. Edinburgh.]
 - -----. 1992. “The participants in the ancient Olympic Games: social background and social mobility.” In *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games, 5-9 September 1988*, edited by W. Coulson and H. Kyrieleis. 147-153. Athens.
 - Poltera, O. 2008. *Simonides Lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente*. Basel.
 - Pomeroy, S.B. 2002. *Spartan Women*. Oxford.
 - Postlethwaite, N. 1995. “Agamemnon, best of spearmen.” *Phoenix* 49.2: 95-103.
 - Pretzler, M. 2005. “Pausanias at Mantinea.” *PCPS* 51: 21-34.
 - Pritchard, D. 2000. “‘The fractured imaginary’: popular thinking on citizen soldiers and warfare in fifth century Athens.” Diss. Macquarie University.
 - -----. 2003. “Athletics, education and participation in classical Athens.” In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by D.J. Phillips and D. Pritchard. 293-350. Swansea.
 - -----. 2013. *Sport, Democracy, and War in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
 - Raaflaub, K. 1997. “Homeric society.” In *A New Companion to Homer*, edited by I. Morris and B.B. Powell. 629-649. Leiden.
 - Race, W.H. 1989. “Climactic elements in Pindar’s verse.” *HSCP* 92: 43-69.
 - -----. 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar’s Odes*.
 - -----. 1997. *Pindar*. Cambridge.
 - Raschke, W.J. 1994. “A Red-figure *kylix* in Malibu. The iconography of female charioteers.” *Nikephoros* 7: 157-179.
 - Raubitschek, A.E. 1968. “Denkmal und Epigramm.” In *L’épigramme grecque, Entretiens sur l’Antiquité Classique* 14: 1-37.
 - Rausa, F. 1994. *L’immagine del vincitore*. Milan.
 - Redfield, J.M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago.
 - -----. 2008. *The Locrian Maidens : Love and Death in Greek Italy*. Princeton.

- Rhodes, P.J. 2001. "Public documents in the Greek states: archives and inscriptions." *G&R* 48.1: 33-44.
- Richter, G. 1946. *Attic Red-Figured Vases, a Survey*. New Haven.
- ----- 1970. *Kouroi – Archaic Greek Youths. A Study of the Development of the Kouros Type in Greek Sculpture*, 3rd Edition. London.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1981. *Fifth-century Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton.
- Riordan, J. 1984. "The Workers' Olympics." In *Five Ring Circus*, edited by A. Tomlinson and G. Whannel. 98-112. London.
- Robbins, E. 1986. "The broken wall, the burning roof and tower: Pindar, *Ol.* 8.31-46." *CQ* 36.2: 317-321.
- Robert, C. 1900. "Die Ordnung der Olympischen Spiele und die Sieger der 75-83 Olympiade." *Hermes* 35.1: 141-195.
- Robert, L. 1960. "Recherches épigraphiques IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX." *REA* 62: 271-361.
- Robinson, D.M. and Fluck, E.J. 1937. *A Study of the Greek Love Names*. Baltimore.
- Rose, P.W. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
- ----- 2006. "Divorcing ideology from Marxism and Marxism from ideology: some problems." *Arethusa* 39: 101-136.
- ----- 2009. "Class." In *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, edited by K.A. Raaflaub. 468-481. Oxford.
- ----- 2012. *Class in Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.
- Rose, V. 1967. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Stuttgart.
- Rösler, W. 1980. *Dichter und Gruppe*. Munich.
- Roy, J. 1996. "Polis and tribe in Classical Arkadia." In *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, edited by M.H. Hansen. 107-112. Copenhagen.
- ----- 1997. "The *perioikoi* of Elis." In *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community. Symposium August 29-31 1996*, edited by M.H. Hansen. 282-320. Copenhagen.
- ----- 2000. "The frontier between Arkadia and Elis in Classical Antiquity." In *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History*, edited by P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen and L. Rubinstein. 133-156. Copenhagen.
- Ruck, C.A.P. 1972. "Marginalia Pindarica IV-VI." *Hermes* 100: 143-169.
- Scanlon, T. 2002. *Eros in Greek Athletics*. Oxford.
- ----- 2005. "The dispersion of pederasty and the athletic revolution in sixth-century Greece." *Journal of Homosexuality* 49.3-4: 63-85.
- ----- 2008. "The *Heraia* at Olympia reconsidered." *Nikephoros* 21: 159-196.
- Schadewaldt, W. 1966 [1928]. *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*. Tübingen.
- Schmitz, T.A. 1999. Review: *Pindaricus Homericus, Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*. *BMCR* 1999.04.20.
- ----- 2010. "Speaker and addressee in early Greek epigram and lyric." In *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, edited by M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic. 25-41. Cambridge.
- Schrader, H.P. 2005. *The Olympic Charioteer*. Lincoln, NE.

- Scott, J.W. 1986. "Gender: a useful category of historical analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91.5: 1053-1075.
- Scott, W.C. 1997. "The etiquette of games in *Iliad* 23." *GRBS* 38.3: 213-227.
- Seaford, R. 1988. "The eleventh *Ode* of Bacchylides: Hera, Artemis, and the absence of Dionysos." *JHS* 108: 118-136.
- -----. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual*. Oxford.
- Sedgwick, E.F. 1985. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York.
- Segal, C. 1985. "Messages to the underworld: an aspect of poetic immortalization in Pindar." *AJP* 106.2: 199-212.
- -----. 1986. *Pindar's Mythmaking: the Fourth Pythian Ode*. Princeton.
- -----. 1986a. "Naming, truth, and creation in the poetics of Pindar." *Diacritics* 16.2: 65-83.
- Serwint, N.J. 1987. "Greek athletic sculpture from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.: an iconographic study." Diss. Princeton University.
- Shipley, D.R. 1997. *Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos*. Oxford.
- Silk, M. 2007. "Pindar's poetry as poetry: a literary commentary on *Olympian* 12." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 177-198. Oxford.
- Simpson, M. 1969. "Pindar's *Ninth Olympian*." *GRBS* 10.2: 113-124.
- Sinfield, A. 1992. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Oxford.
- Skinner, M.B. 1987. "Greek women and the metronymic: a note on an epigram by Nossis." *AHB* 1.2: 39-42.
- Slater, W.J. 1969. "Futures in Pindar." *CQ* 19: 86-94.
- -----. 1969a. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- Smith, D.G. 2009. "Alcibiades, Athens, and the tyranny of Sicily." *GRBS* 49.3: 363-389.
- Smith, R.R.R. 2007. "Pindar, athletes and the early Greek statue habit." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 83-142. Oxford.
- Snell, B. (ed.). 1971-2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (eds.) 1987. *Pindari Carmina Cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.
- Socarides, R. 2014. "Gay-rights advocates prepare for the Sochi Olympics." *The New Yorker* 7 January 2014.
- Sotiriou, M. 1998. *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien*. Göttingen.
- Spivey, N. 1997. *Understanding Greek Sculpture*. London.
- Stadter, P. 2012. "'Staying up late': Plutarch's reading of Xenophon." In *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, edited by F. Hobden and C. Tupling. 43-62. Leiden.
- Stanford, W.B. 1947. *The Odyssey of Homer I: Books I-XII*. London.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M.D. 2006. *Vase Painting, Gender, and Social Identity in Archaic Athens*. Cambridge.

- de Ste. Croix, G. 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. London.
- Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- -----. 2006. "Solon's self-reflexive political persona and its audience." In *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, edited by J. Blok and A. Lardinois. 79-113. Leiden.
- Steinbock, B. 2011. "A lesson in patriotism: Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*, the ideology of the *ephebeia*, and Athenian social memory." *CA* 30.2: 219-317.
- Steiner, D. 1993. "Pindar's *oggetti parlanti*." *HSCP* 95: 159-180.
- -----. 1998. "Moving images: fifth-century victory monuments and the athlete's allure." *CA* 17.1: 123-150.
- -----. 2001. *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Princeton.
- -----. 2009. "Diverting demons: ritual, poetic mockery and the Odysseus-Iros encounter." *CA* 28.1: 71-100.
- -----. 2010. *Odyssey XVII-XVIII*. Cambridge.
- Stewart, A. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: an Exploration*. New Haven.
- Strauss Clay, J. 1992. "Pindar's Twelfth *Pythian*: reed and bronze." *AJP* 113.4: 519-525.
- Suter, A. 1993. "Paris and Dionysus: *iambos* in the *Iliad*." *Arethusa* 26: 1-18.
- Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca, NY.
- Swaddling, J. 1980. *The Ancient Olympic Games*. London.
- Swift, L. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
- Szegedy-Maszak 1993 in *Cultral Poetics*
- Tamiolaki, M. 2012. "Virtue and leadership in Xenophon: ideal leaders or ideal losers?" In *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, edited by F. Hobden and C. Tuplin. 563-589.
- Thalmann, W.G. 1988. "Thersites: comedy, scapegoats, and heroic ideology in the *Iliad*." *TAPA* 118: 1-28.
- -----. 1998. *The Swineherd and the Bow*. Ithaca.
- Thomas, R. 2007. "Fame, memorial and choral poetry: the origins of epinikian poetry – a historical study." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals*, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. 141-166. Oxford.
- Thummer, E. 1968-1969. *Pindar: die Isthmischen Gedichte textkritisch hrsg., übers. und kommentiert, mit einer Analyse der pindarischen Epinikien*.
- Tod, M.N. 1949. "Greek record-keeping and record-breaking." *CQ* 43: 105-112.
- Too, Yun Lee. 1991. "'HPA ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΑ and poetic self-reference in Pindar 'Olympian' 6.87-90." *Hermes* 119.3: 257-264.
- Travers, A. 2008. "The sport nexus and gender injustice." *Studies in Social Justice* 2.1: 79-101.
- Tuplin, C.J. 1977. "Kyniskos of Mantinea." *LCM* 2: 5-10.
- Tyrrell, W.B. 2003. *The Smell of Sweat: Greek Athletics and Greek Culture*. Wauconda, IL.
- Verdenius, W.J. 1987. *Commentaries on Pindar, Volume I*. Leiden.
- Vernant, J-P. 1991. "A 'beautiful death' and the disfigured corpse in Homeric epic." In *Mortals and Immortals*, edited by F. Zeitlin. 50-74. Princeton.

- Voigt, E. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam.
- Wachter, R. 2010. "The origin of epigrams on 'speaking objects'." In *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, edited by M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic. 250-260. Cambridge.
- Wallace, M.B. 1970. "Early Greek 'proxenoi'." *Phoenix* 24.3: 189-208.
- Wallace, S. 2010. *Ancient Crete: From Successful Collapse to Democracy's Alternatives, Twelfth to Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge.
- Wamsley, K.B and Pfister, G. 2005. "Olympic men and women: the politics of gender in the Modern Games." In *Global Olympics: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games*, edited by K. Young and K.B. Wamsley. 103-126. New York.
- Weedon, C. 1997. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory, 2nd Edition*. Oxford.
- van Wees, H. 2007. "'Stasis, destroyer of men': mass, elite, political violence and security in Archaic Greece." In *Sécurité Collective et Ordre Public dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, edited by C. Brélaz and P. Ducrey. 1-48. Geneva.
- Wente, M. 2014. "Agony on the slopes: should women jump?" *The Globe and Mail* 1 February 2014.
- West, M.L. 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford.
- -----, 1992. "Alcman and the Spartan royalty." *ZPE* 151: 1-7.
- -----, 1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci 2nd Edition*. Oxford.
- -----, 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- -----, 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*, Oxford.
- -----, 2013. *The Epic Cycle*. Oxford.
- "Wide World of Sports athlete of the century." *ESPN*. 14 Jan. 1999. Web: 15 Nov. 2013.
- Wilhelm, A. 1909. *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*. Brünn.
- Wilkinson, C.L. 2012. *The Lyric of Ibycus*. Berlin.
- Williams, R.T. 1965. *The Confederate Coinage of the Arcadians in the Fifth Century B.C.* New York.
- Williams, R. 1976. *Keywords*. New York.
- Willink, C.W. 1986. *Euripides: Orestes*. Oxford.
- Willis, W.H. 1941. "Athletic contests in the epic." *TAPA* 72: 392-417.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City, and the Stage*. Cambridge.
- Wohl, V. 1998. *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy*. Austin.
- Wolicki, A. 2002. "The heralds and the games in archaic and classical Greece." *Nikephoros* 15: 69-97.
- Woodbury, L. 1979. "Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar, *Nem.* 7.30 ff." *Phoenix* 33.2: 95-133.
- Woodward, A.M. 1908. "The inscriptions." *BSA* 15: 40-106.
- Young, D.C. 1968. *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*. Leiden.
- -----, 1970. "Pindaric criticism." In *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, edited by W.M.

Calder and J. Stern. 1-95. Darmstadt. [Original work published 1964: *Minnesota Review* 4: 584-641].

- -----, 1983. "Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: inscriptional ποτέ and the 'poetic epistle'." *HSCP* 87: 31-48.
- -----, 1984. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago.
- -----, 1988. "How the amateurs won the Olympics." In *The Archaeology of the Olympics*, edited by W. Raschke. 55-75. Madison, WI.
- -----, 1988a. "Modern Greece and the origins of the Modern Olympic Games." In *Proceedings of a International Symposium on the Olympic Games, 5-9 September 1988*, edited by W.D.E. Coulson and H. Kyrieleis. 175-184. Athens.
- -----, 1996. "First with the most: Greek athletic records and specialization." *Nikephoros* 9: 175-197.
- -----, 2004. *A Brief History of the Olympic Games*. Malden, MA.

Curriculum Vitae

Name: Peter John Miller

Post-secondary Education and Degrees:

The University of Western Ontario (London, ON, Canada)
2009-2014 Ph.D.

University of Victoria (Victoria, BC, Canada)
2007-2009 M.A.

University of Toronto (Toronto, ON, Canada)
1999-2007 Hons. B.A.

Honours and Awards:

Crake Doctoral Fellowship in Classics
Mount Allison University (Sackville, NB, Canada)
2013-2014

Province of Ontario Graduate Scholarship
2013-2014

Joseph Armand-Bombardier Doctoral Fellowship
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
2011-2013

Province of Ontario Graduate Scholarship
2010-2011

Publications: “Destablizing Haimon: radically reading gender and authority in Sophocles’ *Antigone*.” *Helios* (forthcoming)

Related Work Experience:

Instructor
Mount Allison University
2013-2014

Instructor
The University of Western Ontario
2011-2012

Teaching Assistant
The University of Western Ontario
2009-2011

Teaching Assistant
University of Victoria
2007-2009