Journal of Hellenic Studies 137 (2017) 142–162 doi:10.1017/S0075426917000118

PINDAR'S VOICES: MUSIC, ETHICS AND REPERFORMANCE

TOM PHILLIPS
*Merton College, Oxford**

Abstract: This article analyses monodic reperformance of epinicians in the fifth century BC and argues that the musical and ethical dimensions of such performances were mutually reinforcing. Reperformances by solo singers would have strongly foregrounded the agency of the individual performer, while also enacting his understanding of musical conventions. This relationship forms a structural parallel with the function of ethical statements in epinicians, which are usually conventional in terms of their conceptual content and yet also emphasize the agency of individuals in responding to them. I argue that the parallelism between ethics and monodic reperformance is an important thematic strand in *Nemean* 4 and *Isthmian* 2, and prefigures the responses that the poems elicit from audiences.

Keywords: Pindar, epinician, monody, gnomai, symposium

One of the most prominent trends in recent epinician scholarship has been the move towards a more temporally diffuse notion of performance. Although the 'premiere' remains an object of scholarly interest, critics have paid increasing attention to the role of subsequent 'reperformances' in the poems' dissemination.[1] Interpretation of reperformances has tended to emphasize their social function in asserting and perpetuating the victor's fame, and as generating 'symbolic capital' for the victor and his family.[2] This article addresses the reperformance of epinicians by monodists and argues that such performances would have accentuated the role of performers as individuated ethical agents.

In pursuing the question of what makes monodic performances of such poems distinctive,[3] I focus on how epinicians dramatize the formation of subjectivity and use the *laudandus* and the *persona loquens* to call for an ethical response from listeners. Although they are also present when the poems are performed chorally, these dynamics are brought to the fore by solo performances, which both embody and evoke an individuated response to the poems. Relatedly, a crucial feature of the poems' function lies in the interpretative responses they invite. My readings see the epinicians not so much as bestowing praise on victors, in the sense of simply encouraging listeners to respond positively to them, as enacting a celebration of the system of values within which victories are understood and elic-

* thomas.phillips@merton.ox.ac.uk. I am grateful to Armand D'Angour, Tim Rood and the journal's referees for their comments on this article.

[1] Some important contributions to the debate over reperformance include Morgan (1993) 10–15; Carey (1995) 85–90; Loscalzo (2003); Currie (2004); Morrison (2007); (2012). The vocabulary of '*re*performance' is in some respects unhelpful, in that it inscribes a notion of secondariness or belatedness, even as the critical gesture of focusing on such performances attempts to challenge the prioritization of the 'premiere'. Far from committing to such a notion of secondariness, my readings will argue that monodic reperformances are formally and ethically distinctive.

[2] See, for example, Morrison (2012) 114; Clear (2013) 34–35.

[3] The debate over monodic versus choral performance of epinicians (for which see, for example, Heath (1988) and Lefkowitz (1988), both arguing that monodic performance was the norm, with the counter arguments of Carey (1989); Currie (2005) 16–18 provides a useful overview and further bibliography) has given way to a consensus that most of the odes were probably performed chorally in the first instance, with subsequent solo reperformance at symposia and elsewhere (see, for example, Morrison (2012) 111, n. 3). My focus here should not be taken as implying that monodic singing was the only possible conduit for reperformance, however; for the possibility of choral performances subsequent to the 'premiere' see, for example, Loscalzo (2003) 116–18; Currie (2004) 55–69; Hubbard (2004) 75–76; Morrison (2011) 233, n. 20 with further references.

iting reflection on these values.[4] My argument falls into four main parts. After presenting an overview of how Pindar's gnomai foreground individual response, I analyse the relationship between gnomai and monodic reperformance, and discuss how music contributes to the 'embodied ethics' of solo singing. I then explore some specific manifestations of these features in *Nemean* 4 and *Isthmian* 2.

I. Individuals, groups and gnomai

Most recent Pindaric criticism, and scholarship on early Greek performance culture in general, has tended to conceptualize response to poetry as a communal phenomenon.[5] This emphasis reflects a concern with the social functions of early Greek poetry; strategies such as appeasing a deity, constructing and affirming a group identity or validating the exemplary force of an athletic victory have an obvious importance to the communities within and through which they took place. The chorus is a communal medium, readily understood both as an idealizing synecdoche for the community and a projection of the shared response it demands.[6] The symposium, the most frequently utilized performance setting in Archaic and Classical Greece, set individual performers in relation to a responding group and seems to have placed a premium on the group's regulation and acceptance of the individual.[7] While the general importance of communal groups to the performance culture of this period is indisputable,[8] my aim in this article is to analyse two related features of Pindar's appeal to listeners qua individual interpretative agents and to explore their consequences. Focusing on *Nemean* 4 and *Isthmian* 2, I shall explore how figures within the text act as models for audience response.[9] Although the poems differ in their respective emphasis on the musical and ethical aspects of these figures' agency, I shall argue that in each case the figures emphasize the idea of the poem as a dialogue with individual listeners.[10]

[4] *Cf.* Silk (2007) 196. My approach challenges the notion of epinician's 'social function', as influentially elaborated by Kurke (1991) 1 (and see next note), and emphases such as those of Burnett (2005) 240, which see epinicians as transforming audiences into 'a single recipient of pleasure and shared illumination'. I argue that epinician's social affectivity resides as much as in giving rise to reflections on the meaningfulness of its conceptual frameworks as in persuading its listeners to act or think in a certain way.

[5] Highly influential in Pindaric studies has been the formulation of Kurke (1991) 258 that 'the poet negotiates with the community on behalf of the returning victor. To ease the victor's acceptance by various segments of the audience, the poet dramatizes shared representations, portraying the victor as ideal citizen and aristocrat'; the communal aspect of epinician is also stressed in, for example, Crotty (1983). Representative of the 'ritual poetics' approach to audiences is Kowalzig (2007), especially 37, 53–55; see also Kurke (2005). Morrison (2007) analyses the variations in Pindar's epinician audiences, while Fearn (2011) focuses on the cultural and political specificity of Pindar's Aeginetan poetry with an emphasis on its local reception.

[6] On the chorus in tragedy as an 'ideal spectator' *cf.*, for example,Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1972) 27; for critical responses, see Gould (1996); Goldhill (1996). For a useful recent overview of this debate, see Gagné and Hopman (2013) 25–28. For the educative role of the chorus in Plato's *Laws*, see Calame (2013) 94–99; for the chorus in the *Laws* more generally, see the essays in Peponi (2013) 87–239.

[7] See most recently Wecowski (2014) 74–77, 121–24 with further references.

[8] My analyses share some ground with communitarian notions of selfhood; such accounts tend to emphasize the intersubjective nature of the individual self, arguing that individuals' fields of action and notions of themselves are constituted in large part by their relations to others: see, for example, Sandel (1998) 62–63; Farenga (2006) 18–19. As such, they bear certain similarities with how individuals are pictured in epinician, which emphasizes how actants operate within a social contexture of behavioural and motivational norms rather than as self-grounding agents. However, the act of performance creates a virtualized identity that does not simply analogize the social self. Moreover, the volitionary aspect of individual engagement with the poems is also crucial.

[9] Audience response is modelled by internal figures in other poems; see next note for remarks about *Ol.* 1. What makes *Nem.* 4 and *Isthm.* 2 distinctive is the salience of Timocritus, Xenocrates and Nicasippus as models.

[10] Although my focus here falls on individual respondents, I do not propose a radical cleavage between individual and collective in Pindar's poetry. On the contrary, Pindar situates individual response in social terms. We see a particularly subtle example of this in *Ol.* 1, where the 'envious neighbours' of *Ol.* 1.47, responsible for spreading the false myth about Pelops (27–29, 36–51), act as a negative paradigm for group response, by means of which Pindar diagnoses the kind of motivations that generate false stories: see further Scodel (2001); Park (2013) 27–30. But the passage also prompts listeners to consider their responses to *Ol.* 1 in relation to their roles

My second major claim is that the monodic reperformance of epinicians both instantiated and demanded an individuated response to the poem in question, and that this response carried both an ethical and interpretative charge. Before examining these claims in relation to the two poems, however, some general reflections on both the idea of the individual listener and the monodic reperformance scenario are in order. As moments at which individual ethical agency is prominent, gnomai provide a helpful starting point for considering the relationship between these features. Gnomic passages have often been analysed in relation to their role in articulating poetic arguments,[11] but their frequent reference to a generalized individual figure, the so-called 'gnomic τις', also makes them a crucial part of how the poems call on responses from individuals.[12]

We can see this process at work at *Pyth.* 11.55–58, where the speaker, having 'censured the condition of tyrannies' (53) and commended shared achievements (54), says that 'if a man has won the peak and dwelling there in peace has avoided dire insolence (αἰνὰν ὕβριν / ἀπέφυγεν), he would go to a more noble bourne of black death, having given his sweetest offspring … the grace of a good name.' While these lines apply primarily to the victor,[13] the generalizing force of εἴ τις underlines the passage's wider applicability: avoiding *hybris* and passing on 'the grace of a good name' (εὐώνυμον … χάριν) are actions, and imply a wider ethical comportment, to which all Greeks would be expected to aspire. Gnomai often stress human limitations, as at *Pyth.* 3.103–04: 'if any mortal understands the way of truth, he must be happy with what good the blessed gods allot him' (εἰ δὲ νόῳ τις ἔχει θνατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων / τυγχάνοντ' εὖ πασχέμεν). These lines articulate a general proposition, and occur as part of an extended series of ethical reflections (103–11), but stress that understanding is located in individuals (τις ἔχει … ἀλαθείας ὁδόν). A similar situation occurs at the end of *Isthmian* 7, where a series of gnomic reflections on 'all men dying alike' (42: θνάσκομεν γὰρ ὁμῶς ἅπαντες) and the inequality of fortune (43: δαίμων δ' ἄϊσος) concludes with the statement 'if a man peers at distant things, he is too little to reach the gods' bronze-paved dwelling' (43–44: τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις / παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν). The focus on individual action continues in the following lines, which present a vignette of Bellerophon's vain attempt on Olympus (44–47). Such use of individuals as negative exempla is common in Pindar,[14] and although these figures have specific functions in the contexts in which they occur, they share with the gnomic passages just mentioned an emphasis on ethical conduct being as much an individual as a social matter.

Scholars have often noted that these passages appeal to understandings of ethical conduct familiar from earlier stages of Greek poetry; many of Pindar's gnomic statements have varyingly proximate antecedents in Homer, Hesiod and the Theognidean corpus.[15] However, we should not understand these gnomic formulations simply as the reflection of pre-existing and definitively established cultural norms.[16] In a recent discussion of Pindar's ethical discourse, Payne argues that

as agents within different types of collectives. It is specified that the false story originated with 'one of the envious neighbours [speaking] in secret' (*Ol.* 1.47: ἔννεπε κρυφᾷ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων). The implication, reinforced by the reference to 'slanderers' at 53 (ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους), is that the 'neighbours' in general were responsible for spreading the story, so the collective action reflects and extends that of the τις. *Cf.* also *Ol.* 1.64, 82 for uses of τις in ethical contexts.

[11] See, for example, Stenger (2004) on gnomai in Bacchylides.

[12] A distinction should be noted between the passages I discuss here and references that bear more closely on the *laudandus*' achievement: *cf.*, for example, *Ol.* 6.11, *Pyth.* 8.73, *Isthm.* 6.10–11. These passages have a narrower range of reference, but can still be understood as generating a generalizing force in which athletic victory operates as a heightened and idealized form of achievement.

[13] *Cf.* Finglass (2007) 121.

[14] See, for example, Tantalus (*Ol.* 1), Ixion (*Pyth.* 2), Coronis (*Pyth.* 3) and Polydectes (*Pyth.* 12). On negative exempla in Pindar, see, for example, Young (1971) 37–38; Most (1985) 76–86; Finglass (2007) 42–43.

[15] For an overview of Pindar's gnomai, see Boeke (2007) 24–28.

[16] Payne (2006) 162 on the cultural critical paradigm of poetry 'reflect[ing] back to its audience what it already knows and believes'. This approach sees Archaic poetry as involving 'the recirculation of pre-existing paradigms' (Payne (2006) 162), rather than as prompting interpretative reflection, and is grounded in the notion of audiences

the poet's claims about the world are not self-sufficient statements capable of being tested against an exterior reality, but rather ways of opening up sites of ethical reflection.[17] They are 'orientated towards the future', in that they require acceptance and extension by individual listeners.[18] Payne describes the famous statement νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς (fr. 169a.1) as 'a provisional assertion designed to advance ethical thought': the fact that it is not verifiable does not affect its value as an incitement to reflection. This statement is an instance of the wider 'future-orientation' of Pindar's ethical discourses, which Payne characterizes as

> not grounded in beliefs, practices, or texts outside the poem in which it appears, nor, in its universality … intended to be operative solely in its immediate performance context. Instead, it invites listeners or readers to make use of it to understand and act in their own world. The poet's concern is not to formulate a system of morality that rests on verifiable principles, or that could be totalized as a consistent set of paradigms, but to provide a repository of thought that can be brought along to the changing circumstances of everyday life and be helpful there.[19]

Although Payne's primary interest is in 'truth claims', such as νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς, I suggest that his model is also useful for thinking about gnomic statements and the resonances that these statements have when in scenarios of monodic reperformance.

A striking feature of the gnomic statements discussed above is that they foreground conditionality. In doing so, I suggest, they produce a striking form of 'future orientation'. Lines such as εἰ δὲ νόῳ τις ἔχει θνατῶν ἀλαθείας ὁδόν, χρὴ πρὸς μακάρων / τυγχάνοντ' εὖ πασχέμεν function as open propositions, creating a space of possibility and decision which invites listeners to 'make use of [the gnomai] to understand and act in their own world'. Gnomic statements also often emphasize the risks attendant on human action. The conditionality of statements such as 'if a man peers at distant things' (*Isth.* 7.43) and 'if a man has … avoided dread insolence' (*Pyth.* 11.55–56) resonates in the world outside the text, implying the continuing possibility of men's actions going astray, and hence demanding an interpretative and lived response from listeners that takes account of this possibility. Another feature of these conditional statements is that they enact moments of ethical comportment, representing the kind of reflections in which men ought to be immersed in the course of their actions: phrases such as 'if a man peers at distant things, he is too little to reach …' anticipate concrete situations in which individuals will act as well articulating the general conditions within which such actions will occur. By dramatizing and holding open such moments, gnomai allow listeners to reflect on their conditions of possibility. The suspendedness of the τις also contributes to this process; as an open subject position in the process of being formed and

in oral cultures as incapable of complex interpretative engagement with performance poetry: see, for example, the influential discussion of Gentili (1988) 39–40; also Kurke (1991) 258 for a similar conception of epinician audiences. For criticism of this position, see Payne (2006) 162, n. 6; also Thomas (2012).

[17] For the pragmatic grounds of his reading, *cf.* Payne (2006) 161–63. It should be noted that Payne's model is not inconsistent with Pindar's use of the language of ἀλήθεια and the role of truth claims in his poetry, for which see, for example, Komornicka (1972); Park (2013) 18–20. Rather, Payne's analysis deals with a different aspect of Pindar's poetics.

[18] Payne (2006) 164–65.

[19] This develops the position of Fränkel (1973) 488: 'the values in which Pindar believed were no otherwordly abstractions; they had to be fulfilled and realized in life'. *Cf.* Boeke (2007) 14, analysing proverbs from a different perspective. Payne's analysis may be helpfully contrasted with the notion of the 'scripts' acted out by individuals in the performance of social identity: see, for example, Goldhill (1999). Farenga (2006) 8 defines a script as 'a fixed, stereotypical representation of knowledge incorporating a sequence of actions, speech acts, and situations'. Oaths are one prominent example of such 'scripts': see, for example, Sealey (1994) 95–100; Kozak (2014) 213–29 on oaths in Homer; Sommerstein (2014) 83–85 on oaths sworn in civic contexts. On oaths in political life generally see, for example, Rhodes (2007). The ethical propositions on which Payne focuses are less contextually defined and more conceptually open than civic oaths. They are also more reliant on *actualization* in the subsequent conduct of the individual listener/actant, whereas an oath's performative quality is located in the speech act itself: see Farenga (2006) 27.

which exists solely in relation to putative actions, rather than a realized self with individuated properties, the figure draws attention to how subjects are shaped by their implication in decisions. In addition to invoking ethical norms, therefore, such passages dramatize the processes of negotiation, conflict and risk by which individual subjects are constituted as ethical actors.

II. Musical ethics

Gnomic passages can fruitfully be conceptualized in relation to an understanding of texts as events of meaning, the significational force of which is unfolded in the acts of emotional and interpretative response to which they give rise.[20] In responding to a given text, individual respondents find their preconceptions and modes of response transformed or adjusted in various ways. Pindar's innovative handling of myths and his complex engagement with poetic predecessors, especially Homer, often require listeners to be as self-aware about their role in responding to stories as Pindar is about telling them.[21] Yet as moments of opening or possibility that the responding subject confronts,[22] gnomic passages instantiate this call on and formation of individual subjectivity in a particularly pointed way, explicitly foregrounding ethical challenges and highlighting the role of the individual in responding to them.[23] Monodic reperformance likewise dramatizes an individual commitment and response to the poem on the part of the performer, while also enacting the poem's projection of a subject.[24] In creating a dialogue between a solo performer and an audience, this scenario instantiates and brings to the fore epinician's appeal to individual subjectivities more insistently than choral performances.[25] Gnomic passages are therefore both usefully synoptic of the ethical force generated by this performance scenario[26] and moments which, during such a reperformance, would have had a particular self-reflexive force.

Yet these songs were bodily as much as intellectual acts, and their concrete realization through voice, gesture and instrumentation was also crucial in distinguishing choral and monodic performances. In the former, voices are blended into a collective utterance, with the result that individual singers' vocal idioms are less noticeable. Although our evidence for choral rehearsals is minimal, it seems a reasonable assumption that either the poet or a chorus trainer acting as his proxy would have superintended the process,[27] presumably exerting considerable control over the melody and other musical features. Monodic performance, by contrast, puts the focus squarely on an individual's idiomatic realization of the poem, and its success is much more obviously dependent on

[20] Attridge (2004) 58–59 discusses the way in which readers of a literary text experience 'a reformulation of existing norms … which opens new possibilities of meaning and feeling'. In the case of how Pindar's listeners respond to gnomai, I would argue that this 'reformulation' happens not in terms of fundamental conceptual reorientation, but in the relation between the text's projection of a subject and its assumption by the individual listener.

[21] On Pindar's use of myth as a means of reflecting on the role of storytelling itself, see, for example, Most (1985) 184–85; Park (2013) 30–35 (on *Nem.* 7); Scodel (2001).

[22] 'Responding subject' here applies equally to listener and performer.

[23] We may contrast the way Pindar usually leaves the relations between myths and frames implicit, creating gaps that must be bridged by listeners/readers. Representative are *Ol.* 1, *Pyth.* 11 and *Nem.* 1: for debate ancient and modern over the function of the myth(s) in these poems, see respectively Köhnken (1974); Cairns (1977); Howie (1984); Griffith (1989); and Braswell (1992) 56; Finglass (2007) 34–47 and Kurke (2013) 108, both with extensive bibliography; the useful overview of Catenacci et al. (2013) 14–17.

[24] This is not to say that the elicitation of individual interpretation and ethical response would not have been at work in choral performances, but that this emphasis would have been stronger when poems were performed monodically: see below for further comment on this issue in relation to *Isthm.* 2.

[25] In this sense, the monodic performer as an idealized respondent forms a counterpart to the chorus as an idealized embodiment of communal response to the victor. For comments on the relation between Pindar qua author and a solo reperformer, see Morrison (2007) 34.

[26] Although I shall argue below that the effects generated by the use of named individuals such as Timocritus and Xenocrates differ in certain respects from those created by the gnomic τις. I should also make clear that my analyses are directed primarily at reperformances occurring in the years immediately succeeding a given 'premiere': see n. 47 below.

[27] On choral training at Athens, see Wilson (2000) 81–86.

his musical and vocal skills. Far from being of merely formal significance, however, musical elements will have inflected audiences' responses to reperformances as ethical events. The significance of these inflections will become clearer when we consider the specific cultural background against which these performances took place.

The men responsible for such performances, mostly aristocrats, would have received a musical training as part of their education.[28] Although the precise nature of this training is unclear, it seems likely that it would have entailed learning how to play stringed instruments such as the lyre and how to sing (parts of) the Homeric poems.[29] A musical training was an indicator of social status and paralleled other modes of sophisticated social comportment mobilized at symposia as means of aristocratic self-display.[30] But music was also commonly understood in this period to carry a distinctive ethical charge. Damon of Oa's famous statement, paraphrased by Socrates in the *Republic*, that 'never are musical styles changed without changing the most important rules of the city' (*Resp.* 424c: οὐδαμοῦ γὰρ κινοῦνται μουσικῆς τρόποι ἄνευ πολιτικῶν νόμων τῶν μεγίστων) testifies to a perception of a fundamental connection between musical structures and those of the social world that is widespread in Greek culture.[31] Another instance of this thinking is found at *Resp.* 401d, where Socrates claims that music is the 'most powerful training' (κυριωτάτη … τροφή) because of the effect it has on the soul:

> ἆρ' οὖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὦ Γλαύκων, τούτων ἕνεκα κυριωτάτη ἐν μουσικῇ τροφή, ὅτι μάλιστα καταδύεται εἰς τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς ὅ τε ῥυθμὸς καὶ ἁρμονία, καὶ ἐρρωμενέστατα ἅπτεται αὐτῆς φέροντα τὴν εὐσχημοσύνην, καὶ ποιεῖ εὐσχήμονα, ἐάν τις ὀρθῶς τραφῇ, εἰ δὲ μή, τοὐναντίον;
>
> 'In that case, Glaucon', I said, 'isn't the training in music most sovereign for these reasons, in that rhythm and melody above all plunge into the innermost soul and take a most vigorous hold of it, bringing with them the beauty of form; and, if one is trained correctly, they make him beautiful and good in form; if not, isn't the result the opposite?'

The understanding of musical education that Plato gives to Socrates here is a more developed form of common ideas. The musical modes were thought to have particular ethical characters[32] and different melodies and rhythms to produce different types of reactions and behaviour.[33]

The musical dimension of an epinician performed by a solo singer would therefore have had a marked ethical significance. In demonstrating a culturally sanctioned knowledge of musical techniques and the ability to apply these to a given song, the performer would have foregrounded his status as a καλὸς κἀγαθός in the act of performance.[34] This musical conduct would also have affirmed shared practices and social bonds; audience members who had received a similar training to that of the performer would have been able to recognize and appreciate his skill on the basis of

[28] On musical education, see in general West (1992) 36–38. For discussion of music in Pindar, see Prauscello (2012); Phillips (2013).

[29] On lyre playing in education, see, for example, Ar. *Nub.* 961–72 and Pl. *Leg.* 812b–e with the comments of Barker (1984) 101–02, 162–63. Homer appears to have played an important role in education from a relatively early stage, but the precise nature of this role is disputed: see, for example, Verdenius (1970) for a collection of the evidence; Ford (2002) 197–201 for discussion of passages such as Hdt. 2.53 and Heraclitus B 57 DK on Hesiod.

[30] See, for example, Thgn. 533–34; on the erotic associations of lyre playing, see Power (2010) 34–38.

[31] For an analysis of Damon's musicology, see Wallace (2004); (2015).

[32] The crucial discussion is Pl. *Resp.* 398c–99e. See in general West (1992) 177–89 for comment and further references.

[33] On the social importance of musical affectivity, see, for example,Wallace (2004) 263. Pl. *Prt.* 326a4–b4 offers a succinct statement of the (idealized) effects that learning lyric poetry ought to have on the dispositions of the young.

[34] For the association of music and social order, see *Pyth.* 5.65–67, where Apollo 'has provided the cithara and confers the Muse on whomever he pleases, after putting peaceful good governance into their minds' (πόρεν τε κίθαριν, δίδωσί τε Μοῖσαν οἷς ἂν ἐθέλῃ, / ἀπόλεμον ἀγαγών / ἐς πραπίδας εὐνομίαν).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426917000118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

their own experience.[35] Part of the significance of a musical performance, therefore, lay in music's dramatization of the performer acceding to and participating in a shared ethical system, yet monodic reperformances of epinicians would also have been powerfully idiomatic acts. Each performer had a unique voice and appearance, and each performance would have been a unique, unrepeatable event.[36]

We cannot be sure of the procedures according to which performers would have set individual poems to melody and instrumentation, but it seems clear that in an age before musical scores and notation these procedures would not have involved an exact replication of a melody composed by the author or employed in a previous performance. One model is that performers would have improvised the vocal melodies, basing the melodic contours on the pitch structures that were present in everyday speech, guided in this practice by melodizational methods suited to given genres.[37] Another possibility is that performers would have sung the poems by applying the melodic patterns used in singing the Homeric poems.[38] In either scenario, however, individual performances would have relied on the subjective input of an individual as well as on that individual's awareness of musical norms.

A correlation therefore emerges between epinicians' projection of ethicality and the realization of the poems in performance. Gnomic statements dramatize the relationship between ethical generalities and their application by individuals, while the performance scenario as a whole entails a performer acceding to the text's ethical framework and the emergence of the performer as a distinctive subject through that process. This duality of normativity and individual agency is paralleled by a performer's instantiation of musical norms and his inventive, idiomatic realization of the poem, such that the musical dimension of monodic reperformance both reflects and reinforces an individual's ethical engagement with the text. But while musical realization embodies a response to a given poem, the very act of performance is charged with a meaningfulness that is independent of any particular utterance. As will become clear in my subsequent readings, such performances activate distinctive subtexts that supplement poems' themes and statements.

III. *Nemean* 4: Timocritus' music

With these general considerations in mind, I turn to a detailed examination of how reperformance and individual response are represented in *Nemean* 4 and *Isthmian* 2. I begin with a passage that has often been cited as evidence for reperformance practices. Having completed a request for the poem's favourable reception on Aegina, the narrator describes how Timocritus, the victor's father, would have celebrated his son's victory were he still living (*Nem*. 4.9–16):

τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδᾳ τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέᾳ
Τιμασάρχου τε πάλᾳ
ὕμνου προκώμιον εἴη· δέξαιτο δ' Αἰακιδᾶν
ἠύπυργον ἕδος, δίκᾳ ξεναρκέϊ κοινόν
φέγγος. εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἁλίῳ
σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων
θαμά κε, τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς
υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον

[35] Monodic reperformance of a poem previously performed by a chorus would have underlined this dynamic, as it would have involved an individual appropriating a speaker position previously articulated by a group.

[36] The unrepeatability of the event is a commonplace of performance studies: see, for example, De Marinis (1993) 51–53.

[37] See D'Angour (2006).

[38] For which see Hagel (1994); Danek and Hagel (1995). A beautiful demonstration of this melodizational technique can be found on the website of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften at http://www.oeaw.ac.at/kal/sh/demodokos.mp3. On this model, the employment of the basic Homeric melodic pattern would have been subject to the specific modal requirements laid out in particular poems: see n. 44 below.

> May I set forth such a word for Cronus' son Zeus and Nemea, and for Timasarchus' wrestling, as my hymn's prelude; and may it find welcome in the Aeacidae's high-towered domain, that beacon of justice protecting all foreigners. And if your father Timocritus were still warmed by the blazing sun, often would he have played an elaborate tune on the lyre, and, relying on this song, would have celebrated his triumphant son …

This 'monodic projection' is unusual in Pindar;[39] nowhere else in the epinicians do we find such a detailed focus on a named historical individual as a proxy for the performer and as a figure for the dissemination of the poem.[40] Timocritus' cithara playing and encomiastic singing (υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον), as scholars have noted,[41] clearly prefigure reperformance of the poem, and imaginatively enact poetry's capacity to outlast the deeds it commemorates (6: ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει). Frequent repetition (θαμά) is a central feature of the imagined performances, suggesting the poem's ambition to be integrated into Aeginetan cultural life, or at least that of the victor's family, the Theandridae.[42] But the description of Timocritus as a performer also prompts reflections on music, ethics and individual engagement with the poem.

Despite its brevity, the phrase ποικίλον κιθαρίζων generates a range of meanings.[43] The compliment to Timocritus' 'elaborate', 'skillful' playing, when sung in a monodic reperformance scenario, would have been implicitly transferred to the performer.[44] For audiences conversant with musical practices, the phrasing of ποικίλον κιθαρίζων … τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς would have triggered an attention to the interplay of musical norms and performance idiom present in a given performance: τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς highlights that each performance is conditioned by the specific set of melodic and rhythmic possibilities bequeathed by the song,[45] while ποικίλον κιθαρίζων emphasizes the idiomatic aspect of each performance by underlining the complexity of the task and, implicitly, the skill required of anyone who is to perform the poem successfully. Moreover, in giving Timocritus a voice by doing what he would have done, the performer is partially assimilated to him and continues the musical and performance tradition of which he was a part.

[39] Modifying Henrichs' 'choral projection': he uses the phrase to refer to passages in which tragic choruses 'locate their own dancing in the past or the future, or refer to groups of dancers who are outside the concrete space of the orchestra and who dance in the realm of the dramatic imagination' (Henrichs (1996) 49).

[40] As opposed to the nymph Echo in *Ol.* 14 and the personified Angelia in *Pyth*. 5. The end of *Isthm.* 2, which I discuss below, provides a partial parallel. Aeneas in *Ol.* 6 is a *chorêgos* as opposed to a monodic singer: see Hutchinson (2001) 417.

[41] Power (2010) 422; Morrison (2011) 232–33, 236.

[42] *Cf.* Morrison (2012) 113–15. Sympotic reperformance (perhaps hinted at by the undertone of 'reclining' in κλιθείς) seems the likeliest scenario anticipated here: for this type of performance prefigured elsewhere, *cf.* Thgn. 237–40; Bacchyl. 20b.5; Pind. *Ol*. 1.14–18. For scholarship on sympotic (re)performance, see, for example, Clay (1999); Budelmann (2012).

[43] On the semantics of ποικίλος in early poetry, see LeVen (2013).

[44] The vocabulary of ποικιλία is also used in relation to the compositional skill needed to fashion such complex artefacts, as at *Nem.* 8.15; but even there the lexis also connotes the skill required of the performer(s). The precise musicological implications of τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς are unclear, but when understood in relation to *Nem*. 4.44–47, the phrase may offer support for D'Angour's explanation of melodization as a process by which a melody was shaped to pitch structure (see above, section II). The latter passage is addressed to the *phorminx*: 'weave straightaway, sweet *phorminx*, this song in a Lydian *harmonia*, that was once beloved by Oenona and Cyprus, where Teucer the son of Telamon ruled in exile' (ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ, / Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον / Οἰνώνᾳ τε καὶ Κύπρῳ, ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει / ὁ Τελαμωνιάδας). However, the translation used here, taking τόδ' … μέλος as meaning 'this song', cannot be quite accurate, as Pindar's epinician itself was not 'beloved by Oenona and Cyprus' in the distant past when Teucer was exiled to Cyprus (*pace* Miller (1983) 202, the μέλος does not refer to a previous theme of which the catalogue of Aeacid heroes at 44–58 is a resumption). It seems more likely that here μέλος means 'melodic structure' or form, comparable with νόμος: for this sense of the word see, for example, Ruijgh (2001) 302; D'Angour (2006) 280–82; *cf.* also Barker (1984) 249–55; West (1992) 309–10; Power (2010) 215–24 on νόμοι. If this is the case, the μέλος in line 15 would be not to the exact melody used in the original performance but the melodic framework and melodizing protocols that generated it.

[45] A point reinforced by the injunction at 44–45 that the song is to be played in the Lydian *harmonia*, which specifies a particular melodic framework for the performer to work within. *Cf.* also Henry (2005) 32 for the effort implied by κλιθείς.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426917000118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The lines balance an acknowledgment of loss with an instantiation of the poem's capacity to transfigure its subjects:[46] each performance registers Timocritus' absence, while also affirming his transformation into a paradigmatic textual figure.[47] This transformation is artfully underlined by the rhythmical structure of the opening two stanzas. The passage describing Timocritus (13–16: εἰ δ' ἔτι … καλλίνικον) responds rhythmically with the passage in the first stanza in which the speaker describes poetry's power to make deeds endure (5–8):

… τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος.
ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει,
ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχᾳ
γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας.

… as much as praise, the companion of the lyre.[48] For the word lives longer than deeds, which, with the Graces' blessing, the tongue draws from the depths of the mind.

The responsion brings out the thematic connections between the two passages by linking thematically related phrases. Thus σὺν Χαρίτων τύχᾳ (– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –) is answered by τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς, and γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας (– – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – –) by υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον. These connections have the effect of making Timocritus' performance exemplify the generalities outlined in the first stanza. As such, the structural relation of call-and-response between the stanzas acts as an analogue for reperformance of the poem, as the description of Timocritus' singing repeats the rhythmical structure of the opening reflections just as Timocritus himself would have repeated the poem. However, the indirectness of the analogy (the idea of repetition is manifested in rhythms not words) reinforces the figurative element in the representation of Timocritus, whose imaginary performance, in addition to being denoted, has been translated into the sonic co-ordinates of the poem's rhythmical structure.

Both Timocritus' status as a textual construct and the notion of him as a concrete, individuated figure are crucial for understanding the ethical force that would have been generated by the opening two strophes of the poem when performed by a solo singer.[49] As a paradigmatic figure who frames performances of the song, Timocritus operates across contexts, and the description of his singing therefore has a similar force to that of the gnomic statements described above. In addition to its literal function as a past conditional, the statement εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἁλίῳ / σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο … υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον stages a wider conditionality by intimating the poem's dependence on a response. The description is 'future orientated'; in his role as an exemplum, Timocritus becomes part of the poem's 'repository of thought' that listeners are invited to apply to their own experiences. As regards the poem's creation of a persona for the performing singer, the description positions performance as an ethical act. Timocritus' relationship with his son has been translated into the conditionality with which the poem figures performance as itself a type of inti-

[46] The narrator stresses in 11 that Aegina is the place where he hopes the poem will be 'received' (δέξαιτο): *cf.* Bernardini (1983) 99–100. Although it is likely that the reperformance tradition focused on Aegina, it is not impossible that the poem was subsequently performed elsewhere. *Cf.* Morrison (2011) 231 for the distinction between secondary and tertiary audiences.

[47] This dynamic parallels the poem's wider meditations on the relationship between effort, suffering and success, for which see, for example, Machemer (1993); Nicholson (2001); Burnett (2005) 133.

[48] Both instances of s5 begin with a disyllable unrelated to the theme of poetry (γυῖα / φέγγος), creating a strong concinnity between thematic and rhythmical structure.

[49] We should remember that at least in the early stages of the poem's *Nachleben*, many of (if not all) the poem's listeners will have known Timocritus personally. These listeners will have co-ordinated their apprehension of Timocritus as a character within the poem with their memories and experiences of him. When understood against its Aeginetan performance context(s), therefore, the passage draws attention to the dialogue between the 'real' and the 'fictional' in the creation of a performance persona.

macy; when singing, a performer enacts his accession to the ethical conditions implied by Timocritus' behaviour. This passage is therefore a particularly explicit instance of the correlation described above between an individual performer's musical and ethical engagement with a poem. Performance depends on the individual's idiomatic skill (*cf.* ποικίλον) as well as displaying a participation in wider musical norms; this duality parallels the performer's ethical response, which entails both enacting Timocritus' exemplary force and a personal agency in his commitment to the poem's ethical framework. Pindar's 'monodic projection' of Timocritus constructs performance as an act of embodied ethicality.

Timocritus, however, is not the only figure who acts as a model for the performer. At 33, the speaker claims that 'an ordinance' (τεθμός) holds him back from 'telling the long tale' of Telamon at Troy (τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός), reminding the audience that the present enunciation conforms to a general notion of encomiastic appropriateness.[50] The first-person statement at 73–74, meanwhile, picks up on the ethical dimension at work in the 'monodic projection' of Timocritus. Here the *persona loquens* says that he 'has come as a ready herald of the Theandridae in their limb-strengthening contests' (Θεανδρίδαισι δ' ἀεξιγυίων ἀέθλων / κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος ἔβαν), and this is preceded by the statement in 73 that he has 'given an undertaking' (συνθέμενος) to the Theandridae. Whatever the real or fictional situation to which this 'undertaking' refers, it seems likely that συνθέμενος would have expressed a singer's assent to an ethical scheme in which performance acts as a requital for victory and κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος the willing exercise of agency that underlies such a commitment.

The next lines make reference to performances of victory songs at Nemea to which the Theandridae are 'devoted' (πάτραν ἵν' ἀκούομεν, / Τιμάσαρχε, τεὰν ἐπινικίοισιν ἀοιδαῖς / πρόπολον ἔμμεναι), linking the present enunciation with a wider performance economy, while at 85–86, the speaker imagines his voice carrying to the underworld, where it will be heard by the victor's maternal uncle, Callicles: κεῖνος ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμάν / γλῶσσαν εὑρέτω κελαδῆτιν ('let him who dwells by the Acheron hear my voice ringing out'). The unusual adjective κελαδῆτιν recalls κελάδησε in line 16 and creates an echo within the verbal texture of the poem that acts as an analogy for the song carrying to the underworld.[51] Song's power to link generations and places is approached from a different angle in 89–90 with the mention of Euphanes, the victor's grandfather, singing about Callicles: τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραιὸς προπάτωρ / ἀείσεται, παῖ, ὁ σός ('him [sc. Callicles] will your aged grandfather Euphanes gladly celebrate in song, my boy').[52] The whole poem, therefore, acts as a repository of voices, while also plotting its particular utterance into a performance tradition.

These references to the victor's family are not simply retrospective, however, in that they dramatize the formation of subjectivity through performance, adumbrating a vocal template that will shape each subsequent performer's self-presentation.[53] It is a commonplace of performance studies that a singer undergoes a process of transformation when performing, taking on a persona projected by the text, but in *Nemean* 4 we are confronted with a particularly complex staging of this process. The formation of the monodic persona is an act of ethical ποικιλία, moving through

[50] The topos of self-limitation is picked up at 71–72. For discussion of the τεθμός, see Kyriakou (1996) 21.

[51] For journeying to the underworld as a motif of song's context-transcendent power, *cf.* Echo's journey in *Ol.* 14, for which see Phillips (2016) 217–23 with further references.

[52] In 86 I give the text as printed by Race (1997) and Henry (2005), which is Mommsen's emendation of the unmetrical paradosis. Boeckh conjectures σὸς ἄεισέν ποτε, παῖ, which is followed, inter alios, by Snell. For discussion of this reference, *cf.* Currie (2004) 58–60; Morrison (2011) 236; on the final sequence in general, see Burnett (2005) 134.

[53] As such, my emphasis differs from that of Morrison (2012) 114–15: Morrison sees the poem's reperformance primarily as a means of 'preserving the "symbolic capital" of an *oikos*' (p. 114) and goes on to argue that reperformance could have brought about the 'same response' as a premiere.

different tonal shades and taking on different associations as the poem progresses.[54] The performer's voice assumes an intimacy through the 'monodic projections' of Timocritus and Euphanes,[55] but also subsumes the more formalized ethicity of the poet's voice (75: συνθέμενος)[56] as well as the impersonal tone of the gnomic statements at 41–43 (ἐμοὶ δ' ὁποίαν ἀρετάν / ἔδωκε Πότμος ἄναξ, / εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἕρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέσει) and 69 (Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν).[57] Understood in terms of the poem's articulation of subjectivity, therefore, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων hints not only at musical sophistication but at the figural and tonal variegation by which the performer's voice is constituted.[58] The movement of Pindar's *persona loquens* through different ethical and narrative dispositions unfolds an idealizing enactment of the multiple relations by which individual selfhood is constituted.

IV. *Isthmian* 2: Xenocrates' temper

Isthmian 2 is one of the most challenging poems in Pindar's oeuvre,[59] and its opening two stanzas, in which the *persona loquens* appears to contrast past and present poetry and criticize the latter for its mercenary inclinations, have caused particular controversy. The following analysis proposes a reconsideration of this opening sequence in relation to the poem's ethical discourses. On my reading, the treatment of past poetry and the injunctions of the 'Muse … enamoured of gain' (6: Μοῖσα … φιλοκερδής) represent underdeveloped conceptions which act as a foil for the more interpretatively sophisticated response the poem aims to elicit. Ethical comportment is a crucial feature of this response, and its importance is brought to the fore by the figures of Xenocrates and Nicasippus. The poem's final lines hint at monodic renderings of the poem, and, by enacting individual responses to the text's ethical propositions, such performances would have enacted a refutation of claims about poetry's mercenary status.

[54] See Currie (2013) for a wider-ranging analysis of the fluidity of the first-person voice in Pindar.

[55] The song may well have been performed by a member of the family, perhaps even Timasarchus himself; for the possibility of the *laudandus* performing epinicia, *cf.* Currie (2005) 20–21. In such a scenario, performing the song would have enacted membership of a family tradition.

[56] The speaker's ethicity also manifests itself in focalizations such as δάμαρτος Ἱππολύτας Ἀκάστου δολίαις / τέχναισι χρησάμενος (57–58).

[57] This could be seen as developing the Archaic idea of ethical adaptability, an idea expressed in Theognis through the lexis of ποικιλία: the speaker advocates 'turning a versatile disposition in accordance with all your friends, mingling it with the mood that each one has' (213–14: θυμέ, φίλους κατὰ πάντας ἐπίστρεφε ποικίλον ἦθος, / ὀργὴν συμμίσγων ἥντιν' ἕκαστος ἔχει). This capacity is compared to the octopus' ability to 'resemble the rock to which it clings' (214–15: ὃς ποτὶ πέτρῃ, / τῇ προσομιλήσῃ, τοῖος ἰδεῖν ἐφάνη) and is seen as a marker of σοφίη. On my reading, Pindar would be dramatizing the formation of a ποικίλον ἦθος in performance by means of the tonal multiplicity of the voice; whereas Theognis suggests varied behaviour in real situations, *Nem*. 4 enacts a fictionalized version of this process, opening it up for contemplation by listeners. My analysis therefore posits a different relationship between listener and performer than the influential model of Gentili (1988) 39–40, which asserts that 'identification between the hearer-spectator and the various characters in the narrative was complete', while also stressing 'psychosomatic pleasure' as a cornerstone of the listening experience. In the scenario I have outlined, the listener bears a more indirect and interpretative relation to the characters and voices elaborated in the poem. Rather than simply identifying with characters, the listener contemplates and reflects on the dialogue between performer and textual figures.

[58] ποικίλος is sometimes used by Pindar in morally negative contexts, applied, for example, to 'elaborate lies' (ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις) at *Ol*. 1.29 and Hippolyta's 'elaborate designs' (ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν) at *Nem*. 5.28. Here, however, the musical meaning of the adjective encourages listeners to take the term in an approbatory sense.

[59] The poem was written for Thrasybulus, son of the Xenocrates mentioned in line 36, after his father's death: *cf.* Morrison (2011) 236; Cairns (2011) 25. It is also formally unusual in that it does not celebrate an athletic victory by the *laudandus*: the victory commemorated was won before 476 BC, but the poem seems to have been composed after Xenocrates' death, perhaps around 470. On the poem's generic complications, see, for example, Cingano (1990) 222; Cairns (2011) 26. For the argument that the poem was originally an encomium not an epinician, and was incorrectly classified by Hellenistic editors, see Eckerman (2016) 544–45.

In order to examine how these aspects of the poem fit together, I begin by looking at the opening triad before turning to the end of the poem:

οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε,
φῶτες, οἳ χρυσαμπύκων
ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαι-
νον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,
ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν. 5

ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής
πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖ-
αι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τὠργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <⏑ – –> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον, 10

"χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ"
ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.

The men of the past, Thrasybulus, who mounted the chariot of the Muses with their golden headbands, meeting with the famous *phorminx*, often shot honey-voiced songs at young boys, whoever was beautiful and had the sweetest harvest of suitors from Aphrodite on her fair throne. The Muse in those days was never enamoured of gain, and she wasn't a working girl, and nor were soft-voiced songs, their faces silvered over, sold by honey-voiced Terpsichore. But now she bids (us) take heed of the Argive's motto, which comes close to the truth: 'money, money makes the man', said he, losing at once possessions and friends.

Numerous solutions have been proposed to the problem that Pindar appears to be criticizing the kind of poetry he is composing, commissioned epinician poetry, and contrasting the spontaneous love poetry written in the past. Ancient scholars suggested that he was criticizing Simonides or asking for material remuneration.[60] Some modern explanations have employed rather fanciful notions of historical context in order to explain the rhetoric.[61] More recently, scholars have seen the depiction of poetry as ideologically inflected; Kurke has argued influentially that the poem moves from a negative depiction of wealth to a positive recuperation of it in terms of aristocratic notions of gift exchange.[62] Another recent reading sees the passage as contrasting older performances by amateur choruses with modern, professional choral culture; crucially for this argument, the expenditure on choral performances is not a negative feature, but something which redounds to the credit of the *laudandus* as an index of his generosity.[63] While I do not disagree with the idea that the poem articulates a positive view of wealth, I shall argue that its dramatization of listeners' responses is also crucial to the poem's argument.

[60] *Cf.* Σ *Isthm*. 2.9a for the notion that the mercenary Muse is an attack on Simonides; Σ *Isthm*. 2. inscr. a attributes the view that Pindar was asking for remuneration to Callistratus.

[61] See Kurke (1991) 241, n. 1 for references. Woodbury (1968) and Simpson (1969) 471–72 offer more rhetorically grounded interpretations. For a recent reading of the poem in literary historical terms, see Maslov (2015) 259-66.

[62] Kurke (1991) 240–56. This line of argument is developed by Nicholson (2000) 240–42; Nicholson argues that Pindar uses the image of the pederastic poet to obscure 'the real relations of production of his poetry' ((2000) 242). For a justifiably sceptical response to this argument, see Bowie (2012) 88–89.

[63] Cairns (2011). The evidence for professional choruses in this period is slight, however, and the case relies more on probabilities and inference from later evidence than established facts: see, for example, Cairns (2011) 31–33.

Interpretative debate has revolved around taking the opening stanzas as in some way representing Pindar's views. Instead, I suggest that the lines should be read ironically as constructing a deliberately over-simplified opposition between poetry of the past and the present.[64] More specifically, the antistrophe should be understood as voicing a misguidedly critical response to contemporary poetry. This reading is primarily based on two features of antistrophe: namely the use of distinctly unPindaric language and the stress on the contemporaneity of the discourse. A distinct shift in verbal register occurs in the antistrophe; whereas the strophe deploys recognizably Pindaric phrasing,[65] this is the only place in Pindar where φιλοκερδής, ἐργάτις and πέρναμι occur,[66] and ἐργάτις in particular is tonally incongruous with what one would expect in an epinician.[67] Although Pindar qua author and *persona loquens* is focalizing the view being expressed,[68] listeners are meant to notice that this voice is not entirely Pindar's. Kurke argues that the 'description of the modern Muse [is] being drawn *from the point of view of* the older poets'[69] and the sensuous language of the first stanza clearly recalls that of erotic lyric. However, the second stanza squarely emphasizes the difference between the 'Muse' now and then (τότ' ἦν … νῦν δ' ἐφίητι); although the position here draws on views found in Anacreon, Theognis and elsewhere, the explicitly contemporary perspective offered by the second statement means that the antistrophe should not be taken as exclusively representing the view of older poets. Rather, what is being voiced here is a contemporary view of current poetic practice.[70]

Considered against the development of the poem as a whole, the viewpoint articulated in the antistrophe represents a clearly insufficient way of understanding poetry, which serves as a foil for the more complex, ethically engaged response that the poem itself demands. Lines 9–10 (νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τὠργείου φυλάξαι / ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <⏑ –> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον) are often interpreted as referring to poets, the Muse giving them the instruction to 'take heed of the Argive's motto'.

[64] Nisetich (1977) 141 sees the lines as ironic, but despite his reference to the view of the mercenary Muse as representing 'popular wisdom' he does not pursue this line of interpretation. See Kurke (1991) 244 for criticism of Nisetich's explanation of the irony. Her objection that '"ironical depreciation" of his own poetry … seems very uncharacteristic of Pindar' is weakened if the irony is seen to emerge from the view expressed not being that of Pindar himself. Moreover, we might compare *Pyth*. 11.38–40 for a use of poetological irony: the question should be understood as a challenge to the listener to recognize the force of the myth, not as a literal admission of compositional error.

[65] For μελιγάρυας ὕμνους, *cf.*, for example, *Ol*. 11.4 and *Pyth*. 3.64; εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν is a kenning with parallels at, for example, *Pyth.* 6.54 (μελισσᾶν … τρητὸν πόνον). Bowie (2012) 89 sees the erotic discourse of the opening stanza as a reference to *Pyth.* 6.48 and hence to 'Pindar's and Thrasybulus' shared past'. Such a resonance would underline the poems' emergence from a social relationship and hence undermine the cynical view of lines 6–12. There may also be a reference here to Pindar's encomium for Thrasybulus (fr. 124ab S–M): see Cairns (2011) 34, who calls the poem 'an encomium lauding its subject's beauty and ability to inspire love'. Caution is necessary here however, since the extant fragments of 124ab do not contain any explicitly erotic imagery directed at the addressee, although ἐρατᾶν ὄχημ' ἀοιδᾶν (fr. 124a.1) may well hint at the poem's erotic register. For further remarks on erotic discourse in *Isthm.* 2, *cf.* Nisetich (1977) 134; Rawles (2011) 157–58.

[66] In Pindar, ἀργυρωθεῖσαι is only found here in this sense: the use at *Nem*. 10.43 is metaphorical.

[67] It had previously appeared in Archilochus (fr. 208 W). Verdenius (1982) 13 argues that the lines can be explained in terms of Pindar's status as a professional poet 'who had to live by his trade': the flaws of this position are well highlighted by Bowie (2012). Moreover, Kurke (1991) 243 is right to point out the 'extreme negativity' with which the Muse is portrayed in the antistrophe.

[68] The high stylistic register of μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί asserts authorial focalization: although this is the only extant occurence of this adjective in Pindar, elsewhere the phrasing recalls, for example, μαλθακᾷ … σὺν ἀοιδᾷ (*Nem.* 9.49); *cf.* also μαλθακᾷ φωνᾷ (*Pyth.* 4.137; this poem post-dates *Isthm*. 2). The very act of transforming the negative portrayal of poetry into a poetically heightened utterance is itself an expression of authorial power.

[69] Kurke (1991) 245 (italics in the original): she cites, for example, Anacreon *PMG* 384 for the view that the older poets also distrusted wealth.

[70] There is evidence that athletic culture and the expenditure it involved were criticized: Xenophanes fr. 2 W, for instance, is an extended attack on the social inutility of athletics which argues that the gifts received by successful athletes at public expense are unmerited (8–10). It is also possible that the tradition about Simonides' mercenary behaviour ultimately derives from contemporary complaints.

However, ἐφίητι is not directed towards a particular subject. This is significant because it creates an ambivalence: the phrase could mean both that the Muse tells *poets* to 'guard this saying' and that the Muse tells *men in general* to do so. So the lines can be understood as dramatizing not just a view of contemporary poets' concern with wealth, but also a view of what contemporary poetry encourages men to value and how it encourages them to act. The limitations of this view will be made clear as the poem unfolds, but are foreshadowed in the phrasing of φυλάξαι / ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <⏑–> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον. The notion of 'guarding' or 'cherishing' a ῥῆμα implies a relatively simple mode of communication in which the 'saying' is communicated to a listener who assents to and internalizes it.[71] Within this implied communication, the statement χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ conveys a straightforward message to the listener by means of simple denotation.[72] This mechanism, however, is at odds with how *Isthmian* 2 articulates its poetic agenda and hence contributes to the passage's function as a foil: while the picture of the Muse as an ἐργάτις and the equation of man with χρήματα constitute a reductive picture that will be exceeded by the complexities of the poem, φυλάξαι / ῥῆμα implies a type of response that will prove inadequate to those complexities.

Part of the intricacy to which listeners respond lies in the irony of lines 6–11: Thrasybulus is 'wise' (ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὦν σοφός) not only because he knows how to use wealth correctly,[73] but also because he recognizes that poetry involves a 'transaction' that goes beyond the monetary, and hence the limitations of the viewpoint articulated in 6–11.[74] The poem's success is measured against Xenocrates' character (35–37) and constitutes not just an economic exchange but 'a celebration of value'.[75] Inasmuch as the 'conversation' between the *persona loquens* and Thrasybulus at 6–12 stages a shared understanding of poetic practice as undergirded by ethically legitimate social rela-

[71] For other uses of the verb in this sense, *cf.* LSJ *s.v.* d3.

[72] For discussion, *cf.* Kurke (1991) 245. The scholia (Σ *Isthm.* 2.15b and 17, iii. 215–16 Dr.) attribute the phrase to Aristodemus the Spartan. The latter cites Alcaeus (fr. 360), noting that unlike Pindar he specifies the man's name: ὡς γὰρ δήποτ' Ἀριστόδαμον φαῖσ' οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Σπάρτᾳ λόγον / εἴπην, χρήματ' ἄνηρ, πένιχρος δ' οὐδ' εἷς πέλετ' ἔσλος οὐδὲ τίμιος ('for they say that Aristodemus once expressed it shrewdly at Sparta: "Money is the man, and no poor man is good or honourable"').

[73] Thus Kurke (1991) 249. The implication recalls the characterization of Thrasybulus at *Pyth.* 6.46–49, where he 'uses his wealth with intelligence, enjoys a youth without injustice or insolence, and culls wisdom in the haunts of the Pierians' (νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει, / ἄδικον οὔθ' ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν δρέπων, / σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων). The connection is noted and discussed from a different perspective in Rawles (2011) 157–58.

[74] I follow here the rendering of ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὦν σοφός proposed by Verdenius (1982) 10, who sees the γάρ as 'almost equivalent to ἀλλὰ γάρ', meaning 'need I say more for …'. This interpretation is followed by Race (1997), who translates 'but enough, for you are wise'. It may also be significant that Pindar's encomium for Thrasybulus contains a discussion of wealth in the context of sympotic drinking: ἀνίκ' ἀνθρώπων καματώδεες οἴχονται μέριμναι / στηθέων ἔξω· πελάγει δ' ἐν πολυχρύσοιο πλούτου / πάντες ἴσᾳ νέομεν ψευδῆ πρὸς ἀκτάν· / ὃς μὲν ἀχρήμων, ἀφνεὸς τότε, τοὶ δ' αὖ πλουτέοντες (fr. 124ab.5–8: 'when men's wearisome cares vanish from their breasts, and on a sea of golden wealth we all alike sail to an illusory shore; then the pauper is rich, while the wealthy'). This is an instance of the sympotic topos of fantasies brought about by drink, and is paralleled in Bacchyl. 20B; for an extensive comparison of the two poems, *cf.* Fearn (2007) 37–48 with further bibliography. We do not know how Pindar's encomium continued, but it is possible that, like Bacchylides' poem, it involved a shift to reflections on the transitoriness of ὄλβος and the concomitant importance of poetic immortalization (*cf.* Bacchyl. 20B.19–20 with the comments of Fearn (2007) 70–72). The precise role of fr. 124ab.11 (ἀέξονται φρένας ἀμπελίνοις τόξοις δαμέντες, 'increase in their minds, overcome by the vines' arrows') in the poem's argument is unclear, but it is notable that Athenaeus' comments on the poem emphasize its intellectual dimension: 'for time spent drinking expands, nourishes and enlarges the soul, by rekindling and awakening each person's mind with thoughts, as Pindar says ...' (Ath. 11.782d: αὔξει γὰρ καὶ τρέφει μεγαλύνει τε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ ἐν τοῖς πότοις διατριβή, ἀναζωπυροῦσα καὶ ἀνεγείρουσα μετὰ φρονήσεως τὸν ἑκάστου νοῦν, ὥς φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος). If the encomium involved something like a move from fantastical dreams of wealth to a more realistic, ethically inflected appreciation of the role of wealth in human life, it would have provided a particularly pointed intertext for ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὦν σοφός at *Isthm.* 2.12: that phrase would then recall the understanding that Thrasybulus, and doubtless some of the audience, had derived from the encomium's more complex treatment of wealth. For a biographically based reading of the relations between the poems, *cf.* von der Mühll (1964); Nisetich (1977) 134–35.

[75] The phrase is borrowed from Silk (2007) 196.

tions, the exchange creates an intimacy that is itself a response to the notion of the Muse as an ἐργάτις. Crucially, the audience is involved in this intimacy, positioned as overhearing the imagined conversation and expected to share in the 'wisdom' attributed to Thrasybulus.

This position, implied by contrast in lines 6–12, is brought to the fore by Xenocrates' role in the poem. Whereas the ῥῆμα at 11 uses a generalized ἀνήρ to make its point, responding to *Isthmian* 2 entails engagement with a fully realized individual. As in *Nemean* 4, the personalization of ethics affects how the poem addresses the audience: through Xenocrates, the poem speaks to listeners as individuated agents as well as to a community.[76] Like Timocritus, Xenocrates is a gnomic figure who serves as a paradigm not just for his son, but as a conduit through which the poem makes a general ethical claim on the audience,[77] inviting an acceptance by listeners that will confirm his paradigmatic status. The poem projects a scenario in which acting in accordance with the precepts here instantiated involves, after hearing the poem, allowing one's behaviour to be measured against that of Xenocrates.

His construction as an exemplum is immediately preceded by a statement about achievement smoothing the way for poetry (33–34) and a co-ordination of poetic achievement and ethical conduct: 'having thrown the discus a great distance may I cast the javelin as far as Xenocrates surpassed other men in his sweet temper' (35–37: μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', ὅσον ὀργάν / Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν / ἔσχεν). The enumeration of Xenocrates' disposition (3–7), conduct towards his fellow townsmen (37), his expenditure on horse-breeding (38) and his 'embrace' of the gods' feasts (39) reaches a climax in another metaphor (39–42):

> οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν
> οὖρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἱστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν·
> ἀλλ' ἐπέρα ποτὶ μὲν Φᾶσιν θερείαις,
> ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι πλέων Νείλου πρὸς ἀκτάν.
>
> And never did an oncoming wind cause him to furl the sails at his welcoming table. Rather, he travelled to Phasis in the summers, and in the winter sailed to the shore of the Nile.

These lines realize their claims in contrast to the rhetoric of the first antistrophe. Unlike the straightforwardly denotative χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ, in which the pared-down impersonality of the phrasing reflects the way the ἀνήρ is reduced to his possessions, Xenocrates is constituted as a 'repository of thought' by the intricacy with which he is described. Although the general function of the metaphor in commending Xenocrates' hospitality is clear, its precise dynamics can be understood in several ways. It is perhaps most naturally taken as 'emphasis[ing] both the extension and continuity of Xenocrates' hospitality',[78] but Σ *Isthm.* 2.61a (iii. 221 Dr.) suggests that the notion of travelling to a warm location (the Nile) in the winter and a cool one (Phasis) in the summer is also a metaphor for Xenocrates' 'cleverness with regard to situations' (τὴν περὶ τοὺς καιροὺς δεξιότητα). However the terms of the metaphor are understood, its very richness of expression and the attentive, interpretatively engaged response these lines invite, enact Xenocrates' significance as an individual.[79]

[76] Kurke (1991) 250 and Clear (2013) are representative in focusing on the relation between Xenocrates and Thrasybulus.

[77] The terms in which he is described closely recall those applied to Thrasybulus at *Pyth.* 6.52–54: γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν / καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν / μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον ('and his sweet spirit, in company with his drinking companions, surpasses the perforated labour of bees'). Thrasybulus 'surpassing' (ἀμείβεται) is recalled in Xenocrates' outdoing other men (*Isthm*. 2.36). Clear (2013) 50 examines the relationship between these lines in view of a putative performance of the poems alongside each other, arguing that they dramatize a noble character shared across generations of the family. I would emphasize that the shared vocabulary performs an abstraction of idealized ethical comportment from political contingencies.

[78] Verdenius (1982) 31.

[79] *Cf.* Silk (2012) 353 on the enactive force of Pindar's style.

Beyond this mimetic functionalism, the metaphors of 35 and 39–42 draw attention to the enactive force of the poem's language: the space that measures this poem's superiority to others is itself measured by Xenocrates' ὀργά, which can now only be apprehended as a measure for and constraint upon the potentially violent imaginative impetus of the poem's language.[80] Even as the metaphors, through their imaginative reach and exorbitance, project their subjects out of the normal parameters of human conduct, their actions are also bounded by Xenocrates' 'disposition' and the limits of geography and the seasons. Because his 'sweet disposition' is 'beyond [other] men' (35–36: ὀργάν / … ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν), Xenocrates is not simply a template to be inhabited by a performer; like Timocritus, he has become a set of figural co-ordinates that adumbrate ethical possibilities. Responding meaningfully to this figuration is not a matter of internalizing propositional content, as in the case of 'money, money is the man', or even of recognizing the value of his expenditure and conduct (37–39), but of sharing in an acknowledgement of the frameworks of understanding that make such conduct possible. Above all, responding to the poem consists in a receptiveness to being constituted as an ethical subject through the poem's linguistic performance of transfiguration and limitation.[81]

On this reading, the poem constitutes an argument that operates not only through a redescription of wealth, but by using the threadbare response to poetry dramatized in lines 6–11 as a foil for the more elaborated response demanded by the poem as a whole. Far from being a ῥῆμα denoting transparent content, the poem requires its audience to understand social subtexts, to draw out implications and to reflect on their own interpretative activity. This dynamic reaches its climax in the poem's final lines, which as several recent discussions have noted, refer to future performances of the poem:

μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ
θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,
μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρῴαν,
μηδὲ τούσδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεί τοι 45
οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.
ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν
ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον ἔλθῃς.

But now, since envious hopes hang around men's minds, let him not silence his ancestral excellence, nor these songs: I did not make them to stand still. Impart these words, Nicasippus, whenever you visit my noble host.

Scholars have noted that Thrasybulus is asked here to ensure that the poem continues to be performed in order to perpetuate the memory of his father's achievements (44).[82] Significantly, however, the precise terms of these performances are not made clear. The lines could refer to performance by a chorus, but monodic reperformance is likely *a priori*,[83] and it is probable that both scenarios are meant to be imagined.[84] What I want to stress here, however, is the particular force that a monodic reperformance would have generated.

[80] *Cf.* Porter (2016) 357 on the 'sublime' overtones of this rhetoric.

[81] On the difficulty or obscurity of poetic language as opening up spaces of intellectual encounter, see Payne (2007) 12–13.

[82] Morrison (2007) 89–92; Athanassaki (2014) 211. Clear (2013) 40 argues plausibly that τούσδ' ὕμνους refers to *Pyth.* 6 and *Isthm.* 2 being (re)performed together.

[83] Cairns (2011) 32 suggests that Nicasippus may be 'the professional trainer or *chorêgos* who has gone to Acragas for the performance'; this is plausible, but the phrasing of the poem's final lines is sufficiently capacious to also allow Nicasippus qua individual to gesture to the idea of solo reperformance, an idea which may also be hinted at in the choice of a first-person singular verb (ἐργασάμαν). The idea of Nicasippus foreshadowing monodic reperformance would not be excluded by his being the *chorêgos* responsible for the first (choral) performance, as there is an obvious conceptual overlap between the two roles; both are skilled individuals who use their musico-poetic training in the service of disseminating the poem.

[84] Clear (2013) 32 imagines the first performance taking place at a symposium.

Seen as a whole, the poem responds to the notion of contemporary poetry elaborated in the first antistrophe with an appeal to an ethically freighted listening. Engagement with the irony generated by the first antistrophe requires an awareness of the passage's ethical subtext and of the extent to which poetry relies for its success on listeners' sympathetic interpretative participation. By contrast with the reductive simplicity of the proposition χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ, the figuration of Xenocrates at 35–42 affords listeners an experience of ethicality being enacted through the poem's performance of its verbal resources and challenges listeners to correlate their own conduct with the 'repository of thought' constituted by its implications and figurative movements. Far from reducing poetry to a monetary transaction and conceptualizing poetic activity in terms of its causes (φιλοκερδής), the poem realizes itself in the effects it has (or aims to have) on listeners' subjectivity and conduct. In the monodic scenario gestured to in the poem's closing lines, the performer constitutes a response to the idea of poetry as an ἐργάτις by enacting a socially grounded, assenting response to the text.[85]

When considered in the light of my earlier arguments about the social and musico-poetic aspects of solo singing, we can see that monodic reperformance as an act of embodied ethicality provides an implicit response to the critique of contemporary poetry as a mercenary activity articulated in the poem's opening triad.[86] Choral and monodic performances should not be conceived as differing radically, insofar as the figures of the *laudandus*, the poet, Xenocrates and Nicasippus would have foregrounded the importance of individual response even when the poem was performed chorally, and the collective performance medium would have dramatized relations of shared understanding between *laudandus* and group. Several features, however, make the monodic scenario distinctive. By taking on the voice of the poet and recapitulating the relationship between poet and *laudandus*,[87] the performer would have dramatized an assenting response to the poem's ethical propositions. While members of a chorus participate in a similarly implicit response, the monodist does so specifically as an individual agent, as underlined by the musically and vocally idiomatic aspect of his realization of the text.[88] This agency would also have been brought to the fore by certain shifts of emphasis in the poem's rhetoric contingent on performance circumstances, as in the metaphor μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', which applies differently to performer and poet. In a monodic scenario, the tenor shifts from the act of composition to that of performance: merely by committing himself to the performance, the monodist fulfils the conditionality the verb implies. Similarly, in ensuring the poem's mobility and acting as a conduit for its propositions, a monodist aligns with Nicasippus' role in 'imparting' (ἀπόνειμον) the poem's discourses. A monodic

[85] Although the extent to which the poem focuses on negative responses to poetry is unusual, the poem's argument can be seen as an extended elaboration of the objections to φθόνος found elsewhere in Pindar. One function of the climactic φθονεραὶ … ἐλπίδες is to remind listeners of the viewpoint articulated in the first antistrophe. Clear (2013) 36 understands the phrase as a reference to a real group whose envy 'would have been notionally based on a sense of kinship with Xenocrates, since this would have been the basis of staking a claim to his ἀρετή'; this is unduly restrictive, and misses the generalizing point that victory is always susceptible to all manner of φθόνος: *cf.* Verdenius (1982) 34. More important than the (putative) concrete situations against which the phrase may have been understood by early listeners is the mode of thinking that the lines dramatize: listeners find their attitudinal comportment measured against the text's propositions. On φθόνος in Pindar more generally, *cf.*, for example, Goldhill (1991) 161; Bulman (1992).

[86] The most likely scenario involves performance by someone close to Thrasybulus, either a φίλος or family member, but we should not unduly restrict our notion of the extent of the poem's dissemination: *cf.* the comments of Rawles (2011) 158. The rhetoric of the final lines would have fitted a performance in other locations equally well. If performed by Pindar or one of his φίλοι in Thebes, for example, the poem's realization in a setting removed from the *laudandus* would put further emphasis on its generalizing celebration of ethical values and hence would constitute a forceful rejoinder to the charges of poetic prostitution.

[87] *Cf.* Stehle (1997) 8 on poems as vehicles for performers: I would emphasize the dialogic nature of this relationship.

[88] The fact of such performances taking place some time after the 'premiere' is also efficacious, in that it signals the embeddedness of the poem and its propositions in the social fabric of the *polis*.

rendering of the poem would have highlighted both the poem's power to mould individual subjectivity and the poem's reliance on the social, ethical and musical agency of the performer qua individual. Such a performance would have been the antithesis of the Μοῖσα … φιλοκερδής, constituting rather an act of ξενία the 'gains' of which lay in its vivification of the social bonds between performer and audience.

V. Conclusions

Although they differ considerably in subject and form, both the poems I have examined foreground the encounter of the individual listener with the poetic voice. This voice, through 'the power of [its] language, the abrupt soaring of [its] thought',[89] dramatizes a mode of attunement to the world, while simultaneously seeking a receptiveness in the listening it projects. The relational processes by which subjectivity is enacted, both within the poems and through the figure of the performer, disclose what constitutes, at least within the system of values the poems are concerned to celebrate, meaningful engagement with the world of human relationships and concerns. On this account, listening is not an informational processing of pre-given social norms, but is characterized by an openness to moments of ethical and interpretative possibility. A significant part of the θέλξις exerted by Pindar's poetry rests in listeners' apprehension of a given poem's potentiating effects, the varied ways in which it calls for extension in lived experience.

This θέλξις also entails a sensitivity to the boundedness of performances. Pindar's epinicians are linguistically,[90] musically and ethically heightened events of meaning that foreground their irreducible particularity through the specifics of voice, melody and comportment through which individual performances are realized, and through the various lexical manoeuvres and formal gestures by which the poems separate themselves from other types of discourse. Simultaneously, however, the poems invite processes of interpretation that affirm listeners' ethical and interpretative agency, and entail a deepened, more local and personalized understanding of the intellectual frameworks they promote.[91] Timocritus' song, for example, both models its reception and withdraws into fiction: no performance can ever replace or replicate Timocritus' imagined version of the poem, and yet the imaginative contact the description evokes encourages a grasp of what makes performance a personally and socially significant act. Interpretative processes are crucial to the poetic argument of *Isthmian* 2, which on my reading advertises its reliance on audiences' appreciation of social and literary subtexts. Understood in abstract terms, these aspects of 'Pindar's voices' would have been equally manifest in choral as in monodic realizations of his poems. Yet when considered as a scenario informed by the individual singer's musical skill, and as manifesting a personal engagement with a given poem, solo reperformance constitutes a powerfully particular form of embodied ethicality. This scenario derives considerable force from instantiating both sides of the dialogue between poem and listener, functioning simultaneously as a realization of the poem itself and an enactment of a way of responding to it. In addition to the local socio-political circumstances that doubtless informed specific reperformance scenarios in ways now opaque to us,[92] the distinctive ethicality of monodic performance accounts for much of its importance as a cultural phenomenon.

[89] Fränkel (1973) 428.

[90] Silk (2012) 349 gives a good account of the verbal aspect ('a linguistic corollary of the aristocratic ideology he so actively upholds … Pindar's language is distinctively and *locally* heightened'), but resists discussing music or the ethicality of the performing figure.

[91] *Cf.* Thomas (2012) 244, commenting on Pindar's difficulty from an ethnographic perspective.

[92] *Cf.* Athanassaki (2009) 254–59 on the political aspects of sympotic reperformance of Pindar's epinicia for Hiero; see further Morgan (2015) 111–15 on performance scenarios for the Sicilian odes. Athanassaki's reading emphasizes the importance of the social aspect of reception ('posthumous inclusion in the sympotic repertoire was … the ultimate challenge for tyrants': (2009) 259), but although the circumstances of such performances would have differed markedly from, say, those of *Nem.* 4, I would argue that the ethical force of the individual performer would still have played an important role in articulating the poem's effects.

Bibliography

Athanassaki, L. (2009) 'Narratology, deixis, and the performance of choral lyric: on Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds), *Narratology and Interpretation* (Berlin and New York) 241–73

— (2014) 'The creative impact of the occasion: Pindar's songs for the Emmenids and Horace's *Odes* 1.2 and 4.2', in D. Cairns and R. Scodel (eds), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh) 197–225

Attridge, D. (2004) *The Singularity of Literature* (London and New York)

Barker, A. (1984) *Greek Musical Writings* 1: *The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge)

Bernardini, P.A. (1983) *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro* (Rome)

Boeke, H. (2007) *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes: Gnomai, Cosmology, and the Role of the Poet* (Leiden)

Bowie, E. (2012) 'Epinicians and "patrons"', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 83–92

Braswell, B.K. (1992) *A Commentary on Pindar* Nemean *1* (Fribourg)

Budelmann, F. (2012) 'Epinician and the symposion: a comparison with the enkomia' in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 173–90

Bulman, P. (1992) *Phthonos in Pindar* (Berkeley)

Burnett, A.P. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford)

Cairns, F. (1977) 'ἔρως in Pindar's first Olympian ode' *Hermes* 105, 129–32

— (2011) 'Money and the poet: the first stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnemosyne* 64, 21–36

Calame, C. (2013) 'Choral practices in Plato's *Laws*: itineraries of initiation?', in A.-E. Peponi (ed.), *Performance and Culture in Plato's* Laws (Cambridge) 87–108

Carey, C. (1989) 'The performance of the victory ode', *AJPh* 110, 545–65

— (1995) 'Pindar and the victory ode', in L. Ayres (ed.), *The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions Presented to I.G. Kidd* (New Brunswick) 85–103

Catenacci, C., Giannini, P. and Lomiento, L. (2013) *Pindaro.* Le Olimpiche (Milan)

Cingano, E. (1990) 'L'opera di Ibico e di Stesicoro nella classificazione degli antichi e degli moderni', *AION(filol)* 12, 189–224

Clay, J.S. (1999) 'Pindar's sympotic epinicia', *QUCC* 62, 25–34

Clear, R. (2013) 'Family, duty and expectation: a case for the joint performance of Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 and *Pythian* 6', *Mnemosyne* 66, 31–53

Crotty, K. (1983) *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore)

Currie, B. (2004) 'Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes' in C. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden and Boston) 51–69

— (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford)

— (2013) 'The Pindaric first person in flux', *ClAnt* 32.2, 243–82

D'Angour, A. (2006) 'The "new music": so what's new?', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds), *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece* (Cambridge) 264–83

Danek, G. and Hagel, S. (1995) 'Homer-Singen', *Wiener Humanistische Blätter* 37, 5–20

De Marinis, M. (1993) *The Semiotics of Performance*. (Bloomington)

Eckerman, C. (2016) Review of Maslov (2015), *AJPh* 137, 541–45

Farenga, V. (2006) *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece: Individuals Performing Justice and the Law* (Cambridge)

Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford)

— (2011) 'Introduction: Aegina in contexts', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford) 1–37

Finglass, P. (2007) *Pindar* Pythian *11* (Cambridge)

Ford, A. (2002) *The Origins of Criticism* (Princeton)

Fränkel, H. (1973) *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: A History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth Century* (Oxford)

Gagné, R. and Hopman, M.G. (eds) (2013) *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge)

Gentili, B. (1988) *Poetry and Public in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore)

Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice* (Cambridge)

— (1996) 'Collectivity and otherness – the authority of the tragic chorus: response to Gould', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford) 244–56

— (1999) 'Programme notes', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge) 1–29
Gould, J. (1996) 'Tragedy and collective experience', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford) 217–43
Griffith, R.D. (1989) 'Pelops and Sicily: the myth of Pindar *Ol*. 1', *JHS* 109, 171–73
Hagel, S. (1994) 'Zu den Konstituenten des griechischen Hexameters', *Wiener Studien* 107–08, 77–108
Heath, M. (1988) 'Receiving the κῶμος: the context and performance of epinician', *AJPh* 109, 180–95
Henrichs, A. (1996) 'Dancing in Athens, dancing on Delos: some patterns of choral projection in Euripides', *Philologus* 140, 48–62
Henry, W.B. (2005) *Pindar's* Nemeans*: A Selection* (Stuttgart)
Howie, J.G. (1984) 'The revision of myth in Pindar *Olympian* 1: the death and revival of Pelops (25–7, 36–66), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4. 277–313. Reprinted in Howie, J.G. (2012) *Exemplum and Myth, Criticism and Creation: Papers on Early Greek Literature* (Prenton) 161–90
Hubbard, T.K. (2004) 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: pan-hellenism, reperformance, written texts', in C. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden and Boston) 71–93
Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford)
Köhnken, A. (1974) '*Olympian* I: Pindar as innovator', *CQ* 27,199–206
Komornicka, A.M. (1972) 'Quelques remarques sur la notion d'ΑΛΑΘΕΙΑ et de ΨΕΥΔΟΣ chez Pindare', *Eos* 60, 235–53
Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford)
Kozak, L.A. (2014) 'Oaths and characterization: two Homeric case studies', in A. Sommerstein and I. Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (Berlin and Boston) 213–29
Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise* (Princeton)
— (2005) 'Choral lyric as "ritualization": poetic sacrifice and poetic ego in Pindar's sixth paean', *ClAnt* 24.1, 81–130
— (2013) 'Pindar's *Pythian* 11 and the *Oresteia*: contestatory ritual poetics in the 5th c. BCE', *ClAnt* 32.1, 101–75
Kyriakou, P. (1996) 'A variation of the Pindaric break-off in *Nemean* 4', *AJPh* 117.1, 17–35
Lefkowitz, M. (1988) 'Who sang Pindar's victory odes?', *AJPh* 109, 1–11
LeVen, P. (2013) 'The colors of sound: *poikilia* and its aesthetic contexts', *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 1, 229–42
Loscalzo, D. (2003) *La parola inestinguibile: Studi sull'epinicio pindarico* (Rome)
Machemer, G.A. (1993) 'Medicine, music, and magic: the healing grace of Pindar's fourth *Nemean*', *HSPh* 95, 113–41
Maslov, B. (2015) *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature* (Cambridge)
Miller, A.M. (1983) '*N*.4.33–43 and the defense of digressive leisure', *CJ* 78, 202–20
Morgan, K.A. (1993) 'Pindar the professional and the rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ', *CPh* 88, 1–15
— (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford)
Morrison, A. (2007) *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (London)
— (2011) 'Aeginetan odes, reperformance, and Pindaric intertextuality', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford) 227–53
— (2012) 'Performance, re-performance, and Pindar's audiences', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 111–33
Most, G. (1985) *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second* Pythian*, and Seventh* Nemean Odes (Göttingen)
Nicholson, N. (2000) 'Pederastic poets and adult patrons in late Archaic lyric', *CW* 93, 235–59
— (2001) 'Pindar *Nemean* 4.57–58 and the arts of poets, trainers, and wrestlers', *Arethusa* 34.1, 31–59
Nisetich, F. (1977) 'Convention and occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10, 133–56
Park, A. (2013) 'Truth and genre in Pindar', *CQ* 63.1, 17–36
Payne, M. (2006) 'On being vatic: Pindar, pragmatism, and historicism', *AJPh* 127, 159–84
— (2007) 'Ideas in lyric communication: Pindar and Paul Celan', *Modern Philology* 105.1, 5–20
Peponi, A.-E. (ed.) (2013) *Performance and Culture in Plato's* Laws (Cambridge)

Phillips, T. (2013) 'Epinician variations: music and text in Pindar, *Pythians* 2 and 12', *CQ* 63.1, 37–56
— (2016) *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford)
Porter, J. (2016) *The Sublime in Antiquity* (Cambridge)
Power, T. (2010) *The Culture of Kitharôidia* (Washington and Cambridge MA)
Prauscello, L. (2012) 'Epinician sounds: Pindar and musical innovation', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 28–82
Race, W. (1997) *Pindar*: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, *Fragments* (Cambridge MA)
Rawles, R. (2011) '*Eros* and praise in early Greek lyric', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination* (Berlin) 139–59
Rhodes, P. (2007) 'Oaths in political life', in A. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher (eds), *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society* (Exeter) 11–25
Ruijgh, C. (2001) 'Le "Spectacle des lettres", comédie de Callias (Athénée x 453c–455b), avec un excursus sur les rapports entre la mélodie du chant et les contours mélodiques du langage parlé', *Mnemosyne* 54.3, 257–335
Scodel, R. (2001) 'Poetic authority and oral tradition in Hesiod and Pindar', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden) 109–37
Sandel, M. (1998) *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge)
Sealey, R. (1994) *The Justice of the Gods* (Ann Arbor)
Silk, M. (2007) 'Pindar's poetry as poetry: a literary commentary on *Olympian* 12', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford) 177–97
— (2012) 'Reading Pindar', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 347–64
Simpson, M. (1969) 'The chariot and the bow as metaphors for poetry in Pindar', *TAPhA* 100, 437–73
Sommerstein, A. (2014) 'How oaths are expressed', in A. Sommerstein and I. Torrance (eds), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (Berlin and Boston) 76–85
Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece* (Princeton)
Stenger, J. (2004) *Poetische Argumentation: die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides* (Berlin)
Thomas, R. (2012) 'Pindar's "difficulty" and the performance of epinician poetry: some suggestions from ethnography', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 224–45
Verdenius, W.J. (1970) *Homer: The Educator of the Greeks* (Amsterdam)
— (1982) 'Pindar's second *Isthmian* ode: a commentary', *Mnemosyne* 35, 1–37
Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1972) *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris)
von der Mühll, P. (1964) 'Weitere pindarische Notizen', *MH* 21,168–72
Wecowski, M. (2014) *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet* (Oxford)
Wallace, R.W. (2004) 'Damon of Oa: a music theorist ostracized?', in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford) 249–68
— (2015) *Reconstructing Damon: Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles' Athens* (Oxford)
Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the* Khoregia*: The Chorus, the City, the Stage* (Cambridge)
Woodbury, L. (1968) 'Pindar and the mercenary muse', *TAPhA* 99, 527–42
West, M.L. (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford)
Young, D.C. (1971) *Pindar,* Isthmian *7, Myth and Exempla* (Leiden)