

FROM *POLIS* TO *OIKOS*: IDEOLOGY AND GENEALOGY IN PINDAR'S *OLYMPIAN* 9¹

PETER MILLER

Abstract: In *Olympian* 9, Pindar constructs a family for his victor, Epharmostos, whose family does not—contrary to the generic expectations of epinikian—appear in the ode. By establishing connections between the early ethnic and civic history of Lokris and Opous respectively, Pindar elevates the athletic victory of Epharmostos to the level of ethnic and civic foundation; at the same time, the conceiving of citizenship as essentially familial allows Pindar to praise inherited excellence and fulfill his ideological goals, even in an ode—and for a victor—who cannot claim to have inherited his athletic abilities.

At the end of *Olympian* 9, the ode for Epharmostos, the champion wrestler from Opountian Lokris, Pindar declares φυά, his idiosyncratic rendering of φύσις (*s.v.* φυή *LSJ*; cf. Slater) κράτιστον ἅπαν (“altogether best”: *Ol.* 9.100);² he says that the herald’s proclamation ought to record that his victor was born εὐχειρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὀρώντ’ ἄλκάν (“with quick hands, nimble legs, determination in his look”), all the natural endowments necessary for athletic success (*Ol.* 9.108ff).³

¹ I owe thanks to colleagues and friends who read earlier versions of this paper: C. G. Brown, D. H. J. Larmour, D. E. Lavigne, C. Manfredi, D. T. Steiner, B. Steinbock, C. H. Stocking, and A. Suksi. Furthermore, I wish to thank the audiences at meetings of the Classical Association (Reading, UK; 2013) and the Atlantic Classical Association (Wolfville, NS; 2013) as well as the anonymous reader of the journal. All errors and omissions that remain are, of course, my own.

² Quotations from Pindar come from Maehler-Snell. Translations of Pindar are from the most recent Loeb volumes of Race (1990).

³ φυά, for Pindar, refers to internal qualities of character as well as physical form: see Hubbard 107–108. φυά is potential, which can be actualized through *sophrosyne* and “toil and expense” (cf. *Ol.* 5.16, *Isthm.* 1.42). I follow Rose, who argues for a

Despite his emphasis on Epharmostos' birth (*Ol.* 9.110: τόνδ' ἀνέρα δαίμονιά γεγάμεν "with divine help he was born"), Pindar, unusually, names neither the father of the victor nor acknowledges any family whatsoever. In a genre as concerned with family and identity as epinikian, the omission is striking and potentially troublesome for the rhetoric of epinikian praise.⁴

Family, via the father's name, was an element of the herald's proclamation—the *angelia*—and would have been announced after Epharmostos' victory.⁵ While Pindar's epinikians evoke the *angelia*,

specifically Pindaric use of φῦά, which is not an essential element of specific people, but an elite pride in birth from a particular *genos* or *oikos* (150–61). On the aristocratic belief that the qualities necessary for victory were inherited in only a few families, see Nicholson 212.

⁴ In only a few odes does Pindar not mention family members: *Ol.* 1, *Ol.* 4, *Ol.* 9, *Pyth.* 3, *Pyth.* 12, and *Isthm.* 3. In a number of these, the paternal and familial absence may be rationalized: the victor is either a ruler or politically or socially prominent and the ode focuses attention on them, or at any rate participates in a rather complex political context (*Ol.* 1 for Hieron; *Pyth.* 3 for Hieron); in another two cases the father's name appears in an earlier ode for the same victor, and perhaps familial self-identity had been fulfilled (Hieron's father's name appears in another ode as well: *Pyth.* 1.79; *Ol.* 4 for Psaumis of Kamarina, whose father Akron is named at *Ol.* 5.8, and his sons at 5.23; *Isthm.* 3 for Melissos of Thebes, whose father is named at *Isthm.* 4.45). *Pyth.* 12 praises the victory of Midas of Akragas in the *aulos* competition at the Pythian Games; significantly, it is the only extant ode to praise a victor in a musical contest. While Strauss-Clay suggests that the absence of Midas' father and family is explained by his professional standing as an *aulos* player (519), Maria Pavlou offers a convincing and subtle explanation that situates the absence of family in the context of Akragantine politics (2012, 83–87). She suggests that Midas' victory is an *agalma* for the city, since Akragas itself receives an extended encomium (*Pyth.* 12.1–5), and she argues that Midas' victory ode was commissioned by the then-ascendant Emmenidai (perhaps Theron himself), in order to stress their power, and to relate them to a celebration of Akragantine culture. Therefore *Pythian* 12 does not offer evidence that lower-status athletes (if, indeed, Midas was lower-status) would not celebrate their fathers, but rather indicates the potential utility of an epinikian victory to the political program of an aspiring tyrant.

⁵ The final element of victory in an athletic event in ancient Greece was the proclamation (*angelia*) by the herald appointed to the task; on which, see Wolicki 74–75; on the duties of heralds, see Crowther 191–93; Schadewaldt 16 already recognized the importance of the *angelia* to epinikian. While the proclamation itself was ephemeral, and some of

they freely include, exclude, or modify elements of the proclamation.⁶ The exclusion of a component of the *angelia* therefore serves as an opening for my analysis of *Olympian 9*: I explain here how Pindaric praise, particularly the praise of inherited ability, functions in an ode that omits a key component of epinikian poetics. Pindar, despite the ostensible absence of literal family in this ode, nonetheless still praises inherited excellence through a narrative of early Lokrian and Opuntian history. The Archaic and early Classical explanation of ethnic and civic history as genealogy permits Pindar to join such seemingly disparate concepts as inheritance, family lineage, and genealogy with ethnic descent and civic foundation.⁷ The *polis*, one component of the *angelia*, can replace family, another component, because of the conceiving of ethnic and civic identity as essentially genealogical. By recognizing the replacement of *oikos* by *ethnos* and *polis*, this paper highlights Pindar's commitment to the praise of $\varphi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ and inherited excellence and also the means through which Pindar sustains this commitment; moreover, the modification—in this case through omission—of the *angelia* reveals the ideology of Pindaric praise, its integration with a particular conception of identity and excellence, and the role of athletic victory and encomium in manufacturing a reality in which this ideology prevails.

In his analysis of the rhetorical and compositional strategies of *Olympian 9*, Andrew Miller emphasizes that the victor himself and the facts of athletic victory must have been the beginning of the epinikian composition.⁸ Since the father is absent in this poem, Miller assumes that Epharastos did not consider his father's name essential to his

the details unclear to us, 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 $\nu\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (Day 64).

⁶ Even outside of epinikian, athletic reality and heraldic representation can be at odds: e.g., Hdt. 6.103.2, which informs us that Kimon chose to have Peisistratos *proclaimed* as victor for political ends. Similar modifications may be part of Pindar's modulation of Hieron's identity through the metaphor of the herald at *Pyth.* 1.29–33.

⁷ On the aristocratic conviction in the persistence of traits through generations, see De la Torre 97–98.

⁸ Miller 113.

self-identity, even though this contradicts the contemporary understanding of the integration of family and individual.⁹ Maria Pavlou has also addressed the absence of the father from this ode, though she inquires into the commissioning process and concludes that it was a civic commission.¹⁰ Thus, my analysis complements those of Miller and Pavlou by adducing a contextualized understanding of praise in *Olympian 9*, especially insofar as it intersects with the ideology of athletic victory and the concomitant ideology of the elite classes who made up all known athletic victors in the fifth-century.¹¹

Although Epharmostos has no actual family worth mentioning in the ode (or which he wished to have mentioned), the song manufactures a lineage of great deeds through the telling and re-telling of history and mythology.¹² The establishment of *ethnos* and *polis* respectively is emphasized in the ode and functions to praise Epharmostos by placing him in a continuity of inheritance, modulated through civic and ethnic lineage. It is therefore in the two figures that complete great deeds—Deukalion and Opous—that we should look for the mythic parallels through which Pindar praises his patron, Epharmostos, and by which he creates a lineage of excellence.

⁹ On family as a component of individual selfhood, see Kurke (1991a) 289.

¹⁰ Pavlou 2012, 78–79.

¹¹ The class identity of athletes has been a source of major debate (see Pleket, Young; more recently, Christesen and Pritchard). Kyle's study of fifth-century Athens concludes that the only victors whose class can be ascertained are of the upper social classes (118–23); Golden concludes that athletics could be used as a way to move up in social class (on which, see Young 158), but that we have no evidence for any athlete of a lower class actually doing so (165). In any case, as Pleket points out, even after the population of athletes becomes more socially diverse in the Hellenistic period, the ideology of athletics remains aristocratic (71–76); considering the aristocratic monopoly on representation of any sort, we should not be surprised to discover an overwhelming majority of upper-class victors, regardless of the reality.

¹² The only other named historical individual who appears in the ode, Lampromachos (*Ol.* 9.82–84), has been explained as a family member by some of the scholiasts (*schol. ad* 9.125c), or as the *proxenos* of the Thebans by others (*schol. ad* 9.123a, 9.123c; see Pavlou 2012, 77). Since Pindar tends to prefer certain identification of family members (cf. Carey 1989, 2–3), Lampromachos is likely not a family member and thus actual family remains obscure in this ode.

Pindar's narrative in *Ol.* 9 is one of the earliest and most complete Lokrian myths.¹³ He begins from the flood, after which Deukalion and Pyrrha descend from Mount Parnassos to found a city and establish its autochthonous inhabitants (*Ol.* 9.43–46); then, the lineage of kings is renewed through the adoption of a son, Opous, descended directly from Zeus (*Ol.* 9.57–66), through whom the civic identity of the Opountians is established. In both cases, however, foundations are not straightforward. Standard Greek origin stories revolved around autochthony or migration,¹⁴ but in Pindar's narrative, migration is coupled with autochthony (Deukalion and Pyrrha) and hereditary inheritance is complicated by adoption (Opous)—a productive merger for representing Epharmostos' civic and ethnic genealogy.

Pindar turns to Deukalion and Pyrrha after his self-recrimination for the Herakles narrative. While the digression accords with Pindar's formal use of *Abbruchformeln*,¹⁵ the specific rationale for the inclusion of Herakles here has generated debate, and some have compared Herakles' stance against the gods (mortal versus immortal) with Epharmostos' victory at Marathon, when he was, according to Pindar, incorrectly placed in the "men's" category (*Ol.* 9.89–90).¹⁶ Though some audience members may have made this connection, the *Abbruchformel* here, as often, also allows Pindar to draw a connection through juxtaposition, where one is logically absent: Herakles' descent from Zeus and its consequent effect on his abilities (for the general principle of inherited ability and divine grace: *Ol.* 9.27–29; for the specific application to Epharmostos, see *Ol.* 9.100–104) is placed in close contact with the founding story of Opous and the Lokrians, in which Zeus will similarly play a major role and will bequeath abilities to Lokrian and Opountian progeny (*Ol.*

¹³ They appear in the *Catalogue of Ships* (*Il.* 2.527–35); in the fifth-century, Lokrians fought at Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.203) and were aligned with Sparta during the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.9.2). On Lokris in antiquity, see Fossey.

¹⁴ Hall 31–35.

¹⁵ Race (1990) 41–57.

¹⁶ Miller 128. Gerber (2002, 35) regards the comparison of Epharmostos and Herakles as un-Pindaric, since it would contradict the poet's standard piety (cf. *Ol.* 9.35–41; *Ol.* 1.35). Carey (1980) points out, persuasively, that Pindar may use a myth with potentially negative implications because he can end the myth easily, without it taking over the whole ode: "literary and religious feeling go hand in hand" (153).

9.56–65).¹⁷ By the end of the ode, the connection of divinity and ability is made clear in the latest generation, in the object of the ode’s praise, when Pindar observes that men do poorly ἄνευ δὲ θεοῦ (*Ol.* 9.103); Epharmostos’ divine favour acts as proof positive of his putative ethnic and civic ancestry, and the Herakles digression allows Pindar to produce evidence of this concept before he even properly begins the myth.

After this apparent interruption, Pindar commands himself to focus on his topic, which is “the city of Protogeneia” (*Ol.* 9.41–56)—the injunction directing audience attention to the object of the ode’s praise, as if by happenstance rather than poetic artifice—and he begins to construct Epharmostos’ lineage through the narrative of Lokrian ethnic foundation:¹⁸

φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας
 ἄσται γλώσσαν, ἴν’ αἰολοβρέντα Διὸς αἶσα
 Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε Παρνασσοῦ καταβάντε
 δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον, ἄτερ δ’ εὐνᾶς ὁμόδαμον
 45 κτισσάσθαι λίθινον γόνον·
 λαοὶ δ’ ὀνύμασθεν.
 ἔγειρ’ ἐπέων σφιν οἶμον λιγύν,
 αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ’ ὕμνων

νεωτέρων. λέγοντι μάν
 50 χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν
 ὕδατος σθένος, ἀλλά
 Ζηνὸς τέχναις ἀνάπτωιν ἐξαίφνας
 ἄντλον ἐλείν. κείνων δ’ ἔσαν
 χαλκάσπιδες ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι
 55 ἀρχᾶθεν, Ἰαπετιονίδος φύτλας
 κοῦροι κορᾶν καὶ φερτάτων Κρονιδᾶν,
 ἐγγώριοι 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.

¹⁷ Carey (1980) 151–52.

¹⁸ Pindar’s ability to mask his artifice in a disguise of orality has been called “oral subterfuge” (Carey 1981, 5).

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...

Here, Pindar briefly summarizes the end of the flood narrative, which left only Deukalion and Pyrrha alive atop Mount Parnassos. In his telling, the origin of the flood is left obscure, though Zeus' will is the clear cause of its cessation.¹⁹

Essential qualities, as in the Herakles episode, play a role in the introduction to the Lokrian—indeed, human—foundation myth. While the significance of 48–49 (“praise wine that is old, but the blooms of hymns / that are newer”) has been disputed, the phrase must make sense in the context of its performance and patron, not to mention in re-performance scenarios.²⁰ The contrast is perhaps best understood in terms of praising the essential qualities of things: antiquity in wine is best (e.g., Hom. *Od.* 2.340), whereas novelty in songs, at least in the context of this ode, is best. Here I am not arguing for a universal motif in Pindar, but rather, that in this ode in particular, which Pindar opens by stressing the novelty of his song (in contrast to the “Archilochus song,” *Ol.* 9.1), novelty in song is an important element;²¹ Pindar buttresses this contention—not self-

¹⁹ D'Alessio 220. On early evidence for the flood narrative, see Gerber (2002) 47. A scholion says that the flood was sent by Zeus because of the “pollution” resulting from the butchering of Pelops (*schol. ad Ol.* 9.78d). Much later, Ovid remarks that mankind's arrogance, violence, and contempt for the gods were to blame (*Met.* 1.161–62). 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.

²⁰ Gerber (2002) 45–47.

²¹ On the distinctions Pindar draws between his song and the “Archilochus song,” see Pavlou (2008) 541–45.

evident—by the comparison with wine.²² Since essential qualities generally play a major part in the praise of the victor (*Ol.* 9.100ff), the extension of this opinion to the song that praises that victor makes thematic sense and further strengthens the encomium. If the following myth is unconventional, or stresses unconventional aspects by focusing on the Lokrian and Opountian origin of humanity after the flood, then the statement serves as a self-reference to the poet's skill as well as being emphatic about one of the objects of the ode's praise.²³ When Pindar turns to the story of Lokrian and Opountian foundation, he foregrounds the connections among *ethnos*, *polis*, and Epharmostos (and strengthens his case for a continuity of inheritance), by asking “for them, a clear-sounding path of words” (*Ol.* 9.47): surely here we read a reference to the Lokrian ethnicity, since σφιν follows the riddling reference to their name (*Ol.* 9.45–46). Therefore, the whole of 48–49 serves as a transition and, via an abbreviated priamel, an explicit way to focus audience attention on the objects of the ode's praise: Epharmostos and his ancestors, i.e., the ethnicity of the Lokrians.²⁴

In the particular vocabulary used to describe the foundation of Opous, Pindar strives to construct a connection with his victor. Thus, the first human habitation following the destruction of the race comes about Διὸς αἴσα (“by decree of Zeus”, *Ol.* 9.42). αἴσα is a polyvalent 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 *Nem.* 3.16, Aristokleidas' strength in the *pankration* persists κατ' αἴσαν (“thanks to your [i.e., the Muses] favor”); at *Nem.* 6.13, Alkimidas' fortune at Nemea is expressly connected to Zeus' favor (Διόθεν αἴσαν “a fortune from Zeus”); in *Pyth.*

²² Compare the similar rhetorical strategy at work in the famous opening of *Ol.* 1, where a series of connected (analogical) elements are simply preeminent in their own spheres (Gerber 1982, 4–5).

²³ On the problem of knowing when Pindar is being unconventional, see Carnes 25. The novelty may well be the poem's performance, since it connects Epharmostos with Lokrian and Opountian history (per Pini 341). Furthermore, a cogent suggestion is that Pindar innovates with respect to the origin of the name “Opous” (from the adopted son, rather than an earlier child of Zeus and Protogeneia: see Pavlou 2008, 557). λέγοντι in these readings, adds veracity by framing the story – and the connection with Epharmostos – as a commonly held belief (Gerber 2002, 47).

²⁴ On the “two-term priamel” and a persuasive argument that “for them” refers to the Opountinas generally, see Miller 131.

10, it is κατ' αἴσαν (“duly”) that a living man sees his son crowned at the Pythian Games (10.25–26).²⁵ *Ol.* 9 points to the necessity of the favor of the gods (above all, Zeus) to athletic victory: ἀνευ δὲ θεοῦ, σεσιγαμένον / οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον (“but when god takes no part, each deed is no worse / for being left in silence”, 103–104; cf., *Ol.* 9.27–29). In fact, Zeus is one of the honorees of Epharmostos' ode (*Ol.* 9.6).²⁶ 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; it also works to elevate Epharmostos' athletic victory to the level of divinely-ordained civic and ethnic foundations. As Pindar describes it, these three instances are correlative, not through content, but through the *aition* for each, that is, divine will (and Zeus is particularly attuned to watching over Lokrian history, as this ode's mythic narrative demonstrates); therefore they are thematically contiguous despite the vast expanse of time.

The Lokrian foundation myth connects with the victor by stressing the possibility of constructing relations of inheritance even where they are strictly absent: Deukalion and Pyrrha are the founders of the Lokrian *ethnos*, but 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” (*Ol.* 9.45; cf. Str. 9.4.2). κτισσάσθαι λίθινον γόνον suggestively combines foundation language (κτίζω “to found”) with parentage (γόνος “offspring”), and blurs the line between strictly biological and ideological relationships respectively.²⁷ Deukalion and Pyrrha begin the replacement of *oikos* by *ethnos* and *polis*: their natural daughter, Protogeneia, evaporates into the city they found (*Ol.* 9. 41–42);²⁸ the λίθινοι λαοί

²⁵ On αἴσα, see Pfeijffer 626–30.

²⁶ D'Alessio 221.

²⁷ It also evokes Pindar's vocabulary for athletic inscriptions (cf. *Ol.* 7.86: ἐν Μεγάρουσιν τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα / ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον, “while in Megara the record in stone / tells no other tale”).

²⁸ 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 Ol.* 9. 62b, d; 9.79c, d; 9.81; see Gerber 2002, 49).

(“stone people”) are treated as if their children; the original inhabitants of Opous, their fellow-citizens, are also their descendants.

Pindar’s ambiguous diction emphasizes the blurring of *oikos* and *polis*. He describes the descendants of the λίθινοι λαοί: “from them came your ancestors of the bronze shields” (*Ol.* 9.53–54). The antecedent of κείνων has provoked much discussion among commentators ancient and modern, though rather than stress a specific meaning, ambiguity, as often, renders Pindar’s verse more, not less, understandable; ambiguity exists in the initial description of the “city of Protogeneia” and the parentage of the λίθινοι λαοί.²⁹ The understanding of ὑμέτεροι (*Ol.* 9.54) has proceeded along similarly fraught lines, though again, sensitivity to the theme of replacement and identity of *oikos*, *ethnos*, and *polis* in the ode provides some clarity.³⁰ ὑμέτεροι can refer to both Epharastos’ family and the Opountians generally because Epharastos’ family, as represented in the ode, are the Opountians (Epharastos is like one of his mythological antecedents, Opous, whose true “family” are the inhabitants of his eponymous city). Pindar’s verse, through mythic narrative and ambiguity completes a replacement of *oikos* by *ethnos* and *polis* in this first part of the Lokrian and Opountian myth: Deukalion’s natural daughter becomes an alternative name for a city that is populated by the descendants of the λίθινοι λαοί; the ancestry of Deukalion and Pyrrha becomes the generalized lineage of a “race” of Opountians, whether directly inherited—“always a native line of kings” (*Ol.* 9.56)—or not; genealogical relations are used as metaphors so that the κοῦροι of the daughters of Iapetos are a civic, as much as a familial, category.³¹

While the first foundation story of Opous begins the subsuming of *oikos* into *ethnos* and *polis*, the second foundation continues but also

²⁹ 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 (133); a scholion agrees with him and provides a genealogical framework (*schol. ad Ol.* 9.79c; see D’Alessio 222).

³⁰ Gerber wants the adjective to refer equally to Epharastos’ family and the Opountians more generally (2002, 48), whereas Miller argues for it as a description only of the Opountians (134).

³¹ On this last identification, see Gerber (2002) 49: the “sons from the daughters of Iapetos’ race” become, like the “sons of the Achaeans” (*Il.* 1.473, 2.562, 3.82, *et passim*), a shorthand political or geographic, rather than familial, description.

deepens and expands the replacement (*Ol.* 9.57–66), and, in doing so, continues to construct Epharmostos’ quasi-familial relations:

πρὶν Ὀλύμπιος ἀγεμὼν
 θύγατρ’ ἀπὸ γᾶς Ἐπει-
 ῶν Ὀπέεντος ἀναρπάσας, ἕκαλος
 60 μίχθη Μαιναλίαςιν ἐν δειραῖς, καὶ ἔνεικεν
 Λοκρῶ, μὴ καθέλοι νιν αἰὼν πότμον ἐφάψαις
 ὄρφανὸν γενεᾶς. ἔχεν δὲ σπέρμα μέγιστον
 ἄλοχος, εὐφράνθη τε ἰδὼν ἥρωος θετὸν υἷόν,
 μάτρως δ’ ἐκάλεσσε νιν
 65 ἰσώνυμον ἔμμεν,
 ὑπέρφατον ἄνδρα μορφᾶ τε καὶ
 ἔργοισι. πόλιν δ’ ὤπασεν λαόν τε διαιτᾶν.

until the lord of Olympos
 carried off the daughter of Opous
 from the land of the Epeians³² 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;³³
 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. In response to this, Zeus generates offspring for the people of Opous: the god absconds with a daughter of the king of the Epeians (the king is named Opous, but Pindar does not name the daughter) and presents the fruit of this encounter, a remarkable boy, to the childless king of Opous.³⁴

³² 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).

³³ ἔχεν (“bearing”) here must be taken to mean “pregnant with.”

³⁴ The identity of the unnamed daughter is much discussed: see Gerber (2002) 49–50, who cites Huxley, who argues that the unnamed daughter is the eponymous heroine of the town of Kaphyai, at the foot of Mount Mainalos. She is mentioned, though the name is corrupt, in a fragment of the Aristotelian work on *Constitutions* (F 561

In the second foundation story of the ode, especially considering it is the action of Zeus himself that brings about the rejuvenation of the Opountian line of kings (*Ol.* 9.59–61), Pindar establishes 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 intervention of Zeus. The parallel is strengthened when we consider that Deukalion and Opous are both newcomers to this land, and though it becomes their home, they are not natives. Zeus' act, 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, and the *oikos* of Opountian kings is defined through their political identity and their actions. The intervention of Zeus has manufactured a tradition of inheritance where, in strictly genealogical terms, none existed. A similar action by Zeus, of course, in the form of an Olympic victory, will, through Pindar's song, manufacture a tradition of inheritance for Epharmostos as well.

The naming of the son further emphasizes the political character of family identity in the ode. In the story of the adoption, naming is of primary importance, since the child born from the anonymous daughter of the king of the Epeians is named “the same name as the mother's father” (*Ol.* 9.63–64). This does not stray too far from historical Greek practice, but considering the child is adopted, it is unusual to locate his 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 (*Ol.* 9.58): Opous' name is performative of the civic identity of the Opountians themselves.

Deukalion and Pyrrha were closely correlated with the Lokrian *ethnos*, but Opous and his namesake city are almost identical; the rendering of Opous as “beyond description for his beauty and deeds” redounds onto the city itself (*Ol.* 9.65–66) and permits Pindar to use a commonplace of his praise of athletic victors, even from this ode (*Ol.* 9.94; also, *Ol.* 6.74–76; *Ol.* 8.19–20; *Nem.* 3.19). Opous' beauty and

Rose); Plutarch also refers to a Καβύη as the wife of Lokros and the mother of Opous (*Mor. Quaest. Graec.* 15). Specificity, however, does not seem to be necessary, since, in the course of the ode, 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.

immigrants continues the confusion of *oikos* and *polis*, since the people who arrive in Opous will be called from the name of their eponymous hero—Opountians—just as if they were family members.³⁸ 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 *Ol.* 9.70–79.³⁹ That the story obliquely appropriates Achilles is probably all the better when it comes to praise of the city of the Opountians, since the Opountian story is given pan-Hellenic significance, and Opous connected to the greatest of Greek heroes—particularly useful for a city with a poor athletic record and an association with a maligned epic character (the Lesser Ajax).⁴⁰

Through the telling of these myths and in the performance of the song, Pindar correlates the mythical and legendary foundations of *ethnos* and *polis* with the athletic victory of Epharmostos. This correlation 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 epinikian 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; Opous' rather poor athletic record is rehabilitated too, since Epharmostos' deed, though in reality at the Olympic Games, is in this divine story on the level of civic and ethnic foundation—or the foundation of the human race altogether.⁴¹ Pindar's

³⁸ Compare above with the description of the race of Lokrians as the κοῦροι of Deukalion and Pyrrha's line; the correlation of Opous' name with the name of the city makes Opountian civic nomenclature a sort of patronymic.

³⁹ On the identification of a parallel with Patroklos for Epharmostos, see Gerber (2002) 12.

⁴⁰ On the formal features of the catalogue of immigrants that emphasize Patroklos, see Race (1989) 50. This praise, however, is subsumed into the category of city praise, since Patroklos' greatness reflects onto Opous. The inclusion of Patroklos and Achilles is perhaps a necessity for Opous, given its association only with the Lesser Ajax, a personage Pindar includes at the poem's end (*Ol.* 9.112), on whom see Pavlou (2012) 79–80.

⁴¹ Prior to Epharmostos' victory, Opous could claim only two other Olympic victors: Nikeas (Moretti no. 150; ca. 500 BC, boxing) and Rhexibios (Moretti no. 119; ca. 536 BC, *stadion*; cf. Paus. 6.18.7).

poem, therefore, participates in the ideological elevation of athletics—an activity primarily performed by elite men in the fifth-century, especially at the pan-Hellenic level—to the level of city and ethnic foundations—activities, which, although performed by those same elite men, bring tangible benefits to the community of citizens. Athletic victory is given the appearance of providing benefits to the community through analogy with civic and ethnic foundation.⁴²

The story of Opous makes this analogy, and concurrently the ideology, transparent. For example, the origin of Opous' mother, from Elis, presages the similar arrival of Epharostos from Elis, in possession of an Olympic victory.⁴³ Whereas the arrival of Opous rejuvenates the royal line of the city and sparks the influx of immigrants who come to marvel at the semi-divine ruler, the arrival of Epharostos with his Olympic victory similarly exalts the city of Opous, and reactivates its ancient connection to Elis (*Ol.* 9.16–20). Pindar draws an explicit connection between the immigrants who come to marvel at Opous and the victories that Epharostos brings in tow with his triumph at Olympia: foreigners come from Argos, Thebes, Arkadia, Aigina, and Pisa (*Ol.* 9.67–70). In the victory catalogue that follows, each of the victories comes from a contest held in these same areas: Argos (*Ol.* 9.88), the Lykaia and Pellene in Arkadia (*Ol.* 9.95–98), the Ioleia in Boeotia, and of course, Olympia, which corresponds to Pisa.⁴⁴ We might understand the list of immigrants and the victory catalogue here in the same structural relationship as lists of clan and individual victories in other odes; when Pindar hopes to be suitably “creative” (εὐρησιεπής; *Ol.* 9.80), he gestures to the internal creativity of a performance that manipulates epinikian convention for novel effect.⁴⁵ By the time the catalogue has been recited, Pindar's subtle

⁴² Cities granted rewards to athletic victors, especially at the pan-Hellenic games, which implies a belief (perhaps a politically expedient belief) in the reality of the benefits that a city gained from association with a victor (e.g., at Athens, see Plu. *Solon* 23.3). On the “talismanic quality” of athletic victory, see Kurke (1993). Many critics—following Kurke (1991)—have remarked on epinikian's propensity to reintegrate the victor into his family, social class, and political community (see, with this ode in mind, Pavlou 2012, 79–80).

⁴³ On which, see D'Alessio 227; Gerber (2002) 50; Miller 132.

⁴⁴ On these festivals, see Gerber (2002) 60–64.

⁴⁵ Cf. Pavlou (2008) 561.

words have approximated athletic victories and ancient immigration, and thus Epharmostos' victory does, contrary to appearances, celebrate and renew the κλέος of family—a ideological family to be sure, 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 and 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 telling of the story of ethnic and civic foundation; 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, *ethnos*, and the human race. Replacement and identification during the singing of the ode develop the putative and metaphorical civic and ethnic lineage into an actual one. Regardless of the impossibly obscure commissioning process, 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* 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” (*Ol.* 9.20); after all, Pindar enjoins his chorus to αἰνήσαυ ἔ καὶ υἷόν (“praise the son and his city,” *Ol.* 9.14).

In *Olympian* 9, Pindar uses genealogically imagined ethnic and civic identity to effect a family for his victor, in place of—we must reasonably assume—his actual family. Through the imagining of ethnic and civic history as genealogy, the performance of the ode effectively generates a lineage for Epharmostos at the same time as it recalls the legendary history of Opous and integrates a current Lokrian into the illustrious past. The establishment of this quasi-familial relationship and the replacement of *oikos* by *polis* and *ethnos* are not, especially in the context of a memorial to athletic victory, neutral or benign developments.⁴⁶ Nigel Nicholson remarks that victory memorials bear witness to an ideological contest over the nature of nobility, athletics, and victory in the fifth century: “they are

⁴⁶ On “aristocratic temporality” and the use of the past to justify the present, especially ideologically, see De la Torre 98–100.

no unmediated reflections of reality, but attempts to corral that reality down certain interested paths” (16). The end of the ode is revelatory, when Pindar declares $\phi\nu\acute{\alpha}$ “altogether best” (*Ol.* 9.100). He confidently asserts that a relationship of inheritance has been established for his *laudandus*, and he commands any would-be herald to include divinity, in-born excellence, and the physical attributes of his victor (*Ol.* 9.108–111)—all characteristics he has obtained from his ideological family. While the ode excludes an odious component of the actual *angelia* (i.e., Epharmostos’ real, though athletically—or otherwise—unacceptable, father), by the end of the poem, Pindar commands a herald to include fictitious categories of seemingly natural and inherited characteristics.

Pindar’s conclusion, however, opens as many doors as it closes. While I have read here an ideological argument for inherited excellence, even absent actual excellence in lineage, Pindar’s rhetoric suggests—it seems—that *anyone* could claim inherited excellence simply by appealing to civic and ethnic mythology. Indeed, as early as the seventh century, Tyrtaios claims special descent for the Spartan kings (2.13 *IEG*²) and a generalized—though still special—descent for the Spartiates (11.1 *IEG*²). While in some *poleis* (such as Athens), social class was contained and defined by civic law, aristocratic status more generally is a mark of lineage, and here we might read a broad-based access to “aristocracy,” or at least inherited excellence by virtue of citizenship.⁴⁷

Pindar, however, rather incredibly allows his victors to have it both ways. The ode celebrates a broad-based excellence in Opous’ citizenry at the same time as it valorizes the current incarnation of that excellence; Pindar effectively reintegrates his victor into his community, and, what is more, he makes the victor a manifestation of a particularly Opountian quality. Any egalitarian impulse, however, is contained by the very act of epinikian poetics: Pindar seemingly enacts a structure in which excellence is broadly available, but he effaces *his own role* in the production of Epharmostos’ excellence.⁴⁸ Whatever Epharmostos’ social class and family lineage, he can be represented as the inheritor of an Opountian

⁴⁷ On the consequences of Athenian sumptuary legislation on athletics at Athens, see Pritchard.

⁴⁸ Pindar recognizes his role as a praise poet throughout the ode (*Ol.* 9.21–29; 41–42; 80–85), but Epharmostos’ excellence is portrayed as something Pindar must simply reveal (*Ol.* 9.99: a silent tomb bears witness after all), not something to be generated by encomium.

tradition of excellence only through Pindar's song. The poem portrays an ideal of civic communality and egalitarianism—it motions in the same direction as Tyrtaios' Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικῆτου γένος ἔσθε ("for you are the race of unconquered Herakles"; *IEG*² 11.1)—but the reality of epinikian poetics means (regardless of the commissioning scenarios) that Pindar's ethnic and civic biography and his creation of an ideological lineage for Epharmostos is by its nature limited, and excludes the majority of the population (in fact, any collective). While the poet enjoins us to celebrate the city and person, Opous and Epharmostos, it is only Epharmostos who is named, and only Epharmostos' connection to the mythic and legendary lineage that is stressed. Even if Pindar gestures towards an egalitarian sort of aristocracy in Opous, this possibility is immediately foreclosed by the genre of epinikian and the reality of its performance.

Performance is central to the ode, since Epharmostos' status is established in performance. While aspects of that status might appear to be open to the Opountian population through a broadly-conceived civic and ethnic mythology, status is celebrated for a particular athlete by assimilating him to the traditional definitions of the closed aristocracy: birth and a focus on outward—inherited—characteristics (Epharmostos' outward form has revealed, we are told [*Ol.* 9.94], his lineage in the past, even as the song constructs both the lineage and that past). Therefore, through a close analysis of the contemporary ideology of athletics, epinikian poetics, and the specifics of this ode's mythic narrative, the rhetoric at the heart of Pindar's poem becomes clear: the myths of descent and community structure the praise of the ode and reveal a tradition of inherited excellence, but the focus on the person of Epharmostos and the exclusivity of song mean that Pindar celebrates *another* aristocrat—in the traditional mold, a descendent, a benefactor, an athlete—not another type of aristocracy.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND MODERN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURES
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
PETER.MILLER@TTU.EDU

WORKS CITED

- Carey, C. "Three Myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3," *Eranos* 78 (1980): 151–52.
- . *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8.* New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- . "Prosopographica Pindarica." *CQ* 39.1 (1989): 1–9.
- Carnes, J. S. "Why Should I Mention Aiakos? Myth and Politics in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 [Part I]." *QUCC* 51.3 (1995): 7–48.
- Christesen, P. *Sport and Democracy in the Ancient and Modern World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Crowther, N. *Athletika: Studies on the Olympic Game and Greek Athletics.* Frankfurt: Weidmann, 2004.
- D'Alessio, G. B. "Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry." In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, edited by R. Hunter, 217–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Day, J. W. "Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual." *HSCP* 96 (1994): 37–74.
- De la Torre, E. "Les mentions généalogiques chez Pindare." *Kernos* 19 (2006): 97–111.
- Drachmann, A.B. *Scholiam Vetera in Pindari Carmina.* Vols. 1-3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1927.
- Fossey, J. M. *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris.* Amsterdam: Brill, 1990.
- Gerber, D. E. *Pindar's Olympian 1: A Commentary.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- . *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.
- Golden, M. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hall, J. *Hellenicity: between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hubbard, T.K. *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry.* Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Kurke, L. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- . "Fathers and Sons: A Note on Pindaric Ambiguity." *AJP* 112.3 (1991a): 287–300.

- . “The Economy of *kudos*.” In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, edited by C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, 131-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Kyle, D. *Athletes in Ancient Athens*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Miller, A. “*Inventa componere*: Rhetorical Process and Poetic Composition in Pindar’s *Ninth Olympian Ode*.” *TAPA* 123 (1993): 109–47.
- Moretti, L. *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1957.
- Nicholson, N. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pavlou, M. “Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar *Olympian 9*.” *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008): 533–67.
- . “Fathers *in absentia* in Pindar’s Epinician Poetry.” *GRBS* 52 (2012): 57–88.
- Pfeijffer, I. L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: a Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III and Pythian VIII*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Pini, G. “Correzioni di miti in Pindaro.” *Vichiana* 4 (1967): 339–82.
- Pleket, H. W. “Games, Prizes, Athletes, and Ideology.” *Stadion* 1 (1976): 49–89.
- Pritchard, D. *Sport, Democracy, and War in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Race, W. H. “Climactic Elements in Pindar’s Verse.” *HSCPh* 92 (1989): 43–69.
- . *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar’s Odes*. Atlanta: Scholar’s Press, 1990.
- . *Pindar*. Vols. 1-2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Rose, P.W. *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Schadewaldt, W. *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*. Halle, 1928.
- Slater, W. J. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969.
- Snell, B. and H. Maehler. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Vols. 1–2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987.
- Strauss Clay, J. “Pindar’s Twelfth *Pythian*: Reed and Bronze.” *AJP* 113.4 (1992): 519–25.
- Wolicki, A. “The Heralds and the Games in Archaic and Classical Greece.” *Nikephoros* 15 (2002): 69–97.
- Young, D.C. *The Olympic Myth of Amateur Greek Athletics*. Chicago: Ares, 1984.