Was Epinician Poetry Performed at Panhellenic Sanctuaries?

Christopher C. Eckerman

In 1985 Thomas Gelzer, following Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Herwig Maehler, and others,[1] published a substantial and influential article, which argued that epinician poems were first performed either at the sanctuary at which the respective victory was won, immediately after the victory, or at the home polis of the victor, shortly after the victor returned home.[2] The great majority of scholars have followed Gelzer in suggesting two alternate performance contexts for epinician odes. David Campbell, for example, comments on Bacchylides 2, "this brief song seems to have been performed at the Isthmus, the elaborate poem 1 at a later celebration on Ceos."[3] Campbell's note displays the common assumption that, when a longer and a shorter ode for the same victory are preserved, then the shorter was composed for on-site performance while the longer was composed for performance in the home of the victor. Similarly Neumann-Hartmann assumes that certain epinician odes were performed on site and devotes a chapter of

---

[1] Cf. H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* (Leiden/New York 1982) I.2 10, 30, with further bibliography.

[2] T. Gelzer, "Μοῦσα αὐθιγενής: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien," *MusHelv* 42 (1985: hereafter 'Gelzer') 95–120: "So gibt es … schliesslich zwei Typen von Siegesliedern im engeren Sinn. Davon sind die einen für ein spezifisches Siegesfest gedichtet, das zu Ehren des Siegers nach seiner Rückkehr vom Wettkampfort in seiner Heimat gefeiert wird, die andern dagegen zur Darbietung bei einer Siegesfeier am Wettkampfort selber, vor der Heimkehr des Siegers in seine Heimat, bestimmt" (96–97).

[3] D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* IV (Cambridge [Mass.] 1992) 125.

her recent monograph to such odes.[4]

The assumption of on-site performance, which has become entrenched, deserves a rejoinder in favor of greater skepticism.[5] No one has reassessed the data marshaled in detail by Gelzer, however, to query how much evidence the epinician odes really offer for performance at the sanctuaries. Here I reexamine the relevant passages and argue that there is no secure evidence for the performance of any of these odes at Panhellenic sanctuaries. My goal is not to depreciate the importance of song culture at victory celebrations on site, since we know that song was an important part of such celebrations. However, we should not assert that some odes were first performed at the Panhellenic sanctuaries and that others were first performed in the home *poleis* of the victors, since the poems themselves provide no evidence for their performance at the sanctuaries. Consequently, no deductions can be made regarding performance location based on the length of any ode: *prima facie* there is no reason to suggest that shorter odes were regularly performed at the sanctuary and longer odes were regularly performed in the home *poleis* of the victors.[6] This paper, then, situates itself among the literature on deixis that Nancy Felson and others inaugurated in relation to lyric poetry.[7] By focusing on *ad oculos* deixis, I hope to make a contribution toward recovering the specific context in which epinician poetry was first

[4] A. Neumann-Hartmann, *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen* (Hildesheim 2009), ch. 3.

[5] Although it is rare for scholars to be critical of Gelzer's arguments, William Race notes, "It is often claimed that shorter epinikia … were improvisations performed at the site of the victory … but there is no conclusive evidence for such assumptions": *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1997) 15.

[6] Contra e.g. Gelzer 99, "Diese kleinen Formen sind also für diesen Typ üblich."

[7] See *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric = Arethusa* 37 (2004) 253–466.

performed.[8]

As both Gelzer and Neumann-Hartmann note, there is no external evidence for on-site performance of epinician poetry, and the evidence accordingly would have to derive from the odes themselves.[9] This may, however, not be surprising since we have very little evidence regarding epinician performance in general.[10] Working only with Pindar's and Bacchylides' extant odes, then, Gelzer suggests that eight of these were composed for on-site performance, and he provides various reasons, based on text-internal references, for his argument.[11] As I shall show, however, Gelzer overlooks several passages, within these eight odes, that argue against his thesis, and all the passages that he uses as evidence for on-site performance are problematic.

It is best to begin with a reexamination of the eight odes that

[8] Felson explains *ad oculos* deixis by saying, "Ocular deictics in performance poetry point extra-textually to objects or properties surrounding the discourse and visible in the extra-linguistic context of the utterance": *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 259.

[9] Gelzer 97 n.6: "Zur Entscheidung, ob ein Lied am Wettkampfort oder anderswo aufgeführt worden sei, ist man ganz auf die Hinweise im Text selber angewiesen." Neumann-Hartmann, *Epinikien* 69: "Um in Erfahrung zu bringen, wo und wann Epinikien am Wettkampfort zur Aufführung gelangten, müssen wir daher von den Siegesliedern ausgehen, die einen Vortrag am Festspielort nahe legen."

[10] For example, it is not clear whether odes were always performed by a soloist or by a chorus, whether odes were performed at the home of the victor or at a public venue, whether some odes were processional, etc. On the paucity of external evidence, see too J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley 1985) 27–28.

[11] Gelzer 97: "Alle acht im folgenden genannten Lieder enthalten Erwähnungen, die als Argument für Aufführung am Wettkampfort interpretiert werden können, nämlich die Nennung von Ort und Gott des Wettkampfs und Umständen der Herkunft der Ehre des Sieges wie Wettkampf, Bekränzung und Feier des Siegers und Neuheit seines Glücks, in folgenden Versen: *O.* 4, 1–5. 5–12; *O.* 11, 7f. 12–14; *P.* 6, 3–9. 16–19; *P.* 7, 4. 10–12; *N.* 2, 1–5. 14f. 24f.; *Ep.* 2, 3–7.11–14; *Ep.* 4, 1–6. 14–16; *Ep.* 6, 1–3. 6. 14–16." Cf. M. Hose, "Bemerkungen zum 4. Epinikion des Bakchylides," in A. Bagordo and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung* (Munich 2000) 161–168, at 162.

——————

are frequently used in support of the case for on-site perfor-
mance. Like Bacchylides 1, Bacchylides 2 was composed for
Argeius of Ceos, and it contains two passages deemed highly
supportive of the on-site hypothesis.[12] The first relates to the
lacuna at the very beginning of the ode, while the second re-
volves around the phrase Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενής in line 11. The
brief poem may be cited in full.[13]

ἅ[. . . . .] σεμνοδότειρα Φήμα
ἐς Κ[έον ἱ]εράν, χαριτώ-
νυμ[ον] φέρουσ' ἀγγελίαν,
ὅτι μ[ά]χας θρασύχειρ<ος> Ἀρ-
5   γεῖο[ς ἄ]ρατο νίκαν,

καλῶν δ' ἀνέμνασεν ὅσ' ἐν κλε[εν]νῷ
αὐχένι Ἰσθμοῦ ζαθέαν
λιπόντες Εὐξαντίδα νᾶ-
σον ἐπεδείξαμεν ἑβδομή-
10   κοντα [σὺ]ν στεφάνοισιν.

καλεῖ δὲ Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενὴς
γλυκεῖαν αὐλῶν καναχάν,
γεραίρουσ' ἐπινικίοις
Πανθείδα φίλον υἱόν.

Report, giver of majesty, [sped/speed (?)] to holy Ceos, carrying
the message of gracious name, that Argeius won the victory in
the bold-handed fight and reminded us of all the fine achieve-
ments we had displayed at the famous neck of the Isthmus when
we left the sacred island of Euxantius and won seventy garlands;
and the *authigenes* Muse summons the sweet skirl of the pipes as
she honors with victory-songs the dear son of Pantheides.

An interpretation of a performance context for this ode may be

---

[12] See e.g. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 10: "Das kurze Lied B. 2,
das sicher für die Aufführung am Isthmos gleich nach der Siegerehrung be-
stimmt war…, zeigt einen einfachen, dreiteiligen Aufbau."

[13] For text of Bacchylides, I follow Campbell's Loeb edition (*Greek Lyric*
IV: 1992) and base my translations closely on those of Campbell. For text of
Pindar, I follow Race's Loeb edition (1997) and base my translations closely
on his.

affected by how we supplement the lacuna at the beginning of the poem. Many scholars, including Schroeder, Taccone, Wilamowitz, Steinkopf, and Maehler, fill the lacuna with an imperative, ἄ[ϊξον], and interpret the opening to be a command, during performance at the Isthmus, to Φήμα, to speed from the Isthmus to Ceos to spread news of the victory.[14] This is the interpretation of Gelzer too, and when the passage is taken thus, it may provide evidence that this ode was not first performed at Ceos; scholars then deduce that the ode must have first been performed at the Isthmus, the site of victory.[15]

I suggest an alternative interpretation that, on the one hand, retains the imperative ἄϊξον but, on the other, positions the first performance not at the Isthmus but at Ceos. Assuming for the moment that Bacchylides did use the imperative in the lacuna, ἄϊξον, ὦ σεμνοδότειρα Φήμα, ἐς Κέον ἱεράν ("speed, Report that gives majesty, to holy Ceos"), nonetheless it is not clear whence the performers' voices arise. Is the chorus at the Isthmus or at Ceos? It may be plausible, perhaps even preferable, to assume that this is an invocation and that a chorus on Ceos, not at the Isthmus, calls on Φήμα to come to Ceos with news of the victory. Given Pindaric and Bacchylidean comparanda, it becomes more likely that the phrase "speed to Ceos" is an invocation, rather than an exhortation to flight. There are many such invocations where a divinity is called upon to be present at an epinician celebration, but there are no passages where the chorus urges a divinity to leave its side. As Maehler notes, "Mehrere Siegeslieder beginnen mit einem Anruf an Göttinnen wie Phema (B. 10), Nika (B. 11), Hora (Pind.N.8), auch an die Ἀμέρα, die sehr wahrscheinlich in B. 7.2 zu ergänzen ist."[16] Although Bacch. 10 also begins with an invocation of Φήμα, there is no reason to suggest that that ode

[14] Cf. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 28, and R. Jebb, *Bacchylides. The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge 1905) 251.

[15] Cf. T. Hubbard, "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric," in C. J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden 2004) 71–93, at 77.

[16] *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 28.

was performed on site. The invocation of Φήμα in Bacch. 2, then, may not derive from a need for Φήμα to leave the Panhellenic sanctuary and report news of the victory at Ceos; rather, the invocation of Φήμα may participate in a generic encomiastic topos: Panhellenic victories should be widely 'reported' and celebrated through epinician poetry, such as the currently performed ode.[17]

The invocation hypothesis explains how the chorus can use the imperative while the first performance occurs on Ceos, not at the Isthmus.[18] Accordingly, if the chorus in Bacch. 2 beckons Φήμα to hurry to Ceos, it would be a powerful dramatic conceit that enlivens performance at Ceos, with Φήμα bringing news to the home polis of the victor from the site of victory. And through Bacchylides' ode, Φήμα does arrive and bring news of the victory, for, as Hubbard notes in relation to Bacch. 10, Bacchylides' poem is an agent of Φήμα.[19]

Alternatively, the lacuna may be supplemented with an aorist indicative. Gelzer does not notify his readers that the indicative is an important possibility to consider, although many Hellenists, including Levi, Blass, Festa, and Jebb, preferred this over the imperative.[20] If the lacuna did contain the aorist indicative, Φήμα has already sped from the Isthmus to Ceos, where Bacchylides' ode is being performed, and this would mirror reality on Ceos, since the people at the celebration know they are there to celebrate Argeius' victory.

The opening of Bacch. 2, then, need not provide any evidence in favor of on-site performance whether the imperative or the indicative is chosen as a supplement. Maehler provides

---

[17] This problematizes Gelzer's thesis that the 'Botschaft' and 'Zeugnis' motifs are peculiar to the 'on site' category of poems. See Gelzer 99–101, and Hose, in *Bakchylides* 161–162.

[18] Contra Jebb, *Bacchylides* 251, who claims, "If ἄιξον, ὦ were read, it would imply that the poet himself was at the Isthmus."

[19] Hubbard, in *Oral Performance* 73.

[20] Gelzer 99; for discussion see Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 28.

numerous comparanda that lead him to favor the imperative,[21] and, given those comparanda, I find it most likely that Bacchylides did use the imperative rather than the indicative in the lacuna. Furthermore, given the epinician comparanda in favor of invocation rather than exhortation to flight, I find it most plausible that a chorus on Ceos invokes Φήμα to be present at the victory celebration; nonetheless, the aorist indicative should not be ruled out.

Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενής in line 11 is also a topic of concern and has been taken to provide substantial evidence for the on-site hypothesis. αὐθιγενής, according to LSJ, means 'born on the spot', 'born in the country', or 'native'. As a compound adjective formed from the deictic adverb αὖθι and the verb γίγνομαι, the semantics of the adjective are unproblematic, meaning 'born right here'. Thus Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενής means 'Muse that is born right here'. For the original audience, which knows whether the performance is occurring at the Isthmus or at Ceos, the adjective is unproblematic. The important point to stress, however, is that 'born right here' is not a declaration of performance at the Isthmus any more than it is a declaration of performance at Ceos. For some scholars, including Wilamowitz, Maehler, and Gelzer, however, the phrase refers to a Muse that is 'born on the spot [of victory]' and accordingly the adjective refers to on-site performance.[22] However, 'of victory' or the like is a peculiar and unwarranted addition to the semantics of αὐθιγενής.

Critics who do not favor on-site performance have assumed that the adjective means 'born right here', i.e. 'kindred', 'native'—thus Jurenka, Festa, Taccone, and Jebb. With Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενής, Bacchylides would refer, then, either to himself metaphorically as a Muse native to Ceos ('born right here') or

[21] *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 28, 205–206.

[22] Campbell, *Greek Lyric* IV 125, follows Gelzer but also considers the other possibility: the Muse is *authigenes* "since B. is composing at the site of the games; but perhaps 'the compatriot Muse' with reference to the Cean origin of B. and the victor."

to a Muse that Bacchylides has brought to life 'on the spot' during performance at Ceos. Bacchylides is fond of programmatic statements linking himself metaphorically with a Muse,[23] and he may see himself here as the mouthpiece of the Muse and hence the Muse is 'kindred', reflecting that Cean Bacchylides has close ties to the Cean victor specifically and Ceos generally. Bacchylides stresses his Cean identity in Bacch. 3 where he refers to himself as a "Cean nightingale" (Κηίας ἀηδόνος, 98) and in Bacch. 10 where he refers to himself as a "clear-voiced island bee" (νασιῶτιν … λιγύφθογγον μέλισσαν, 10). In epinician poetry, moreover, the end of a poem is frequently a place for programmatic statements where the poet asserts his preeminence,[24] and Bacchylides' stressing his close bond to the Muse would generically be more expected than a statement that asserts that a Muse was brought to life at the site of victory, which is otherwise unparalleled.[25] Whether we interpret Μοῦσ᾽ αὐθιγενής to mean 'Muse born on the spot' or 'native/kindred Muse', the phrase provides no evidence for the on-site hypothesis.

Like the first stanza of Bacch. 2, that of Bacch. 4 is often taken to offer strong evidence for on-site performance, specifically in lines 4 and 5:[26]

> ἔτι Συρακοσίαν φιλεῖ
> πόλιν ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ἀπόλλων,
> ἀστύθεμίν θ᾽ Ἱέ[ρω]να γεραίρει·
> τρίτον γὰρ π[αρ᾽ ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς
> 5 Πυ[θ]ιόνικος ἀ[είδε]ται
> ὠ[κυ]πόδων ἀρ[ετᾷ] σὺν ἵππων.
> ἔ[λακε δ᾽] ἀδυεπὴς ἀ[να]-
> [ξιφόρ]μιγγος Οὐρ[αν]ίας ἀλέκτωρ

[23] Cf. 3.98 (nightingale), 4.8 (cock), 5.10 (servant of Urania), 10.10 (bee).

[24] E.g. Bacch. 3.96–98.

[25] On programmatic statements in epinican poetry see I. Pfeijffer, "The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides," *CP* 89 (1994) 305–317.

[26] Cf. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 64, and *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge 2004) 100–101.

[ποτὲ μ]έν· ἀλλ' ἐκ[όν]τι νόῳ
10   [νῦν νέο]υς ἐπέσεισ᾿εν᾿ ὕμνους.

Golden-haired Apollo still loves the Syracusan city and honors
its righteous ruler …[see below]… and the sweet-voiced cock of
lyre-ruling Urania (cried out once before?) but (now) with willing
mind he has showered on him (new) songs of praise.

This stanza has been heavily reconstructed, and presumably we
should not invest heavily in any dogmatic position that may de-
rive from its interpretation. Regardless, Campbell's translation
may serve as a standard way of interpreting lines 4 and 5:

Since for the third time he is hymned by the navel of the high-
ridged land as a Pythian victor, thanks to the excellence of his
swift-footed horses.

The evidence for on-site performance has been written into the
text with the provision of ἀ[είδε]ται as a supplement in line 5.
ἀ[είδε]ται is not unquestionable as a supplement because
multiple letters need to be provided and because it creates a
performance context for epinician poetry that is not elsewhere
clearly recognized in the epinician corpora. As Neumann-
Hartmann too notes, the supplement is not a given.[27] In short,
it may be that ἀ[είδε]ται is not the correct supplement, and if it
is not, then there is no evidence for on-site performance in this
ode. Regardless, for the sake of scholarly dialogue, I shall take
it as an attractive supplement and analyze the passage with it.

Scholars generally take π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς
with ἀ[είδε]ται, following a traditional syntactic rendering of
the passage, but as S. R. Slings has shown, "Bacchylides' style
is still an oral style," and a pragmatic approach to under-
standing his language is often more helpful than a traditional
grammatical approach.[28] Bacchylides begins line 4 by seeming
to assert that something has happened for a third time (the

---

[27] *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen* 38.

[28] S. R. Slings, "Information Unit and Metrical Unit," in I. L. Pfeijffer
and S. R. Slings (eds.), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides* (Amsterdam 1999) 61–
75.

temporal denotation 'third' will only become apparent as the sentence unfolds). As the line continues, we learn that something seems to have happened at the *omphalos* of the high-ridged land, namely Delphi. At the end of line 4 there is period end, and, pragmatically, the audience will construe meaning for this line before the next period begins. Given epinician norms, the audience will interpret this line, as an information unit, to mean that Hieron has now won his third victory at the Pythian games, since they know that the currently performed hymn celebrates his victory (470 B.C.) in the chariot-race at Delphi and that he won twice previously at Delphi in the horse race (482 and 478). In addition, *para* + dative or accusative is a formulaic way to name the place of victory in an epinician ode;[29] word order and epinician norms, then, encourage the audience to link τρίτον with π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς as an information unit and to take π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς as a reference to the place of victory. Accordingly, the audience may supply a verb such as 'he won' at the end of line 4 to make sense of the preceding material in the period. Though it would not be unparalleled, it presumably would come as something of a surprise if in line 5, with a new metrical period, the audience has to realign their understanding of the previous information unit. A traditional syntactic rendering of the line, however, requires such a reinterpretation of the information unit in line 4. As line 5 develops, the victor is referred to as a Pythian victor and we learn that he is being sung. In fact, the seemingly enjambed Πυ[θ]ιόνικος, with its emphasis on winning, eases the grammatical difficulty of the preceding line where the audience members were, perhaps, encouraged to supply 'won' for themselves; at this point they may no longer need to supply a verb 'won' since that verbal idea is explicitly supplied in the verbal noun Πυ[θ]ιόνικος. However, as a new metrical unit and information unit begin, Πυ[θ]ιόνικος will also

---

[29] Cf. W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) 411–412, and D. Gerber, *Lexicon in Bacchylidem* (Hildesheim 1984) 187–188.

be taken with ἀ[είδε]ται: Hieron not only won at Pytho (line 4), but he is also being sung *as* a Pythian victor (line 5). Accordingly, we might modify Campbell's traditional syntactic translation quoted above, and pragmatically translate as:

> For, for the third time, he is being sung [at e.g. Syracuse], for being a victor at Pytho, at the *omphalos* of the high-ridged land.

More can be said in favor of rethinking the traditional interpretation of the syntax and semantics of lines 4 and 5. If we take the lines as postulated here, then the passage means that Hieron has won three times at Delphi and is now being celebrated in song. Alternatively, if we take the prepositional phrase π[αρ' ὀμφα]λὸν ὑψιδείρου χθονὸς with ἀ[είδε]ται, the sentence asserts that Hieron is being sung for the third time at Pytho. Accordingly, Bacchylides would not be stressing the accomplishments of Hieron, but rather would be commenting on the fact that Hieron had been sung at Delphi twice previously in addition to this third performance at Delphi. However, it would be outside epinician norms for Bacchylides to stress Hieron's previous celebrations at Delphi rather than to stress his accomplishments at Delphi. Accordingly, based on metrical structure, pragmatic linguistics, and epinician *topoi* (i.e., the panegyrist's job is to celebrate the victor, not the fact that the victor has been celebrated three times at Delphi in song), it may be best to take the prepositional phrase as separate from ἀ[είδε]ται; there would be, then, no evidence in this poem for on-site performance.

If, however, we choose to retain the supplement ἀ[είδε]ται and do not choose to follow Slings and his interpretation of Bacchylides in terms of metrical units and sense units (feeling that this interpretation contains special pleading), but prefer a traditional interpretation of the grammar, following, for example, the translation of Campbell, ἀ[είδε]ται still need not refer to Bacchylides' immediate epinician ode. Bacchylides may be saying that Hieron has in the past been sung at Delphi and continues to be sung at Delphi, without explicitly articulating what he has in mind. He may refer here to extemporaneous singing, such as the so-called Archilochus song that

was performed on site (cf. *Ol.* 9.1). Alternatively, the passage may refer to a reperformance scenario of epinician poetry at Delphi. That is to say, Hieron may be sung at Delphi with epinician odes that had been composed previously. There are, then, multiple ways to interpret ἀ[είδε]ται, and lines 4 and 5 need not refer to the immediate performance of Bacch. 4, even if we choose to accept the supplement.

Finally, and most importantly, the Bacchylides papyrus itself preserves textual evidence for the performance of this ode in the home polis of the victor, Syracuse, and not on site. At line 14 the papyrus clearly reads παρεστίαν, which Maehler emends to πάρεστιν δ' ἐν for metrical and syntactical reasons.[30] Editors have objected to παρεστίαν because of a presumed problem in responsion between 4 τρίτον γὰρ παρ' (⏑−−⏑) and 14 παρ' ἑστίαν (⏑−⏑−), although, as Maehler points out, Bacchylides has the same anaclastic freedom of responsion in his aeolic base at 19.15. It has also been argued that the infinitives in lines 16 (ἐρέπτειν) and 18 (ἀείδειν) must be dependent on a finite verb. For two reasons, then, Maehler prints πάρεστιν δ' ἐν. As Carmine Catenacci and Marialuigia Di Marzio have argued, however, there is no need to emend the text for either the metrical or the syntactical reason: "In realtà nessuno dei due argomenti è decisivo."[31] I should stress that they did not preserve παρ' ἑστίαν because they believe that the first performance of this ode occurred at Syracuse. Rather, they follow the *opinio communis* and assume that the ode was first performed on site because they do not problematize the supplement ἀ[είδε]ται in line 5. Their maintaining the reading preserved in the papyrus is independent of my interpretation here and is based on their own independent syntactical and metrical arguments. Their acceptance of the *opinio communis* for

[30] See Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 75, and C. Catenacci and M. Di Marzio, "Il gallo de Urania (Bacchilide, *Epinicio* 4)," *QUCC* 76 (2004) 71–89, at 79, both with discussion of previous conjectures.

[31] *QUCC* 76 (2004) 79.

the performance context of this ode places them in a difficult position because they have to assume that the phrase παρ' ἑστίαν must refer to a victory celebration that is to come in the future at Syracuse rather than to an immediate performance at Syracuse. There is, however, no grammatical signal in the passage that suggests that παρ' ἑστίαν should refer to a future performance rather than to the immediate performance. They are willing to accept this problem, however, because they are confident that the papyrus' reading should be preserved. The interpretation put forth here, namely that παρ' ἑστίαν refers to immediate performance at Syracuse, removes this problem from their independent arguments made for respecting the transmitted text and thereby strengthens their position.[32]

In short, the evidence provided by Bacch. 4 for a first performance context on site must be taken with greater skepticism than it has been. That evidence is provided via a questionable supplement that sits within a broader section of tattered papyrus. Moreover, via pragmatics, there is an alternative interpretation for the semantics of the phrase, and, furthermore, even if ἀ[είδε]ται is accepted and the pragmatic interpretation is disregarded, there is still multivalence, since it is not clear that Bacchylides refers to his own ode when he says that Hieron is sung at Delphi. Finally, a controversial emendation of a clear passage of Greek must be made to expunge evidence of performance at the home of the victor in line 14. I think that the supplement ἀ[είδε]ται is incorrect and that it has caused substantial confusion, leading scholars to favor the on-site hypothesis. Following Catenacci and Di Marzio, we should accept παρ' ἑστίαν in our editions of Bacchylides and reckon that line 14 provides explicit testimony for Bacch. 4 being performed at Syracuse.

In addition to Bacch. 2 and 4, Bacch. 6 is regularly con-

---

[32] We need not take παρ' ἑστίαν literally and assume that the performance occurs beside Hieron's hearth, though a literal interpretation should not be ruled out. παρ' ἑστίαν may mean no more than that the ode is performed in Syracuse, Hieron's metaphorical hearth.

sidered to provide strong evidence for the on-site hypothesis. Two passages (lines 6–8 and 14–15) are relevant to the performance context of this ode:

> Λάχων Διὸς μεγίστου
> λάχε φέρτατον πόδεσσι
> κῦδος ἐπ᾽ Ἀλφεοῦ προχοαῖς [‿– –]
> δι᾽ ὅσσα πάροιθεν
> 5   ἀμπελοτρόφον Κέον
> ἄεισάν ποτ᾽ Ὀλυμπίᾳ
> πύξ τε καὶ στάδιον κρατεῦ[σαν]
> στεφάνοις ἐθείρας
>
> νεανίαι βρύοντες.
> 10   σὲ δὲ νῦν ἀναξιμόλπου
> Οὐρανίας ὕμνος ἕκατι Νίκ[ας,]
> Ἀριστομένειον
> ὦ ποδάνεμον τέκος,
> γεραίρει προδόμοις ἀοι-
> 15   δαῖς ὅτι στάδιον κρατήσας
> Κέον εὐκλέϊξας.

Lachon by the speed of his feet latched on to the highest glory from great Zeus at the mouth of Alpheus, (adding to the fine achievements?) for which in earlier days young men, their hair luxuriant with garlands, sang of vine-nurturing Ceos as the winner in sprint and boxing at Olympia; and now to you, wind-footed son of Aristomenes, thanks to Victory the hymn of song-ruling Urania gives praise in an ode sung before your house, since by winning the sprint you brought fame to Ceos.

When Bacchylides mentions young men singing here, he explicitly refers to former singing (6 ποτ᾽), and the passage, accordingly, makes no connection to his currently performed ode. We must decide, nonetheless, how to take the locative Ὀλυμπίᾳ in 6. Should it be connected with the verb 'sung' (ἄεισάν) or with the following participial phrase (πύξ τε καὶ στάδιον κρατεῦ[σαν])? The metrical unit and information unit do not end until κρατεῦ[σαν], and, accordingly, line 6 goes together as a unit, and Ὀλυμπίᾳ may be construed either with the verb or with the participle. The former interpretation suggests that young men sang at Olympia in the past, while the

---

latter does not. The grammatical ambiguity of the phrase is exhibited by Jebb's prescription: "Join Ὀλυμπίᾳ with ἄεισαν, not with κρατεῦσαν. These tributes of song were paid by young men of Ceos at Olympia; the occasion would be a festal procession, escorting the Cean victor to the temple of the Olympian Zeus, where he would give thanks; or it might be a banquet."[33] Whenever editors emphatically prescribe one interpretation over another, as Jebb does here, it tells us that the interpretation of the syntax is in doubt, or there would be no need for such a prescriptive gloss.[34] Contra Jebb, Bacchylides may have intended his audience to link Ὀλυμπίᾳ with κρατεῦ[σαν], in which case the passage provides no evidence for young men singing at Olympia. If one does choose to link the locative with the main verb, however, it is important to note that the passage only asserts that Ceans have sung in the past at Olympia, and that that has nothing to do with the immediate performance context of this ode. Moreover, it is not clear that the young men are singing an epinician ode that has been composed for immediate performance on site. They may be singing an impromptu song or they may be re-performing an epinician ode that had been composed on an earlier occasion. If we follow Bacchylides literally, they are not even singing praise for a specific victor but rather are praising Ceos itself. With this passage, then, Bacchylides brings into his ode a depiction of generic song culture at Olympia. The depiction of celebration and song at the Panhellenic festivals is, unsurprisingly, an epinician topos (cf. *Ol.* 5.4–7, 9.1–4, 10.73–77; *Nem.* 6.37–38), but it provides no evidence for the on-site performance of any of the individual odes.

   While the first stanza, then, provides no evidence for the performance of this song on site, the second stanza suggests that this ode may have been performed at Ceos. For example, McDevitt, without hesitation, avers on προδόμοις in line 15,

---

[33] Jebb, *Bacchylides* 295.

[34] See too Hubbard, in *Oral Performance* 78, on this passage.

"This indicates that Ode 6 was sung in Ceos,"[35] and Jebb states "This short ode was sung before the house of Aristomenes, Lachon's father, in Ceos (v. 14)."[36] Their assertions derive from the fact that the chorus seems to claim to be performing the ode before the house of the victor in the penultimate line, with the phrase προδόμοις ἀοιδαῖς. In his scholarly commentary, Maehler, following Kenyon, argues that the ode would have been performed on Ceos before the house of the victor's father.[37] In his later, student commentary, however, he changes his mind and leans toward interpreting προδόμοις in reference to a performance before the temple of Zeus at Olympia, though he cites no comparanda for this interpretation.[38] There is, however, a Pindaric parallel that suggests that προδόμοις ἀοιδαῖς should refer to performance in the home polis of the victor and not to performance at the sanctuary. At *Nem.* 1.19–20 Pindar says that his song is sung at his patron's "courtyard gates" (ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις / ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου κα-λὰ μελπόμενος, "I have taken my stand at the courtyard gates of a generous host as I sing of noble deeds"). As Christopher Carey notes, "the absence of mention of civic space in most victory odes strongly suggests that state involvement was inter-mittent at most and that most celebrations took place at a private house."[39] Both Bacch. 6 and *Nem.*1, then, seem to have been performed at the homes of the victors, and Bacch. 6 provides no evidence for the on-site hypothesis in either of the passages discussed above.

To return to line 6, there may be one good reason for con-struing Ὀλυμπίᾳ with κρατεῦ[σαν] rather than with ἄεισάν

[35] *Bacchylides* 143.

[36] *Bacchylides* 203.

[37] *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I.2 127, 131–132.

[38] *Bacchylides* 129–130; so too Gelzer 99, "mit Gesang vor dem Tempel."

[39] C. Carey, "Pindar, Place, and Performance," in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford 2007) 199–210, at 203.

———————

ποτ'. Bacchylides would be stressing the continuity of Cean athletic victories at Olympia and their celebration in song in their home polis, continuity which has been played out most recently with Lachon's victory at Olympia celebrated in this song, which, on the evidence of lines 14–15, seems to have been performed at the home of the victor. Since Bacchylides is developing parallelisms between former Cean athletic victors and his current patron, the reference to this poem currently being performed on Ceos before the home of the victor, προδόμοις ἀοιδαῖς, may encourage the audience to envision an analogous performance context for the celebrations of the previous Cean victors. Regardless of Bacchylides' intentions, I presume that some members of the audience would have construed the locative Ὀλυμπίᾳ with the main verb and imagined a reference to generic song culture at Olympia, while others would have construed it with the participle and imagined the accomplishments of Ceos in past competitions at Olympia.

In addition to Bacchylides 2, 4, and 6,[40] Gelzer suggests that five poems of Pindar should be classified as performed at the site of the victory. The Pindaric passages have generally been treated as marginal cases, and the majority of the argument in favor of on-site performance has revolved around the three passages of Bacchylides discussed above. Gelzer does not discuss in detail the Pindaric passages and how they may be used as evidence in support of his thesis, but footnotes a list of passages that he takes as evidence in support of his argument.[41] It is worthwhile, then, to examine these passages in some detail.

[40] While positing that Bacch. 6 was composed for performance at Ceos, A. McDevitt, *Bacchylides: The Victory Poems* (London 2009) 145, suggests that Bacchylides composed Bacch. 7, Bacch. 6's "companion poem," for performance at Ceos because of the proem: "personified 'Day' is … identified with the particular day of the prize-giving at the end of the festival; this suggests very strongly that this ode was intended to be sung in the celebrations at Olympia itself." As McDevitt notes, this is speculative.

[41] See n.11 above.

Gelzer argues that *Ol.* 4 was performed on site because Pindar says he was a witness of the games at Olympia (line 3 ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων), but Pindar's claim to have been present at Psaumis' victory at Olympia provides no evidence that the ode was performed at Olympia. Pindar could have seen Psaumis win at Olympia and then composed his ode to perform at a later time in a different venue. For example, Pindar in *Ol.* 10 also makes reference to seeing his patron Hagesidamus win at Olympia, but nothing in that ode suggests that it was performed on site.[42]

Gelzer suggests too that *Ol.* 11 was performed on site, citing lines 7 and 12–14 as evidence, and Willcock asserts that the brief *Ol.* 11 is "the most secure example" of odes performed on site.[43] At line 7, however, Pindar only generally mentions Olympic victors (making no claim to be at Olympia), while at 12–14 he only refers to the Olympic olive crown (again, making no claim to be at Olympia). As Neumann-Hartmann and Hubbard note, it has also been suggested that *Ol.* 11 was performed on site on the basis of lines 16–19 (ἔνθα συγκω-μάξατ'· ἐγγυάσομαι / μή μιν, ὦ Μοῖσαι, φυγόξεινον στρατὸν / μήδ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν / ἀκρόσοφόν τε καὶ αἰχματὰν ἀφίξε-σθαι), in which Pindar tells the Muses to go to Western Locri, the home polis of the victor.[44] Must Pindar, however, apostrophize the Muses from the site of victory when he urges them to go to Locri? He elsewhere makes reference to 'sending' his odes to the home of the victor,[45] and, as Andrew Miller has shown, he regularly merges composition time and performance time to create greater vividness.[46] Pindar may, then, be composing

[42] παῖδ' ἐρατὸν ⟨δ'⟩ Ἀρχεστράτου / αἴνησα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾷ / βωμὸν παρ' Ὀλύμπιον/ κεῖνον κατὰ χρόνον (99–102).

[43] M. M. Willcock, *Pindar, Victory Odes: Olympians, 2, 7, and 11, Nemean 4, Isthmians 3, 4, and 7* (Cambridge 1995) 55.

[44] For further discussion and bibliography see Neumann-Hartmann, *Epi-nikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen* 32–33; Hubbard, in *Oral Performance* 77.

[45] *Ol.* 7.8, 9.25, *Pyth.* 2.68, *Nem.* 3.77.

[46] A. Miller, "Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode," *CJ* 89 (1993)

these lines anywhere, e.g. Thebes, while exhorting the Muses to go to Locri.[47] Nothing, then, in the ode provides secure evidence for the on-site hypothesis.

Gelzer also cites *Pyth.* 6, which has regularly been used as evidence for on-site performance, but Andrew Morrison, in brief, and I, in detail, have already addressed the problems of that assumption. Accordingly, I take it as a given that there is no reason to think that *Pyth.* 6 was performed at Delphi.[48] As Morrison and I note, the evocation of Delphic space does not necessitate that the ode was performed at Delphi, and, following Nancy Felson, I argue that Pindar "vicariously transports" his audience to Delphi during performance at the victor's home polis, Acragas, through his vivid narration of Delphic space. I shall add here that *Pyth.* 6 is a longer ode than the other ones that Gelzer classifies as composed for performance on site and, accordingly, would typologically be an outlier for the on-site hypothesis.

Gelzer suggests that *Pyth.* 7, for Megacles of Athens, would

---

21–53.

[47] In the companion poem to this ode, *Ol.* 10, Pindar refers to a much-discussed "interest" (9 τόκος) that he needs to pay that may derive from his delinquency in fulfilling his encomiastic obligation for his patron. Since the time of the scholiasts, it has been claimed that *Ol.* 11 is the "interest" used to pay Pindar's debt, and many editors (e.g. Dissen, Gildersleeve, Fennell, Farnell) have followed the scholia in assuming that *Ol.* 11 would have come no sooner and presumably even later than *Ol.* 10 (i.e. it could not have been first performed on site). If Pindar does not perform *Ol.* 11 on site, but sends the poem to Locri from Thebes or elsewhere, then there is no clear temporal relationship between *Ol.* 10 and 11. In fact, the "interest" in *Ol.* 10 presumably refers to the "excellence of the ode itself," as W. S. Barrett notes, "Pindar's Odes for Hagesidamos of Western Lokroi: *Olympians* 10 and 11", in M. L. West (ed.), *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism* (Oxford 2007) 55; for further discussion of *Ol.* 10 and the interest hypothesis, see most recently (with further bibliography) C. Eckerman, "Pindar's κοινὸς λόγος and Panhellenism in Olympian 10," *RhM* 151 (2008) 37–48.

[48] A. D. Morrison, *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (London 2007) 43; C. Eckerman, "Pindar's Pythian 6: On the Place of Performance and an Interpretive Crux," *RhM* 154 (2011) 1–8.

———

have been performed on site at Delphi because the temple of Apollo is evoked in the ode. Pindar's evocation of the temple, however, does not necessitate placing the performance at Delphi. Pindar seems to evoke Apollo's temple to instill symbolic capital in his patron, Megacles, because Megacles' family, the Alcmaeonidae, funded its repair. There has been substantial debate regarding the ode's performance context in relation to Megacles' ostracism from Athens, but the ode and the historical context offer no clear answer.[49] Neither *Pyth.* 7 nor what we know of Megacles' life provides evidence for the ode being performed on site.

The last poem that Gelzer claims for on-site performance is *Nem.* 2, citing lines 1–5, 14 ff., and 24 ff. Lines 1–5 and 14 ff., however, provide no evidence in support, and lines 24 ff. provide evidence in opposition. At 24 Pindar apostrophizes the Athenian victor's fellow citizens (ὦ πολῖται). The apostrophe would make little sense were this ode performed on site since it would not be performed among the fellow citizens of the victor (nor is the sanctuary at Nemea a polis). In addition to the apostrophe, Pindar exhorts the citizens to celebrate the victor's homecoming, *nostos*, and, as Leslie Kurke has shown, *nostos* imagery positions the victor in his home community after his victory.[50] The imagery of *nostos* and the apostrophe to the victor's fellow citizens, then, situate the performance of this ode in the victor's home polis. In addition, like Bacch. 6, which is a short poem and refers to performance in the polis of the victor, this ode too shows that Pindar composed short epinician poems for performance in the victor's polis. Again, one should hesitate to claim that short poems can be linked with on-site performance.

[49] For discussion see L. Athanassaki, "Song, Politics, and Cultural Memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid Temple of Apollo," in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* (Berlin 2011) 235–268, at 238–239.

[50] *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca 1991) 15–61.

This paper has readdressed the evidence mustered in favor of the on-site performance hypothesis of Pindar's and Bacchylides' extant epinician odes, but it has not addressed the logistical problems associated with assuming first performance at the sanctuaries. Given that all the Panhellenic festivals were relatively short, it is hard to imagine that Pindar or Bacchylides would have had time to compose, choreograph, prepare a chorus, and perform an ode before a festival was over and the guests of the festival left. As Gelzer notes in relation to the Olympic festival (109),

> Dort dauerte es im 5. Jahrhundert fünf Tage. Die Wettkämpfe begannen am zweiten und endeten am fünften, an dem auch die Kranzverleihung und die Siegesfeiern stattfanden. Für das Dichten und Einstudieren der Lieder standen also höchstens drei, im knappsten Fall weniger als ein Tag zur Verfügung … In Olympia fanden am letzten Tag die Läufe und die athletischen Agone statt. Wenn die Festordnung in Nemea dieselbe war, so wäre N. 2 für den Pankratiasten Timodemos am selben Tag aufgeführt worden, an dem er seinen Sieg errang.

The constraints of the Nemean festival very well could have meant that *Nem.* 2 would have to be won and celebrated in song on the same day if the on-site performance hypothesis is correct. As I noted above, there is good textual evidence (ὦ πολῖται) that *Nem.* 2 never was first performed at Nemea; regardless, for the proposed on-site category as a whole, it is difficult to imagine how Pindar's and Bacchylides' odes could have been performed under these conditions.[51]

As the odes themselves attest (cf. *Ol.* 5.4–7, 9.1–4, 10.73–77, *Nem.* 6.37–38), song played a prominent role in the celebration of athletic competitions at the Panhellenic sanctuaries, and I find Hubbard's thesis of the reperformance of epinician poems at Panhellenic sanctuaries provocative.[52] Reperformed odes

---

[51] Cf. Eckerman, *RhM* 154 (2011) 7.

[52] Hubbard, in *Oral Performance* 71–93; on reperformance of epinician see too B. Currie, "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes," in *Oral Perfor-*

could have been performed on site without the logistical difficulties necessitated by the thesis of on-site first performance. And we must keep in mind that victories would have been celebrated on site with other forms of singing in addition to formal victory odes (cf *Ol.* 9.1 ff.). Finally, it would be an impoverishing claim to assert that epinician odes were never first performed at Panhellenic sanctuaries. It may be that Pindar and Bacchylides did compose odes for victors that would be performed on site immediately after the victory. We might even conjecture that they could have composed odes in advance so that they would have pieces ready for performance on site if called upon, but there is no evidence in favor of this hypothesis. Two scholiasts (on *Nem.* 3.1c and 6.64d) affirm the performance of singing in honor of victories at the sanctuaries, though their evidence may derive only from the epinician texts themselves. Since the victors held extravagant celebrations, which included sacrifices, banquets, and song,[53] it would be strange, *a priori*, to exclude epinician performances from these celebrations.

In terms of deixis, the extant epinician odes position their first performance at the home of the victor, when they provide information regarding first performance, and, at the same time, they provide internal cues that suggest reperformance at multiple venues.[54] The work of Hubbard, Currie, Felson, and others has productively shifted our inquiry to questions that consider not only where the odes debuted but also where they were reperformed. As Felson notes,[55]

> if ocular deictics once anchored an ode by pointing to the site
> and occasion of its first performance, such deictics—together, in
> the case of victory odes, with the naming of the victor, his

---

mance 49–69; Carey, in *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals* 199–210; Morrison, *Performances and Audiences* 11–19.

[53] E.g. Athen. 3D–E; Plut. *Them.* 5.4; Pind. *Ol.* 5.4–7.

[54] See Currie, in *Oral Performance* 49–69.

[55] *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 264–265.

family, and his homeland—would be expected to "rigidly designate" those lost features in all possible subsequent receptions of the ode. Thus the ode would be intelligible to new, non-local audiences who could re-imagine a lost historical performance context and even imaginatively occupy the homeland space. They, as well as later auditors/readers, would re-experience, vicariously, what it was like to be among that original audience, which included fellow citizens of the victor.

 The findings put forth here suggest that both Pindar and Bacchylides forefront performance in the home polis of the victor for a specific purpose: to stress the importance of the victor's connections to his polis, and this connection will be activated both when the odes debut and when they are reperformed.[56]

The purpose of this paper, then, has not been to degrade the importance of song culture at Panhellenic festivals but rather to inject greater skepticism in relation to a position that has ossified and become, I believe, inappropriately entrenched in scholarly discourse. A reexamination of Pindar's and Bacchylides' epinician odes has found no evidence for the common assertion that many of these poems were first performed at the Panhellenic sanctuaries, and three of Gelzer's eight odes have been shown to provide strong textual evidence that they were performed rather in the polis of the victor: Bacch. 4 (παρ' ἑστίαν), 6 (προδόμοις ἀοιδαῖς), and Pind. *Nem.* 2 (ὦ πολῖται).

March, 2012   Department of Classics
                                                  University of Oregon
                                                  Eugene, OR 97403
                                                  eckerman@uoregon.edu

---

[56] I thank the anonymous referee for bringing this point to my attention.

––––––––––