

# Corinthian Dionysus (Pind. *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler): Space, Genre, and Intertextuality in Pindar’s Dithyrambic Lyric

Alessio Ranno

**Abstract:** *This article discusses in greater detail the fragmentary dithyramb Pind. fr. 70c Snell–Maehler, preserved in POxy. 1604 (a collection of Pindaric dithyrambs), which most likely represents the third surviving example of Pindar’s poetic production for Corinth, alongside the epinician ode Olympian 13 and the σκόλιον/ἐγκώμιον fr. 122 Snell–Maehler composed for the Corinthian athlete Xenophon. The analysis aims to offer additional considerations supporting its Corinthian destination and, more importantly, a close examination of the potential intertextual connections between the dithyramb and Olympian 13, already partially suggested in scholarly debate. This lays the groundwork for exploring a threefold connection between Olympian 13, fr. 70c, and fr. 122 Snell–Maehler, opening up the possibility of framing them as a coherent Corinthian lyric ‘triad’.*

**Keywords:** *Pindar, Corinth, dithyramb, ancient Greek lyric, intertextuality, classical philology*

This article discusses in greater detail the fragmentary dithyramb Pind. *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, preserved in *POxy.* 1604 (a collection of Pindaric dithyrambs),<sup>1</sup> which most likely

<sup>1</sup> *Editio princeps* in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII, Nos. 1594–1625* (London 1919) 27–32, 37–39, 44–45. For a recent detailed commentary on the fragment, see S. Lavecchia (a cura di), *Pindari dithyramborum fragmenta* (Roma 2000) 218–228. Pindar’s quotations follow B. Snell and H. Maehler (eds.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis I–II* (Leipzig 1987–1989<sup>8</sup>).

represents the third surviving example of Pindar's poetic production for Corinth, alongside the epinician ode *Olympian* 13 and the σκόλιον/ἐγκώμιον<sup>2</sup> Pind. *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler—both composed for the Corinthian athlete Xenophon. Within the constraints imposed by the poem's fragmentary condition, I aim not only to offer additional considerations supporting its Corinthian destination, but also, and more importantly, to examine more closely the potential allusive and intertextual connections<sup>3</sup> between the dithyramb and *Olympian* 13—connections that have been only partially suggested in scholarly discussions<sup>4</sup>—and to investigate how they inform the

<sup>2</sup> On the relationship between σκόλιον and ἐγκώμιον, see B. A. Van Groningen, *Pindare au banquet* (Leiden 1960) 16–17; O. Imperio, “Pindaro e la pietra di paragone: una metafora poetologica,” *Eikasmos* 11 (2000) 59–70, at 59 n. 1; E. Cingano, “Entre *skolion* et *enkomion*: réflexions sur le genre et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque,” in J. Jouanna and D. Leclant (éds.), *La poésie grecque antique. Actes du XIIIe colloque de la villa Kérylos (Beaulieu sur Mer, 18-19 octobre 2002)* (Paris 2003) 17–45 (at 44 on *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler); D. Yatromanolakis, “Ancient Greek popular song,” in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge 2009) 263–276, at 271 n. 42; F. Budelmann, “Epinician and the *symposion*. A comparison with the *encomia*,” in P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge 2012) 191–223; G. D'Alessio, “Bacchylides' Banquet Songs,” in V. Cazzato, D. Obbink, E. E. Prodi (eds.), *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion* (Oxford 2017) 63–84, at 64; G. Liberman, “Some Thoughts on the Symposiastic Catena, *Aisakos*, and *Skolia*,” in *Cup of Song* 42–62, at 54–58. Regardless of the issue of classifying Pindar's sympotic songs as σκόλια or ἐγκώμια (the latter term appearing in most modern editions of Pindar), what matters for the purposes of my discussion is how the poems themselves define their own lyric genre (ἐγκώμιον in *Ol.* 13, σκόλιον in *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler) and the implications of this shared strategy of self-generification (see below).

<sup>3</sup> See S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge 1998), for the nuanced distinction between *allusion* and *intertext*. See E. O' Gorman, “Intertextuality and Historiography,” in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge 2009) 231–242, for the definition of intertext and allusion respectively as a *feature* of the text, which must be discerned by its recipients, and an *instrument* of it. See also below, n. 74, on the limitations of readings of intertextual phenomena that rely predominantly on allusion as a primary criterion.

<sup>4</sup> On the potential connection between *Ol.* 13.5–10 and *fr.* 70c.3 Snell–Maehler, see L. Lomiento, “Lode della città in Pind. *Ol.* 13 per Senofonte corinzio,” in P. Angeli Bernardini (a cura di), *Corinto: luogo di azione e luogo di*

lexical, stylistic, and imagistic choices of the former, as well as its broader meanings and communicative purposes.

Furthermore, I propose to broaden this intertextual framework with the inclusion of Pind. *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, by demonstrating how, like *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, this poem is closely bound to *Olympian* 13 through a substantial intertextual relationship. Despite their shared addressee and occasion (the celebration of Xenophon’s 464 BCE Olympic victories), the presence of deeper connections between these two undoubtedly related poems, and the implications of such connections for their interpretation, has largely escaped critical attention.<sup>5</sup> Demonstrating this more substantial relationship between the two members of Pindar’s encomiastic ‘diptych’ for Xenophon, *Ol.* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, therefore bears on the elucidation of the relationship between the σκόλιον and the dithyramb themselves: both indirectly, through their shared engagement with the same lyric intertext (*Olympian* 13), and more directly, through their participation in common ideological and metadiscursive horizons.

This intertextual triangulation lays the groundwork for the analysis of a more sophisticated combinatory strategy jointly enacted by all three poems, one that hinges on the close relationship each text establishes with specific sites within Corinth’s civic topography. The interplay between spatialization and intertextual analysis, especially when pursued transversally across different lyric genres, remains a largely underexplored analytical perspective, despite some recent

*racconto. Atti del convegno internazionale. Urbino, 23–25 settembre 2009* (Pisa–Roma 2013) 92–93; Lomiento in B. Gentili et al. (a cura di), *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche* (Milano 2013) 592–593.

<sup>5</sup> With few exceptions: see J. Stenger, “Pindar und der ‘Protz’ Xenophon (*fr.* 122 S.–M.). Von der Positionierung im politischen und im literarischen Feld,” *Philologus* 155 (2011) 199–228 (below, n. 67). I have elsewhere offered considerations on the intertextual relationship between *Olympian* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, which I am here incorporating into a broader discussion including *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler: A. Ranno, “Pindar’s Corinth. Space, intervisuality, and intertextual perspectives,” in G. Amara and R. Lanteri (a cura di), *Corinto e Siracusa. Relazioni, scambi, influenze / Corinth and Syracuse. Connections, Exchanges, Influences. Proceedings of the International Conference (Syracuse, December 5–7, 2024)* (Roma [forthcoming]) 341–352, at 346–349.

attempts to apply it to the study of interconnections among Pindaric poems associated with particular geographical contexts.<sup>6</sup> The ultimate effect of this shared strategy, I argue, is the framing of the three poems—epinician ode, σκόλιον, and dithyramb—as a fully fledged ‘Corinthian’ lyric triad.

*1. Cross-generic intertextuality: Pind. fr. 70c Snell–Maehler and Olympian 13*

The poem’s overall content centers on the choral lyric voice invoking the epiphany of Dionysus. The god is invited to come to “his beloved city” (*fr.* 70c.9 Snell–Maehler), join his human devotees, heighten their joyful ecstasy, and dispel the threat of socio-political discord (3) by fostering a peaceful, cohesive atmosphere through his τελετά (6):

|   |                                   |                        |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| ] | ναλ[                              |                        |
| ] |                                   |                        |
| ] | ιτο μὲν στάσις·                   |                        |
| ] | πόδα                              |                        |
| ] | κατε[.....]ον κυανοχίτων          | 5                      |
| ] | τεὰν τε[λετ]ᾶν μελίζοι            |                        |
| ] | πλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κισσίνων        | ἀν(τι) (τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν] |
| ] | κρόταφον [                        |                        |
| ] | εωγ ἐλθὲ φίλαν δὴ πόλεια          |                        |
| ] | ιόν τε σκόπελον γείτονα πρύτανιν[ | 10                     |
| ] | αῖμα καὶ στρατιά                  |                        |
| ] | τ' ἀκναμπτεῖ κρέμασον             |                        |
| ] | ς τε χάρμας                       | τὰς ἐπιδορατίδας       |
| ] | π[....]γτος ἀνχὴν ῥύοιτο πα[      |                        |
| ] | ων πέλοι                          | 15                     |
| ] | λαν πόγοι χορῶν [                 |                        |
| ] | εες τ' ἀοιδαί,                    |                        |
| ] | οιο φῦλον ᾠ[                      |                        |
| ] | ε πετάλοις ἥρ[ινοῖς               |                        |

<sup>6</sup> See, in particular, the recent discussion of the intertextual connections among Pindar’s epinician odes for Cyrene (*Pythian* 9 for Telesicrates [477 BCE]; *Pythian* 4 and 5 for king Arcesilas IV [462 BCE]) offered by R. Neer and L. Kurke, *Pindar, Song and Space: Towards a Lyric Archaeology* (Baltimore 2019) 159–217.

\* \* \*

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| ]μιον ἱπ[π  | 22 |
| ]τι ταμίᾱς[ |    |
| ]ν στολ[    |    |
| ]λθε[       | 25 |
| ]υ[         |    |

3 παύσαιτο Schroeder : μὴ γένοιτο Zimmermann : καταλούιτο Van der Weiden: διαλύοιτο Wilson : *fort.* ἀλέξοιτο (*vd.* Pind. *Ol.* 13.9 ἀλέξειν) 5 κατε[ναντί]ον Bury 7 Σ ἀ'(τὶ) (τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν] Grenfell, Hunt : βαλὼν δὲ] πλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κισσίνων Bury 8 ἀμφὶ τεδὸν] κρόταφον Bury 9 φιλ] έων Ferrari 13 Σ τὰς ἐπιδορατίδας 14 ἄλιος δ' ἅ]π[εῖρα]ντος αὐχὴν ρύοιτο πα[νάγυριν] Bury 15 ἔρκος τ' ἐγχωρ[ί]ων πέλοι Bury 17 πολυγαθέες Grenfell, Hunt : εὐμελ]έες Snell : ἄδυμελ]έες Lavecchia 18 Σισύφ]οιο *vel* Γλαύκ]οιο φῶλον Bury 22 στό]μιον ἱπ[ειον *vel* στό]μιον ἱπ[πον Bury

[...] may civil strife (be avoided):

[...] foot

[...] wearing a dark blue tunic (Dionysus?)

[...] may sing of your festival

[...] wreath of ivy crowns (‘a curl’) instead of ‘woven (crowns)’

[...] temple [...]

[...] come to the city that is indeed beloved to you

[...] and to the neighboring rock that is lord

[...] and the army

[...] inflexibly hang up

[...] and spearheads spearheads

[...] may the neck rescue [...]

[...] may be

[...] toils of choruses

[...] and songs

[...] tribe of (Glaucus?) [...]

[...] spring flowers

[...] horse bridle? [...]

[...] dispenser/minister [...]

[...] journey/expedition? [...]

Several elements associated with Dionysiac cult appear throughout the fragment: dance (*fr.* 70c.4 Snell–Maehler πῶδα, 4);<sup>7</sup> the ‘mystic’

<sup>7</sup> On the connection between foot/feet and dance, see Lavecchia, *Fragmenta*

nature of the feast (Ἰτεᾶν τε[λετ]ᾶν μελίζοι, 6); ivy crowns (Ἰπλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κισσίνων, 7); choral song and dance performance (πόννοι χορῶν [...] ]ξες τ' αἰοιδαί, 16–17, possibly πολυγαθέες);<sup>8</sup> floral decorations (Ἰε πετάλοις ἡρ[ινοῖς, 19). This composite imagery, evoking the peaceful and hedonistic atmosphere of Dionysus' feast, contrasts with another set of images linked to war and strife (στάσις, 3; Ἰαμα καὶ στρατιά / Ἰτ' ἀκναμπτεὶ κρέμασον / Ἰς τε χάρμας, 11–13). Within this context, the phrase πόννοι χορῶν may be interpreted as an oxymoronic expression, opposing the joyous 'toils' of choral performance to the grievous labors of war and civic στάσις (3).

A textual detail that supports the poem's Corinthian contextualization is found in the image of the "neck" (π[....]γτος αὐχὴν ῥοῖτο πα[...]) at line 14.<sup>9</sup> Despite the fragmentary condition of the text, the nominative form αὐχὴν as the subject of the optative verb ῥοῖτο indicates that the speaker expresses a wish that this neck "may defend" something or someone—possibly the safety of the entire city or, more specifically, the group physically gathered in the performative context of the dithyramb. This latter interpretation inspired Bury's conjecture [ἄλλιος δ' ἄ]π[είρα]ντος αὐχὴν ῥοῖτο πα[νάγυριν] / [ἔρκος τ' ἐγχορί]ων πέλοι (14–15).<sup>10</sup> Despite the plausibility of this reconstruction and the absence of a direct object for ῥοῖται, what remains evident is that the anatomical image of the neck carries a metaphorical meaning,<sup>11</sup> most likely alluding to a geographical

220, with textual parallels (Pindaric and Bacchylidean examples: Pind. *fr.* 52F.18 Snell–Maehler; *fr.* 107.1 Snell–Maehler; Bacchyl. 17.107–108 Maehler).

<sup>8</sup> Grenfell and Hunt, *Papyri* 45.

<sup>9</sup> For the use of the same metaphorical image, see Pind. *Ol.* 8.52 Κορίνθου δειράδ(α), *Isthm.* 1.9–10 Ἰσθμοῦ δειράδ(α); Bacchyl. 2.7 Maehler αὐχένι Ἰσθμοῦ, 12.38–39 Maehler ἐν Πέλοπος ζαθέας / νάσου π[ι]τνώδει δειρά.

<sup>10</sup> Grenfell and Hunt, *Papyri* 45; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 226.

<sup>11</sup> Alternatively, P. Wilson, "The Politics of Dance: Dithyrambic Contest and Social Order in Ancient Greece," in D. Phillips and D. Pritchard (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea 2003) 163–196, at 173, while inclined toward the hypothesis of the dithyramb's Corinthian destination, suggests the possibility of a literal interpretation of αὐχὴν as referring to the neck of the ox set back to the plow in the peaceful community (suggestion attributed to R. Thomas). Although this reading may establish an interesting connection of the term with the reference to the ox in the epithet βοηλάτης

place that, while perhaps not the precise performance setting of the dithyramb,<sup>12</sup> maintained a strong associative link to the city for which the poem was composed.<sup>13</sup>

applied to διθύραμβος at *Ol.* 13.18–19 (where, in any case, the term appears to carry a sacrificial connotation: see the discussion below), I do not find this hypothesis fully convincing, while certainly intriguing.

<sup>12</sup> According to Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 228, Pind. *fr.* 70c.22 Snell–Maehler [ ]μιον ἱπ[π], plausibly reconstructable as στόμιον ἵππειον or ἵππον (Grenfell and Hunt, *Papyri* 45; see the discussion below), may also allude to the entrance of a subterranean passage (στόμιον) connected with the cult of Melikertes-Palaimon and Isthmia's divine patron Poseidon, who was specifically worshipped in Corinth as Ἴππιος; see on this R. Dubbini, *Dei nello spazio degli uomini. I culti dell'agorà e la costruzione di Corinto arcaica* (Roma 2011) 155–156. Building on this suggestion, one may advance the hypothesis that the Isthmian sanctuary of Poseidon constituted a plausible alternative setting for the dithyramb's first performance. Material evidence for underground spaces reserved for cultic practices at Isthmia is provided by the presence of man-made subterranean caves used for ritual dining, comparable to other dining facilities such as those found in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, and datable at the earliest to the 5th century BCE: see E. R. Gebhard, "Caves and Cults at the Isthmian Sanctuary of Poseidon," in R. Hägg (ed.), *Peloponnesian sanctuaries and cults: proceedings of the ninth international symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11–13 June 1994* (Stockholm 2002) 63–74; C. Morgan, "Debating Patronage: Argos and Corinth," in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons & Festivals. From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford 2007) 213–263, at 243. Such a setting would find an interesting iconographic parallel (also noted by Gebhard, in *Peloponnesian sanctuaries* 73) in the depiction of Dionysus feasting within a cave on Cypselus' chest, as attested by the description of the artifact provided by Pausanias (Paus. 5.19.6). Nonetheless, I favor the more widely accepted view situating the performance of the dithyramb in the urban sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: see Morgan, in *Pindar's Poetry* 243, for arguments favoring this latter location.

<sup>13</sup> In addition to providing further support for the dithyramb's Corinthian context, the metaphorical association of the Isthmus with a neck, together with the specific phrasing employed by Pindar in this passage (αὐχὴν in the nominative, most likely preceded by a genitive marking the metaphorical nature of the image), would not only pay homage to a traditional *topos*, but, on a more specific level, would also function as a lexical and imagistic marker of an intertextual connection with Eumelus' Κορινθιακά. In particular, this phrasing would recall the analogous imagery of Eumel. *fr.* 8 *PEG* <Ἰσθμοῖ> εὐδαίμων πιτυώδεος ὄλβιος αὐχὴν, / Ὀκεανοῦ κούρης Ἐφύρης <ἔδος>, ἔνθα Ποσειδῶν, / μητρὸς ἐμῆς Λαμίας γενέτωρ, προὔθηκεν ἄγωνα / πρῶτος ἄμ' Ἡελίωι,

This interpretation allows the “neighboring rock” (*fr.* 70c.10 Snell–Maehler σκόπελον γείτονα) to be identified as a reference to Acrocorinth; more specifically, it supports the hypothesis that the Corinthian sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, located on the northern slope of Acrocorinth, served as the performance setting of the dithyramb.<sup>14</sup> This hypothesis is supported by a convergence of intra- and extra-textual evidence: first, the spatial connotation of

τιμὰς δ’ ἡνέγκατο μοῦνος, reported at Dio Chrys. *Or.* 37.13. For the attribution of this fragment to Eumelus of Corinth, see A. Barigazzi, “Nuovi frammenti dei *Corinthiaca* di Eumelo,” *RFIC* 94 (1966) 129–148; E. Suárez de la Torre, “Sibylles, mantique inspirée et collections oraculaires,” *Kernos* 7 (1994) 179–205, at 195; M. Tortorelli Ghidini, “Un modello arcaico di Sibilla,” in I. Chirassi-Colombo, T. Seppilli (a cura di), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari. Mito, storia, tradizione. Atti del Convegno. Macerata–Norcia, Settembre 1994* (Pisa–Roma 1998) 249–261, at 249–252. *Contra* C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Early Greek Epic Fragments I. Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic* (Berlin–Boston 2017), who does not report the fragment in his edition of Eumelus’ Κορινθιακά.

<sup>14</sup> See R. S. Stroud, “The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth: Preliminary Report. II: 1964–1965,” *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 299–300; A. D. Ure, “Demeter and Dionysos on Acrocorinth,” *JHS* 89 (1969) 120–121; N. Bookidis, “Ritual Dining at Corinth,” in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London 1993) 45–61; N. Bookidis and R. S. Stroud, *Corinth XVIII.3. The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Topography and Architecture* (Princeton 1997); N. Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth,” *Hesperia* 68 (1999) 1–54; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 223–224; C. Pfaff, “Archaic Corinthian Architecture,” in C. K. Williams II and N. Bookidis (eds.), *Corinth XX. Corinth, The Centenary: 1896–1996* (Princeton 2003) 95–140, at 124–125, 131; Wilson, in *Sport and Festival* 171–175; S. Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford 2004) 202; Morgan, in *Pindar’s Poetry* 240–243; A. Heinemann, “Performance and the Drinking Vessel: Looking for an Imagery of Dithyramb in the Time of the ‘New Music’,” in B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson (eds.), *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford 2013) 282–309, at 302–304 (see below, n. 20). Additionally, *fr.* 70c.10 Snell–Maehler πρύτανι, whether interpreted as an accusative referring to σκόπελον (“neighboring rock that is lord”) or as a vocative πρύτανι υ[*l*], “O lord”, referring to Dionysus (see Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 42 [text], 225 [commentary]), would further reinforce the Corinthian contextualization of the poem, as it would suggestively recall the eponymous magistrate in Corinth (Diod. Sic. 7.9.6, Paus. 2.4.4; see J. B. Salmon, *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* [Oxford 1984] 56–57); see for this hypothesis Bookidis and Stroud, *Corinth XVIII.3* 73 n. 6.

the adjective γείτονα, which accords well with the sanctuary's actual location in close proximity of Acrocorinth, right on the way to its summit; second, the archaeological evidence of ritual activity connected with Dionysus,<sup>15</sup> who is also elsewhere associated with the cult of Demeter and Kore.<sup>16</sup> The nominative singular epithet κυανοχίτων, plausibly referring to Dionysus himself,<sup>17</sup> may further point to this sanctuary as the site of performance, since the black tunic is frequently associated with Demeter's mourning for Kore (κυανόπεπλος: *Hom. Hymn. Dem.* 319, 360, 374, 442).<sup>18</sup> The prominence of Dionysus in Corinthian civic religion, well-attested both archaeologically and in literary sources, can be traced back at least to the Bacchiad period, predating even the Cypselid-era 'invention' of the dithyramb by Arion of Methymna (see below). This long-standing prominence fully justifies the chorus' invocation for Dionysus to come to "his beloved city" (*fr.* 70c.9 Snell–Maehler φίλαν δὴ πόλεια). The god's affective bond with the city, conveyed by the adjective φίλος and reinforced by the emphatic particle δὴ ("the city that is truly dear to you"), would be further intensified by Ferrari's proposed supplement φιλέων for the preceding lacuna ("come, in the name of the love you feel for the city that is truly

<sup>15</sup> See Bookidis and Stroud, *Corinth XVIII.3* 247, 259, 427, 433; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 223; Morgan, in *Pindar's Poetry* 240.

<sup>16</sup> For general discussion of Dionysus' Corinthian cult, see É. Will, *Korinthiakā. Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Corinthe des origines aux guerres médiques I* (Paris 1955) 216–221; G. A. Privitera, *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia arcaica* (Roma 1970) 36–42; Salmon, *Corinth* 186–193; G. Ieranò, "Arione e Corinto," *QUCC* 41 (1992) 39–52; G. Ieranò, *Il ditirambo di Dioniso. Le testimonianze antiche* (Pisa 1997) 187–194; M. A. Seelinger, "The Dionysiac Context of the Cult of Melikertes/Palaimon at the Isthmian Sanctuary of Poseidon," *Maia* 50 (1998) 271–280; G. Casadio, *Il vino dell'anima. Storia del culto di Dioniso a Corinto, Sicione, Trezene* (Roma 1999) 47–153; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 225; P. Reickert-Südbeck, *Kulte von Korinth und Syrakus. Vergleich zwischen einer Metropolis und ihrer Apoikia* (Dettelbach 2000) 95–102; Morgan, in *Pindar's Poetry* 240–243; C. Nobili, "L'inno omerico a Dioniso (*Hymn. Hom.* VII) e Corinto," *Acme* 62 (2009) 3–35, at 20–23; Dubbini, *Culti* 144–152.

<sup>17</sup> See below for further discussion of κυανοχίτων and its intertextual potential.

<sup>18</sup> Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 223–224; Wilson, in *Sport and Festival* 172. See below, n. 48.

dear to you”).<sup>19</sup>

The association between Dionysiac cult and the urban sanctuary of Demeter and Kore finds further support in the phrasing and imagery through which Pindar evokes the first ‘appearance’ of the dithyramb in Corinth at *Ol.* 13.18–19 (ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανε / σὺν βοηλάτᾳ χάριτες διθυράμβῳ;). The depiction of Dionysus’ χάριτες making their “epiphany” in the city (ἐξέφανε, 18), as a metaphor for the genre’s ‘invention’, together with the epithet βοηλάτης (“ox-driving”) applied to διθύραμβος (19), resonates suggestively with the iconography of a mid-fifth-century *skyphos* from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, that depicts a draped woman leading a bovine toward an unidentified female figure.<sup>20</sup> This interplay between Pindar’s poetic imagery and Corinthian iconography would be further strengthened if the receiving figure were identified as Νίκη, in light of the appearance of this kind of imagery within an epinician context.<sup>21</sup>

In addition to reinforcing the link between this specific sanctuary and Dionysiac cult, this element strengthens the hypothesis that Pindar’s digression on the dithyramb at *Ol.* 13.18–19 signals an intertextual connection between the dithyramb and the Olympian ode.<sup>22</sup> As Hansen has recently argued, the explicit mention of the dithyramb serves to highlight the presence of musical innovations in Pindar’s Corinthian ode, which contribute to attributing a distinctly ‘dithyrambic’ character to this piece of epinician lyric.<sup>23</sup> The ‘hybrid’ metrical-rhythmical configuration of the poem,

<sup>19</sup> F. Ferrari, “Contributi al testo dei Ditirambi di Pindaro,” *SIFC* 84 (1991) 1–8, at 6.

<sup>20</sup> Corinth, Archaeological Museum C72.269 + C61.462 + C73.355. See for this hypothesis Heinemann, in *Dithyramb in Context* 302–304: “[...] it may be worth considering whether his audience would not have envisaged the *Dionysiou Charites* in a way similar to the bull-driving women on the Corinth *skyphos* fragments and other vessels treated here.”

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>22</sup> See Lomiento in Gentili et al., *Olimpiche* 592: “[...] potrebbe essere significativo di un qualche legame tematico fra i due componimenti che proprio il genere poetico del ditirambo sia, nel seguito dell’*Olimpica* 13, ricordato da Pindaro come una delle più celebri invenzioni corinzie.”

<sup>23</sup> H. Hansen, “Advertising Innovation in Pindar’s *Olympian* 13,” *Hermes* 151

which juxtaposes dactylo-epitrites and Aeolic meters—an unprecedented feature in Pindar’s epinician production<sup>24</sup>—would reflect a form of interpenetration between epinician and dithyrambic poetry: this blending of genres would be signaled by a distinctive metrical-musical pattern first introduced in dithyrambic poetry by Pindar’s teacher Lasus of Hermione.<sup>25</sup> A further element linking epinician and dithyrambic lyric, as noted by Hansen, lies in the juxtaposition of the Corinthian origin of the dithyramb with Xenophon’s unprecedented double Olympic victory, both functioning as symbols of innovation, with Xenophon portrayed as an athletic *πρώτος εὐρετής* (*Ol.* 13.30–31 *ἀντεβόλησεν / τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὐπω τις πρότερον*).<sup>26</sup> Building on Hansen’s insightful discussion, I contend that the mingling of epinician and dithyrambic features is further reinforced by meaningful lexical choices. More specifically,

(2023) 386–404.

<sup>24</sup> For a thorough metrical analysis of the ode, see A. Peri, *L’Olimpica XIII di Pindaro. Introduzione, commento e analisi metrica* (Stuttgart 2021) 128–147.

<sup>25</sup> Hansen, *Hermes* 151 (2023) 400: “It is significant that the only explicit reference to dithyrambic poetry in Pindar’s epinicia occurs in the only poem that mixes, in the manner of Lasus’ innovative dithyrambic poetry, these same two meters, and that this metrical innovation is showcased in the poem that foregrounds, more than any other, praise for innovation in song, and especially in dithyrambic song [...] With this hybridized, overdetermined metrical scheme, Pindar has ingrained in the very rhythms of the ode another display of praiseworthy innovation, while at the same time subtly anchoring his ode to the tradition of dithyrambic song that was so closely associated with Corinth.” See L. Battezzato, “Meter and Music,” in *Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* 130–146, at 142, and A. D’Angour, *The Greeks and the New* (Cambridge 2011) 196–198, on Lasus’ metrical innovations; L. Prauscello, “Epinician sounds: Pindar and musical innovation,” in *Victory Ode* 58–82, at 67–72, on Lasus’ employment of non-dithyrambic rhythms in dithyrambic context.

<sup>26</sup> Hansen, *Hermes* 151 (2023) 391: “Following on the heels of the catalogue of Corinthian inventions, the implication is that with this unparalleled accomplishment, the victor has followed in the footsteps of earlier Corinthian inventors; we might say that he *invented* the double Olympic victory, although Pindar himself leaves this parallel to be inferred.” See already W. H. Race, *Pindar. Olympian Odes; Pythian Odes* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2012) 190 (“His [Xenophon’s] unique achievement reflects the inventiveness of his city, Corinth [...]”).

the mention of Xenophon's "appearance" in one of his multiple athletic competitions (φανέντα, 34) implicitly establishes an analogy between the Pindaric *laudandus* and Dionysus' (i.e. the dithyramb's) "appearance" in Corinth (ἐξέφανε, 18). The deployment of language and imagery associated with divine epiphany in this context underscores a broader interplay between Pindaric epinician and dithyrambic lyric. What appears as an image elsewhere attested in Pindar's epinician corpus, i.e. the prodigious appearance of an athlete,<sup>27</sup> thus comes to assume a more specific intertextual potential in this context.<sup>28</sup> This blending of generic features in *Olympian* 13 ultimately has a broader impact, serving as a marker of intertextual connection between the epinician ode and a particular textual model of dithyrambic lyric, composed by Pindar for the homeland of his patron Xenophon.

The intertextual implications of the blending of epinician and dithyrambic elements, Dionysiac cult and athletic praise, and especially the significance of Xenophon's athletic epiphany, can be further explored through a close analysis of Pindar's dithyramb itself. The reference to the "two parsley curls" (πλόκοι σελίνων) won by Xenophon at the Isthmian games (*Ol.* 13.33), I argue, reinforces an intertextual reading of the "curl of ivy crowns" (πλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κισσίνων) worn by Dionysus, or one of his worshipers, in the dithyramb (*fr.* 70c.7 Snell–Maehler).<sup>29</sup> The intertextual potential of this image in the dithyramb is heightened by the fact that this highly unusual syntactical configuration—πλόκος + genitive plural adjective specifying the material of the crowns (σελίνων and κισσίνων, with the additional genitive στεφάνων in the latter case)—occurs only in these two passages within Pindar's poetic corpus.<sup>30</sup> Further support

<sup>27</sup> See for parallels Peri, *Olimpica* 54.

<sup>28</sup> On the relationship between *topos* and intertextuality, with particular focus on Latin poetry, see Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext* 34–47. For discussion of *topoi*, and more broadly of the conditions for intertextual readings in Greek literary criticism, especially with respect to Archaic and Classical lyric poetry, see D. W. Fearn, *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford 2007) 37–46.

<sup>29</sup> See Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 222.

<sup>30</sup> See Slater s.v. πλόκος; Peri, *Olimpica* 54, who emphasizes the specificity of this syntagm and its occurrence only in these two contexts, without anyway

for this intertextual reading is offered by the marginal scholium written beside line 13 in *POxy.* 1604, whose most plausible interpretation is ἀν(τὶ) (τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν] (“‘a curl of crowns’ instead of ‘woven [crowns]’”).<sup>31</sup> The adversative function of the preposition ἀντί, together with the initial letters of the missing word (πλ[, echoing πλόκον), suggests that this marginal note was intended to clarify a phrase already perceived by ancient readers as distinctive or unusual. I suggest that the choice of this peculiar phrasing subtly establishes an equivalence between the crowns of Xenophon’s athletic victories and those associated with Dionysus’ τελετά, thereby linking at a broader level the two performance occasions of the epinician ode and the dithyramb. Moreover, if the “curl of ivy crowns” is worn by Dionysus himself, as the invocation of the god’s epiphany in Corinth strongly suggests, this image contributes to shaping an encomiastic representation of the god as victorious over the threats of war and internal strife. In this sense, Dionysus is endowed with a sort of epinician aura, mirroring the ‘epiphanic’ victorious athlete celebrated in *Olympian* 13. The passage in the dithyramb thus closely parallels the interplay between epinician and dithyrambic/Dionysiac language and imagery established in the praise of Xenophon’s Isthmian victories. At the same time, this lexical strategy contributes to shedding further light on that interplay within *Olympian* 13 itself, revealing it as a vehicle of intertextual engagement specifically with Pindar’s Corinthian dithyramb, rather than with dithyrambic poetry in general.

From this intertextual perspective, it may also be significant that this choice of ‘epiphanic’—and, more specifically, ‘Dionysiac’—imagery in celebrating the athletic exploits of Pindar’s *laudandus* specifically occurs in conjunction with the praise of his victories at the Isthmian games (*Ol.* 13.33–34 ἐν Ἰσθμιάδεσσιν / φανέντα), and is thus anchored in a spatial dimension shared with the Corinthian epiphany of Dionysus: a divine appearance already briefly evoked at *Ol.* 13.18–19, and more broadly articulated in the dithyrambic song itself, where, as noted above, the same Isthmus is plau-

pushing further the possible intertextual implications of this lexical-syntactical evidence.

<sup>31</sup> See Grenfell and Hunt, *Papyri* 45.

sibly evoked as an integral part of Corinthian civic geography (*fr.* 70c.14–15 Snell–Maehler).

A similar argument can be made for *χάρμας* at *fr.* 70c.13 Snell–Maehler, whose meaning in context is clarified by the marginal gloss *τὰς ἐπιδορατίδας* (“spearheads”). The alternative interpretation of the term as “joys” would not only be compatible with Dionysiac excitement, but also particularly appropriate for this Corinthian dithyramb, potentially providing a further link to *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.19 *χάριτες*).<sup>32</sup> However, the presence of the marginal gloss—added by a commentator with access to the complete poem—together with the occurrence of other terms belonging to the semantic field of war, makes the martial interpretation of *χάρμας* preferable. Moreover, this meaning carries significant intertextual potential, which helps to explain the presence of what might otherwise appear to be a redundant paratextual commentary. The gloss highlights one of the two coexisting semantic nuances of the term *χάρμη*, which can be interpreted both in the broader, metaphorical sense of “warlike spirit”/“martial ardor” and in the more concrete sense of “spearheads”: in doing so, it foregrounds the polysemic and metonymic value of the noun. This, I argue, has suggestive implications from an intertextual perspective: more specifically, it underscores a connection with the evocation of Ares at *Ol.* 13.23, where the god is described as “thriving with” or “upon (the tips of) the ruinous spears of young men” (*Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ νέων οὐλίαις αἰχμαῖσιν ἀνδρῶν*). In other words, the metonymic image of *χάρμας* in the dithyramb functions as a sort of condensed reflection of the more sophisticated juxtaposition of metaphorical (Ares as the god of warlike spirit) and material (the spear as physical instrument and vehicle of this martial drive) enacted by Pindar’s praise of the Corinthians’ military prowess in *Olympian* 13.

In addition to further reinforcing the intertextual connection between the two Pindaric texts, this analysis also helps to clarify the semantic implications and communicative purposes underlying the dithyramb’s stylistic and imagistic choices, particularly in relation to the epinician ode. The dichotomy between war and the peaceful harmony of Dionysus’ feast, between the instruments of the former

<sup>32</sup> See B. Zimmermann, “Pindar, Dithyrambus III, 3,” *ΖΠΕ* 72 (1988) 22.

(armies and weapons) and those of the latter (crowns, flowers, song and dance, etc.), can be interpreted as a nuanced articulation, in *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, of the relationship between two defining features of Corinth, which *Olympian* 13 presents side by side as equally contributing to the city’s eulogistic portrait: its claimed paternity of the dithyramb (*Ol.* 13.18–19), and its reputation for military prowess (*Ol.* 13.23). War, when not directed against fellow citizens (the danger of στάσις evoked at *fr.* 70c.3 Snell–Maehler), is an essential aspect of a city like Corinth; yet the celebration of Dionysiac cult demands a temporary suspension of arms, as the harmonizing and pacifying force of the god’s τελετά is inherently incompatible with discord and violence.

This framework, together with the semantic and communicative implications it entails, further legitimizes the intertextual reading, already proposed in scholarly debate, of what may represent the most compelling link between the dithyramb and *Olympian* 13, offering clear evidence of the former’s Corinthian destination: the “tantalizing” evocation of στάσις (*fr.* 70c.3 Snell–Maehler) within a dithyrambic context.<sup>33</sup> Regardless of the precise choice of the optative verb to be linked with the nominative στάσις, for which several proposals have been advanced (παύσα]ιτο;<sup>34</sup> καταλύο]ιτο<sup>35</sup> or διαλύο]

<sup>33</sup> P. Wilson, Rev. to Lavecchia, *Fragmenta*, *BMCR* 2002.04.24 (2002); Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar* 202; Morgan, in *Pindar’s Poetry* 239; B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson, “The world of dithyramb,” in *Dithyramb in Context* 1–27, at 12..

<sup>34</sup> See O. Schroeder (ed.), *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1923<sup>6</sup>) 548.

<sup>35</sup> See M. J. H. Van der Weiden (ed.), *The Dithyrambs of Pindar. Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Amsterdam 1991) 113, on the basis of a parallel with *Ar. Ran.* 359. Wilson, *BMCR* 2002.04.24 (2002), highlights that such a verb in this context would carry significant implications, as it could subtly reference Dionysus’ power as Λύσιος—a cultic epiclesis under which the god was worshipped in Corinth. However, I personally favor the hypothesis of στάσις as a threat to be avoided, which has the advantage of marking a tighter intertextual link to *Olympian* 13 and providing a good reason for situating the dithyramb in the same chronological period as the other two Corinthian poems. See also Kowalzig and Wilson, in *Dithyramb in Context* 12 n. 50, for the plausibility of a compound form of λύω.

ιτο;<sup>36</sup> μὴ γένοιτο<sup>37</sup>), the significance of juxtaposing the joyful excitement of the Dionysiac feast with the evocation of στάσις becomes evident when read against the same historical-political backdrop that underpins the proemial imagery in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.5–10), where the Horai (Εὐνομία, Δίκη, Εἰρήνη) are depicted as the protectors of the city against the threat of ὕβρις (9–10). Given the Corinthian context of the dithyramb, and the socio-political resonance of ὕβρις in *Olympian* 13 as a divine counterpart of στάσις,<sup>38</sup> the explicit summoning of the latter at *fr.* 70c.3 Snell–Maehler is best understood, by analogy with the epinician ode, as a preventive warning—supporting integrations like μὴ γένοιτο—rather than a reference to an ongoing situation in need to resolution—which would instead favor proposals such as διαλύοιτο/καταλύοιτο or παύσαιτο.<sup>39</sup> As the proem of *Olympian* 13 demonstrates, the mention

<sup>36</sup> Wilson, *BMCR* 2002.04.24 (2002); Kowalzig and Wilson, in *Dithyramb in Context* 12 n. 50.

<sup>37</sup> See Zimmermann, *ζΠΕ* 72 (1988) 22; B. Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen 1992) 50–51; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 219.

<sup>38</sup> For the connection between the contrast of Εὐνομία and ὕβρις and the poetic representation of στάσις, see in particular Solon *fr.* 4 *IE*<sup>2</sup> (Lomiento, in *Corinto* 93 n. 2; A. Bianchini, “La στάσις in Solone: per un’analisi storico-sociale del *fr.* 4 West [3 Gentili—Prato],” *Eirene* 58 [2022] 227–267). For a representation of the destructive effects of στάσις in Pindar, see *Pind.* *fr.* 52κ.8–15 Snell–Maehler (see Bianchini, *Eirene* 58 [2022] 230–231 n. 10). See also below, n. 39.

<sup>39</sup> See Lomiento, in *Corinto* 92–93 and Lomiento in Gentili et al., *Olimpiche* 592–593: “Di fatto, il riferimento a una *stasis* nel canto ditirambico per i Corinzi non deve necessariamente intendersi in contrasto [...] con l’elogio del Buon Governo aristocratico a Corinto nei versi in questione dell’*Olimpica* 13, ma si può interpretare, al contrario, in coerenza con esso: Pindaro afferma che il ruolo di Εὐνομία dovrà essere quello di ‘scacciare’ ὕβρις madre di Κόρος, che sono poi gli atteggiamenti tipici, nella rappresentazione storiografica e in quella poetica, della *stasis*. I due termini, insomma, non paiono selezionati a caso dal poeta.” Morgan, in *Pindar’s Poetry* 239, argues for the greater plausibility of interpreting στάσις as an ongoing situation to be resolved, based on the fact that most of the proposed textual supplements tend to support this direction; however, I find this probabilistic argument unconvincing. Moreover, Zimmermann’s μὴ γένοιτο is not the only possible interpretation for στάσις as a threat to be avoided. For the hypothesis of an “actual, current *stasis*” to be resolved, see also Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar* 202. It would be worth

of ὕβρις as a counterpart of στάσις is entirely compatible with the image of a city ruled in accordance with peace, justice, and good governance. In this light, the summoning of ὕβρις/στάσις functions primarily in an apotropaic capacity.

This thematic parallel between the Olympian ode and the dithyramb, already noted by scholars, can be further developed through new and more detailed considerations that support an intertextual reading of the two poems. The primary element supporting the hypothesis of an intertextual link, hitherto insufficiently emphasized, lies in the logical connection established in *Olympian* 13 between the Horai, as divine patronesses of both natural order (*Ol.* 13.17 πολυάνθεμοι) and political-institutional stability, and Dionysiac cult itself. This connection is articulated in the ode through Pindar's choice to represent the Corinthian 'invention' of the dithyramb as a gift bestowed by the Horai themselves (ἐβαλον [...] ἀρχαῖα σοφίσματα, 16–17). By situating Dionysus' special bond with Corinth under the patronage of the Horai, Pindar highlights the socio-political implications of Dionysiac cult—and, by extension, of the dithyramb (19)—as a potential means of safeguarding socio-political balance and order: in other words, this configuration ultimately underscores Dionysus' role as a potential collaborator in the Horai's tutelary function within the city of Corinth. From this perspective, the specific phrasing Διωνύσου [...] χάριτες in the epinician ode acquires deeper significance. Not only does it reinforce the association with the Horai by implicitly evoking the traditional divine pairing Horai/Graces, but it also directs attention to Dionysiac excitement itself as the object of the Horai's dispensation of benefits. Consequently, this phrasing foregrounds the instrumental function of Dionysiac cult on socio-political terms: the joyful atmosphere of

considering the optative ἀλέξοιτο ("may be repelled"), from the same verb used in *Olympian* 13 to describe the Horai's opposition against the threat of Ὑβρις mother of Κόρος (*Ol.* 13.9–10 ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλέξειν / Ὑβριν, Κόρου ματέρα θρασύμυθον): this suggestion would not only be a more nuanced option than μὴ γένοιτο, but also provide a further lexical marker for a potential intertextual link between the epinician ode and the dithyramb. However, the validity of this proposal depends on whether one accepts the (uncertain) hypothesis of respension between lines 3 and 14 (Snell and Maehler, *Pindari carmina* II 77–78; see also Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 218).

Dionysus' τελετή, conceived as a moment of collective participation and dissolution of potential socio-political tensions, contributes to the preservation of civic peace and harmony. This interweaving in *Olympian* 13 of Dionysiac cult, political-institutional order, and the concern to avert ὕβρις/στάσις, ultimately provides the conceptual framework that is concretely elaborated in *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler: in the dithyramb, this framework is realized through the celebration of Dionysus as a direct agent of civic harmony and peace, countering the threat of internal discord. Moreover, the evocation of nature and vegetation, through explicit references to flowers and seasonal renewal (*fr.* 70c.19 Snell–Maehler πετάλοις ἥρ[ινοῖς]), underscores the dual natural and civic sphere of influence of Dionysiac cult. In doing so, the dithyramb implicitly reaffirms Dionysus' connection with the Horai as the “many-flowered” (*Ol.* 13.17 πολυάνθεμοι) guardians of civic order.

The ideological and political implications of the dithyramb, which mirror those found in *Olympian* 13 (and are thus compatible with a Corinthian contextualization), can be inscribed not only within the broader cultural and geographical context of the epinician ode, i.e. fifth-century BCE Corinth, but also within the more specific chronological contingencies that likely influenced the ethical, ideological, and encomiastic aims of the latter. Various suggestions have been made regarding the specific historical circumstances affecting the evocation of war and civil discord in the dithyramb. In particular, scholars have pointed to the outbreak of hostilities between Corinth and Athens around 460 BCE,<sup>40</sup> as well as to a more general climate of instability in the Peloponnese following the earthquake that struck Sparta and its surroundings in 464 BCE—an event whose most visible consequence was the outbreak of the third Messenian war in the same year (Thuc. 1.101.2; Paus. 4.24.6).<sup>41</sup> Regardless of these specific factors, on more general grounds, the internal and external political tensions that plausibly inform Pindar's concern for balance and restraint in *Olympian* 13

<sup>40</sup> See Morgan, in *Pindar's Poetry* 239–240; Stenger, *Philologus* 155 (2011) 221–222.

<sup>41</sup> See C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 145; Lomiento, in *Corinto* 93 n. 1; Lomiento in Gentili et al., *Olimpiche* 593–594.

(datable to the very same year of the earthquake) also provide a suitable background for the exhortation to civic harmony expressed in the dithyramb for the Corinthians.

Regarding the connection between Dionysus and the Horai, the intertextual relationship between the two poems would be further underscored by the hypothesis that at least one of these divine safeguarders of the civic order, Peace (Pind. *Ol.* 13.7), is explicitly evoked in the dithyramb as well. This represents one of the several interpretative possibilities—the third in a series of hypotheses—proposed by Van der Weiden. Specifically, she suggests that *πόδα* (*fr.* 70c.4 Snell–Maehler), rather than referring to ritual dance, should be attributed to Peace, and proposes a general reconstruction of the meaning of *fr.* 70c.3–6 Snell–Maehler as follows: “may civil strife stop; may then Peace set foot in our city and may the chorus (or the people) celebrate with song your (Dionysus’) ritual”.<sup>42</sup> Van der Weiden does not take a clear position on the Corinthian contextualization of the dithyramb (she merely notes it as a possibility raised by *αὐγὴν* at *fr.* 70c.10 Snell–Maehler), nor does she highlight potential connections to *Olympian* 13.<sup>43</sup> However, if this interpretation is correct, the intertextual potential of the connection stressed in the dithyramb between Dionysus and peace, and more broadly with socio-political order and harmony, would be further reinforced by the hypothesis of the appearance of peace itself in the dithyramb, and specifically of the goddess Εἰρήνη. Nevertheless, as Van der Weiden herself acknowledges, and as most scholars tend to agree, the hypothesis that *πόδα* refers to dance and chorality in a broad sense, or that it belongs to Dionysus himself, remains the most convincing.<sup>44</sup>

Regardless of the explicit mention of the ‘Corinthian’ Εἰρήνη in the dithyramb, *ταμίας* at *fr.* 70c.23 Snell–Maehler may acquire particular significance when viewed in light of the connection between Dionysus and peace, especially from an intertextual perspec-

<sup>42</sup> Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 114, who also mentions Eur. *TrGF* F 453 as a parallel for the dichotomy Peace/στάσις.

<sup>43</sup> Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 115.

<sup>44</sup> Moreover, the hypothesis that *πόδα* at line 4 would refer to the foot of Peace would also imply that she is the subject of the epithet *κυανοχίτων* at line 5 (Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 115).

tive. The masculine gender and nominative case of ταμίας make it plausible to interpret the term as a designation of Dionysus himself, praising him as a “dispenser” of goods or benefits.<sup>45</sup> This reading aligns to some extent with Διωνύσου [...] χάριτες in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.18–19), which implicitly presents Dionysus as a source of delights (“Dionysus’ delights” understood as “the delights bestowed by Dionysus”), and thus reinforces the broader theme of divine benefaction introduced earlier in the ode through the gifts of the Horai to the Corinthians (*Ol.* 13.14–17). Under this interpretation, ταμίας would subtly recall the proemial portrayal of Peace in *Olympian* 13 as “dispenser of wealth to men” (*Ol.* 13.7 τάμι’ ἀνδράσι πλούτου). This possible link between ταμίας at *fr.* 70c.23 Snell–Maehler and τάμι(α) at *Ol.* 13.7 further strengthens the case for attributing the former to Dionysus, offering a valuable interpretative key to the language and imagery of the dithyramb.

Something similar, I argue, can be observed with the compound epithet κυανοχίτων (nominative) at *fr.* 70c.5 Snell–Maehler.<sup>46</sup> Regardless of its precise attribution—Demeter, the divine owner of the sanctuary and thus the ‘host’ of Dionysus, has been proposed<sup>47</sup>—the epithet finds a suggestive lexical parallel, so far unnoticed in scholarly discussions of the fragment,<sup>48</sup> in the compound κύνανιγς applied to Athena in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.70–72 κύνανιγς ἐν ὄφρα / κνώσσοντί οἱ παρθένος τόσα εἶπειν / ἔδοξεν [...]). Both epithets combine the element κυανο- with a substantive generally referring to a garment: a fleece, like αἴγης, or a tunic, like χίτων. The appearance

<sup>45</sup> For this hypothesis, see Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 119; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 228.

<sup>46</sup> See for a parallel *Ar. Av.* 1389, noted by Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 114, where the dithyramb is called κυανανγής.

<sup>47</sup> See Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos* 50 n. 4; Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 221, who also suggests the alternative hypothesis of a reference to “una personificazione della guerra o della morte” (see e.g. *Pind. fr.* 78.1 Snell–Maehler Κλῆθ’ Ἀλαλά, Πολέμου θύγατερ), based on the frequent association of the dark tunic with contexts of mourning or with chthonian figures.

<sup>48</sup> Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 220, cites as the only comparable parallels κυνόπεπλος (referring to Leto at *Hes. Theog.* 406 and *Hymn. Orph.* 35.1, to Demeter at *Hom. Hymn. Dem.* 319, 360, 374, 442) and κυνόστολος (*Bion. Adon.* 4 [*hapax*], referring to Aphrodite mourning Adonis’ death).

of this epithet in the Olympian ode would strengthen the likelihood of the hypothesis of a divine figure, either Dionysus or Demeter, as a suitable referent for the analogous one in the dithyramb. A parallel with the prominent role of Athena and her cult in *Olympian* 13, emphasized through the aetiological function of Bellerophon's myth (the foundation of Athena Hippias's sanctuary), would provide a compelling rationale for attributing the epithet at *fr.* 70c.5 Snell–Maehler to Dionysus himself—also the referent of *τεῶν τε[λετ]ῶν* in the immediately following verse (6)—as the primary divine interlocutor of the poem and patron of its festive occasion.

It is possible to advance an alternative interpretation of *ταμίας*, building on a cursory suggestion by Lavecchia, which not only reveals an intertextual potential comparable to its reading as a designation of Dionysus, but also has the advantage of offering a plausible explanation for *στολ.* [*στολῶ* in Lavecchia's edition] in the immediately following line (*fr.* 70c.24 Snell–Maehler).<sup>49</sup> In this case, the nominative *ταμίας* may refer to the poet himself, drawing on Pindar's self-referential depiction at *Pind. Isthm.* 6.57–58 as a “steward of victory-songs” (*ταμίας* [...] *κόμων*), or on the image at *Isthm.* 9.7–8 of poets (*σοφοί*) as “ministers of the Muses” (*ταμίαι* [...] *Μοισῶν ἀγωνίων τ' ἀέθλων*).<sup>50</sup> The first parallel is particularly suggestive, given its explicit association with the ‘arrival’ motif (*Isthm.* 6.57 *ἦλθον*). If a metaphorical journey of the poet as “steward” of songs or of the Muses is indeed implied, this would resonate closely with the twofold articulation of the same motif in *Olympian* 13, at *Ol.* 13.49 (*ἐγὼ δὲ ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλείς*) and *Ol.* 13.96–97 (*Μοίσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἐκὼν / Ὀλυγαῖθιδαισὶν τ' ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος*). From this perspective, *ἐπίκουρος* in the latter passage would function as a lexical and conceptual counterpart to *ταμίας*, while, more strikingly, *σταλείς* in the former would help to elucidate the meaning of *στολ.* [*fr.* 70c.24 Snell–Maehler], occurring in the verse immediately following that of *ταμίας*, as a plausible allusion to the motif of poetic journey. Furthermore, given the ‘transitional’ roles played by the

<sup>49</sup> Lavecchia, *Fragmenta* 228, who limits himself to suggesting a possible reference of to the poet, citing *Isthm.* 6.57–58, among a range of interpretative hypotheses.

<sup>50</sup> See above, n. 49.

corresponding passages in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.49–52 and 13.96–97, which respectively introduce the mythical narrative and the second praise of the Oligaithidai), this interpretation of *fr.* 70c.23–24 Snell–Maehler may likewise signal a shift from the invocation of Dionysus to a new section of the dithyramb: possibly, a section of the poem containing a mythical narrative, coherently with the configuration of Arion’s dithyramb as a choral ‘mythical ballad’.<sup>51</sup>

From this perspective, also the proposed reading [στό]μιον ἵπ[πειον] (*fr.* 70c.22 Snell–Maehler) can be understood within this intertextual framework. If, following Bury, the syntagm refers not only to the horse bridle as a Corinthian invention, but more specifically to the myth of the taming of Pegasus (developed at *Ol.* 13.61–92), this would further point to the presence of a narrative section in the poem, and strengthen the connection of the dithyramb with *Olympian* 13. Besides being compatible with a Corinthian context, the reference would function as an additional link with *Olympian* 13, where the invention of the dithyramb and that of the bridle are closely juxtaposed as complementary expression of Corinthian ingenuity (*Ol.* 13.18–20). The appearance of this material artifact in a dithyrambic context, justified by the association established between dithyramb and bridle as Corinthian inventions in the epinician ode, would thus serve as a further vehicle of intertextual engagement. Moreover, the possible mention of this Corin-

<sup>51</sup> See G. A. Privitera, “Il ditirambo come spettacolo musicale,” in B. Gentili and R. Pretagostini (a cura di), *La musica in Grecia* (Roma–Bari 1988) 238–245; Ieranò, *QUCC* 41 (1992) 39–40; Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos* 24–31; Ieranò, *Ditirambo* 187–194. Herodotus’ statement that Arion was the first to have “given a name” to the dithyramb (Hdt. 1.23 ὀνομάσαντα) may refer to the fact that his dithyrambic compositions presumably had titles inspired by their narrative content. This hypothesis has the advantage of being compatible with the presence of the term ‘dithyramb’ in Archilochus (Archil. *fr.* 120 *IE*<sup>2</sup>), a few decades earlier than Arion: see A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford 1962<sup>2</sup>) 20–21; H. Patzer, *Die Anfänge der griechischen Tragödie* (Wiesbaden 1962) 17, 86; Van der Weiden, *Dithyrambs* 2–3; D. J. Mastronarde, *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technique and Social Context* (Cambridge 2010) 92; A. D’Angour, “Music and Movement in the Dithyramb,” in *Dithyramb in Context* 198–209, at 202 (see below, n. 53). Contra Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos* 25; G. B. D’Alessio, “‘The name of the dithyramb’: Diachronic and Diatopic Variations,” in *Dithyramb in Context* 113–132, at 114.

thian invention in the context of the dithyramb, given the political and moral implications of the association between Dionysiac feast and civic harmony, would carry the same symbolic value it assumes in *Olympian* 13, where the horse bridle emerges as a material embodiment of measure: the μέτρον which the epinician speaker, in the gnomic statement introducing the mythical section of the ode, presents as an inescapable universal norm (*Ol.* 13.20–22 τίς γὰρ ἰππέοις ἐν ἔντεσσιν μέτρα [...] ἐπέθηκ'; [...] ~ *Ol.* 13.47–48 ἔπεται δ' ἐν ἐκάστῳ / μέτρον νοῆσαι δὲ καιρὸς ἄριστος). The invocation of Dionysus' epiphany and the celebration of his feast, as a collective experience of harmony and joy, thus appear to arise from a preliminary concern with στάσις, understood as a disruption of the socio-political balances underpinning the city's order and prosperity. In this light, the proposed interpretation further enriches our understanding of the poem's structural and thematic affinities with *Olympian* 13.

Moreover, the proposed interpretation of *fr.* 70c.22–23 Snell–Maehler carries metapoetic significance, further strengthening the interconnection between epinician ode and dithyramb. The poet's metaphorical journey to Corinth—and, by extension, that of the poem itself toward its performance setting—mirrors the explicitly invoked arrival of Dionysus in the city and sanctuary where the dithyramb is performed. From this perspective, the 'journey' of the poetic text toward its performance occasion emerges as the enactment of Dionysus' own journey to Corinth, culminating in his epiphany during the poem's execution. This parallel foregrounds the function of the dithyramb as the very instrument and vehicle of the god's manifestation. This analogy thus transforms the metaphor into a literal realization of divine presence through song performance, providing a concrete articulation of the idea expressed at *Ol.* 13.18–19, where Dionysus' epiphany is linked to the dithyramb in Corinth. The phrasing of *Ol.* 13.18–19 itself presents the dithyramb not merely as a celebration of Dionysus, but as the very accomplishment of the god's epiphany.

The intertextual implications of *Ol.* 13.18–19 also shed further light on the significance of the epithet applied to the dithyramb in

the epinician ode, βοηλάτης (19). Following D'Angour,<sup>52</sup> the epithet can be understood not only as a reference to the cultic and ritual dimension of the dithyramb (the leading of a sacrificial victim) but also, more fundamentally, as an allusion to the performative execution of the dithyramb 'invented' by Arion (that is, formalized into the artistic shape familiar to Pindar's contemporaries)<sup>53</sup> as a straightforward procession. In this sense, the epithet functions as a counterpart to Pindar's reference to a σχοινοτένεια ἀοιδὰ διθυράμβων ("dithyrambic song performed in a straight line") in his dithyramb for Thebes (Pind. *fr.* 70B.1–2 Snell–Maehler), in contrast with the circular choreographic scheme adopted for the performance of that poem (*fr.* 70B.4–5 Snell–Maehler).<sup>54</sup> The cyclic dance mentioned by Pindar, and attested in fifth-century BCE dithyrambic performances at Athens (κύκλιοι χοροί), has often been attributed to Arion, but was more likely an innovation of Lasus.<sup>55</sup> Regardless of

<sup>52</sup> See A. D'Angour, "How the Dithyramb got its Shape," *CQ* 47 (1997) 331–351; D'Angour, in *Dithyramb in Context*.

<sup>53</sup> Arion is traditionally credited with being the first to compose dithyrambic poems that were characterized by an autonomous mythical narrative (see above, n. 51) and presumably had titles inspired by their narrative content; in general, he was regarded as having "organized what appears to be a previously improvisational genre into a more stable melodic form" (D'Angour, in *Dithyramb in Context* 205). See also D'Angour, in *Dithyramb in Context* 202: "The advent of 'named' dithyrambs, 'composed' to be 'taught' to a *choros* by a *chorodidaskalos*, indicates that Arion introduced, or was thought to be the originator of, compositional features and performative structures that made dithyrambs more identifiable, teachable, and repeatable compositions than they had hitherto been."

<sup>54</sup> D'Angour, *CQ* 47 (1997), argues for the restoration διαπέτ[τ]α[νται δὲ νῦν εὖο]μφάλλ[οις κύ] / κλοισι νεαν[ία]. It is possible that the choice of a circular chorus for this Theban dithyramb might have been motivated by the poet's will "to be credited for an innovative contribution to the genre" (D'Angour, in *Dithyramb in Context* 204) in the eyes of his native city.

<sup>55</sup> See Hellanic. *FGrHist* 4 F 86, and Dicaearch. *fr.* 75 Wehrli (= *schol.* Ar. *Av.* 1403), on the word κυκλιοδιδασκαλος; Procl. *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 5.320A.16.30–33. See on this D'Angour, *CQ* 47 (1997) 346–350 and D'Angour, in *Dithyramb in Context* 203–206; D'Alessio, in *Dithyramb in Context* 115; G. Hedreen, "The Semantics of Processional Dithyramb: Pindar's *Second Dithyramb* and Archaic Athenian Vase-Painting," in *Dithyramb in Context* 171–197, at 182–183. On the κύκλιος χορός, and its complex relationship to the dithyramb (of which it

the distinction between two chronological phases in the historical development of the dithyramb,<sup>56</sup> it is plausible that the choice between a processional and a circular mode of performance carried specific semantic weight: in particular, processional performances may have been especially effective in foregrounding the close connection between song, ritual, and the celebration of Dionysus' divine epiphany.<sup>57</sup> This may well be the case in *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, where the chorus calls upon the god to come to the city (9) and reach the performance venue, in order to avert *στάσις* and partake in his *τελετά*. In this light, it can be argued that *Ol.* 13.18–19 acquires additional significance when read in relation to *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, functioning as a springboard for a type of dithyrambic practice traditionally associated with Corinth, and to which Pindar's own Corinthian dithyramb may plausibly have conformed. As a result, this passage in *Olympian* 13, read in conjunction with *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, would function as a device facilitating the (re-) contextualization and deeper understanding of another Pindaric poem composed for Corinth, belonging to the choral lyric genre explicitly mentioned in the epinician ode, and whose connection to its original cultic setting was bound to weaken as the poem increasingly circulated in written form.

## 2. Intertextuality embedded in civic space: a Corinthian lyric 'trptych'

has been usually taken as a synonym), see Ieranò, *Ditirambo* 32–33; D'Angour, *CQ* 47 (1997) 346–350; Fearn, *Bacchylides* 163–225; D'Alessio, in *Dithyramb in Context* 115–118; P. Ceccarelli, "Circular Choruses and the Dithyramb in the Classical and Hellenistic Period: A Problem of Definition," in *Dithyramb in Context* 153–170. There is no example of κύκλιος (χορός) used for the dithyramb in Pindar or any author before Aristophanes: see on this Ceccarelli, in *Dithyramb in Context* 162.

<sup>56</sup> Hedreen, in *Dithyramb in Context* 182–183, argues that the hypothesis of Arion's occasional employment of circular choreographies for his dithyrambic compositions is not to be excluded. However, the Pindaric passage in *Olympian* 13, in comparison with the introductory lines of *fr.* 70b Snell–Maehler, may be a proof that Arion's dithyramb was still linked to a processional execution, and the widespread use of κύκλιοι χοροί was posterior to Lasus' innovations.

<sup>57</sup> See on this Hedreen, in *Dithyramb in Context*.

Within the intertextual matrix<sup>58</sup> of the dithyramb, although the connections between this text and *Olympian* 13 are more evident and more readily traceable, Pindar's second encomiastic poem for Xenophon also comes into view: the σκόλιον Pind. *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, composed for a sacrifice to Aphrodite organized by Xenophon as a thanksgiving for his athletic victories and performed by a group of hetairai recruited by him for the occasion (Ath. 13.574A = Chamael. *fr.* 31 Wehrli).<sup>59</sup>

A wide range of lexical and conceptual choices, in my view, highlights a deep intertextual connection between the σκόλιον and the Olympian ode for Xenophon. The hetairai's privileged bond to Aphrodite, sanctioned through the delivery of a divine gift (erotic seduction and practice: *fr.* 122.6–9 Snell–Maehler), parallels the synergic relationship established in *Ol.* 13 between the hero Belleroophon and the goddess Athena through the delivery of the bridle: a link underscored by the presence in both cases of the verb ἔπορεν (“she gave”: *fr.* 122.6 Snell–Maehler ~ *Ol.* 13.77). Moreover, the Corinthians' talents praised at *Ol.* 13.14–17 are presented as gifts of the Horai (ὥπασαν [...] ἔβαλον, mirroring Athena's ἔπορεν),

<sup>58</sup> On the definition of intertextuality as a “matrix of possibilities”, see D. Fowler, “On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies,” *MD* 39 (1997) 13–34.

<sup>59</sup> Scholars in the last decades have increasingly downplayed the interpretation of the poem as evidence of the so called ‘sacred prostitution’ in Corinth, and emphasized the fictitious nature of this religious phenomenon as a historiographical myth. Selected bibliography: H. Conzelmann, “Korinth und die Mädchen der Aphrodite. Zur Religionsgeschichte der Stadt Korinth,” *NAG* 8 (1967) 247–261; H. D. Saffrey, “Aphrodite à Corinthe: Réflexions sur une idée reçue,” *RBibl* 92 (1985) 366–368; V. Pirenne-Delforge, *L'Aphrodite grecque. Contribution à l'étude de ses cultes et de sa personnalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique* (Athènes–Liège 1994) 100–127; G. Pironti, *Entre le ciel et guerre. Figures d'Aphrodite en Grèce ancienne* (Liège 2007); S. L. Budin, *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity* (New York 2008) 112–140; T. S. Scheer, “Tempelprostitution in Korinth?,” in T. S. Scheer and M. Lindner (hrsg.), *Tempelprostitution in Altertum. Fakten und Fiktionen* (Berlin 2009) 221–266; V. Kousoulini, “Archilochus and Lycambes, Alcman's 5 *PMG* and Pindar's *fr.* 122: Examples of Manipulation of Lyric Poems by Ancient Writers and Commentators,” *Rosetta* 12 (2012) 72–78; B. Breitenberger, *Aphrodite and Eros. The Development of Greek Erotic Mythology* (London 2013) 132–135.

with suggestive lexical/syntactical parallels with *fr.* 122.6–7 Snell–Maehler (ὕμῃν [...] ἔπορευ, / ὦ παῖδες, [...] ~ *Ol.* 13.14–16 ὕμῃν δέ, παῖδες Ἀλάτα, [...] ὥπασαν [...]). Furthermore, the metaphorical representation of the hetairai’s religious devotion as a flight to the heavenly mother of loves, Aphrodite (*fr.* 122.4–5 Snell–Maehler οὐρανίαν πτάμεναι [...] πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν) recalls Pegasus’ flight in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.86 ἵππον πτερόεντ’), as a form of mediation between earth and sky (αἰθέρος ψυχρῶν ἀπὸ κόλπων ἐρήμιον, 88). Additionally, the attribute τελέαις (*fr.* 122.19 Snell–Maehler) falls within the semantic field of τέλος evoked in *Olympian* 13, where the notion that the will of the gods can fulfill any human goal or desire is repeatedly emphasized (*Ol.* 13.83, 104–105, 115). Moreover, in both cases, Xenophon is depicted in the act of leading (ἄγει ~ ἐπάγαγ[ε]) a procession/group (στεφάνων [gen. pl.] ἐγκώμιον [adj.] τεθμόν [subst.] ~ φορβάδων κορῶν [gen. pl.] ἀγέλαν [subst.] ἐκατόγ-γυιον [adj.]) from/to a specific location (πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας ~ τεόν [...] ἐς ἄλσος). From this perspective, the image of Xenophon’s ascent to the civic acropolis provides a fitting continuation of his return to Corinth evoked at *Ol.* 13.29. As will be discussed in detail, this spatialization of the poems within the Corinthian civic geography plays a crucial role in incorporating the dithyramb into a broader intertextual design, alongside Pindar’s encomiastic ‘diptych’ for Xenophon (see below).

An intertextual analysis of *Olympian* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler also provides clearer insight into the issue of the latter’s generic classification. The poem’s self-definition as a piece of sympotic lyric (*fr.* 122.14 Snell–Maehler σκόλιον) gains deeper significance when intertextually connected to another generic label, ἐγκώμιον, used at *Ol.* 13.29 to identify the ode itself (specifically, ἐγκώμιος as adjective of τεθμός).<sup>60</sup> In addition to defining the ode as a specific example of

<sup>60</sup> The poem may have been performed in a banquet/symposium after the ritual, either in Aphrodite’s precinct (*fr.* 122.18–20 Snell–Maehler) or a private setting: see Budelmann, in *Victory Ode* 182–183. For the hypothesis of a choral execution during the sacrifice, see B. Currie, “Epinician *choregia*: funding a Pindaric chorus,” in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (Berlin–Boston 2011) 269–310, at 289–293; T. K. Hubbard, “The dissemination of Pindar’s non-epinician choral lyric,” in *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* 348–363, at

a genre (i.e. epinician lyric), this term serves to connect the ode to the celebratory revel (κῶμος) that the poet imagines accompanying the victor's return home (*Ol.* 13.29 [Zeus] δέξαι τέ οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον / τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει πεδίον ἐκ Πίσας), and, more broadly, to the epinician celebration of which this envisioned revel constitutes a specific manifestation.<sup>61</sup> On the other hand, the term σκόλιον explicitly places the poem within the context of the symposium, positioned as posterior to the victor's travel back home, if not the very destination of it. What matters here is not the *real* performance setting of the poems, but rather how the texts themselves imaginatively frame their relationship with specific spaces and contexts. In this case, κῶμος and symposium delineate two distinct spatial contexts that are arranged in chronological succession: the outdoor space of the city, serving as the broader setting of the epinician celebration, and the indoor space of the patron's οἶκος or another private/public building.<sup>62</sup> As such, this shared strategy of generic self-classification illuminates the mutual relationship between the poems, presenting them as logically consecutive moments of a lyric 'diptych' devoted to the praise of Xenophon and Corinth.<sup>63</sup> Athenaeus'/Chamaeleon's testimony, which explicitly sets the composition of the two poems in chronological succession (*Ath.* 13.574A Πίνδαρός τε τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔγραψεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐγκώμιον, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή [*Ol.* 13.1–2], ὕστερον δὲ καὶ σκόλιον τὸ παρὰ τὴν θυσίαν ἄσθέν), regardless of the actual reality of this sequence, provides an interesting insight into what appears

354–355.

<sup>61</sup> See briefly Peri, *Olimpica* 51. On the epinician rhetoric of κῶμος, see M. Heath, "Receiving the *komos*: the context and performance of epinician," *AJP* 109 (1988) 180–195; K. H. Morgan, "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ," *CP* 88 (1993) 1–15; C. Eckerman, "The κῶμος of Pindar and Bacchylides and the semantics of celebration," *CQ* 60 (2010) 302–312, who emphasizes the broader meaning of κῶμος as 'celebration' beyond any specific and exclusive association with "the various acts and utterances which are parts of celebration as a whole" (302); P. Agócs, "Performance and Genre. Reading Pindar's κῶμοι," in *Victory Ode* 191–223; A. Marinis, *Poetics and religion in Pindar: ambits of performance and cult* (Abingdon 2024) 18–56.

<sup>62</sup> See Budelmann, in *Victory Ode* 186–187.

<sup>63</sup> Breitenberger, *Aphrodite* 133, even suggests a joint performance of *Ol.* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, respectively during the sacrifice and at the subsequent banquet.

to be an established mode of reading these connected poems, as actively encouraged by the texts themselves.

From a broader perspective, this intertextual strategy thorough generic classification also reveals what appears to constitute a *trait d'union* between all the three poems under consideration, including *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, as shown by the combination of Dionysiac and epinician imagery in both the Olympian ode and the dithyramb: a shared concern with metapoetic reflections on (lyric) genres, their specificities, and their potential interactions.<sup>64</sup>

Furthermore, as already suggested by some of the aforementioned allusive connections between *Ol.* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler (see above), a thematic core shared by all three poems under consideration here becomes apparent: a sustained concern with mediation and restraint. In *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, this grounding motif of mediation/moderation is evident from the outset in the poet's praise of the Corinthian hetairai recruited by Xenophon for the thanksgiving ritual. The introductory praise of the women establishes the fundamental encomiastic, religious, moral, and metapoetic coordinates of the song. Their status as privileged interlocutors of Aphrodite, based on reciprocal cooperation and exchange of benefits, and their regular involvement in Corinthian cultic practices (*fr.* 122.3–5 Snell–Maehler αἵ τε τᾶς χλωρᾶς λιβάνου ξανθὰ δάκρη / θυμιάτε, πολλάκι ματέρ' ἐρώτων / οὐρανίαν πτάμεναι / νοήματι πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν; *Ath.* 13.573c = Chamael. *fr.* 31 Wehrli),<sup>65</sup> allow them to function as effective media-

<sup>64</sup> The eulogistic purpose of Pindar's σκόλιον is emphasized by Hubbard, in *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* 355 (“the *megalo-prepeia* of Xenophon's vow and its fulfillment were just as worthy of monumentalization as the double Olympic victory itself”), who talks of a sort of “epinician function” (354) that places the σκόλιον in tight connection with *Olympian* 13. See A. Ford, “Linus: The Rise and Fall of Lyric Genres,” in M. Foster, L. Kurke, N. Weiss (eds.), *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry: Theories and Models* (Leiden–Boston 2020) 47–81, for the application of the label ‘generification’ to a literary-historical period not affected by clear-cut generic distinctions, and for a discussion of the active role played by Archaic and Classical authors in the development of this process (e.g. Pind. *fr.* 128 Snell–Maehler).

<sup>65</sup> See in particular the episode, recalled by ancient sources including Athenaeus (*Theopomp.* *FGrHist* 115 F 285B; Timae. *FGrHist* 566 F 10; Plut.

tors between multiple parties represented in the poem: human and divine; feminine and masculine; the poet's *laudandus* Xenophon, his aristocratic peers, and the broader civic community; the private space of the aristocratic symposium and the public dimension of Aphrodite's civic cult.<sup>66</sup> The significance of the hetairai's mediating role justifies their prominent position at the beginning of Pindar's poem and his extensive, even exclusive focus on their encomiastic portrayal. The poet explicitly anticipates the potential reaction of his recipients to this exclusivity: the introductory depiction of the hetairai culminates in an interrogative statement, in which the poet wonders what "the lords of the Isthmus" will say of him for having begun the poem in this manner (*fr.* 122.13–15 Snell–Maehler ἄλλὰ θαυμάζω, τί με λέξοντι Ἴσθμοῦ / δεσπότηι τοιάνδε μελίφρονος ἀρχὰν / εὐρόμενον σκολίου / ξυνάορον ξυναῖς γυναιξίν). This interrogative statement, which is immediately counterbalanced by the poet's ensuing confidence in the value of his own poetry (*fr.* 122.16 Snell–Maehler διδάξαμεν χρυσὸν καθαρῷ βασάνῳ), can be most insightfully read as yet another articulation, in the σκόλιον for Xenophon, of the fundamental concern with moderation and respect for due limits that resonates across

*Mor.* 871A–B; *Ath.* 13.573C–D = Chamael. *fr.* 31 Wehrli; *schol.* Pind. *Ol.* 13.32B), concerning the supplication to Aphrodite performed by a group of Corinthian women, presumably both hetairai and free women, before the Battle of Salamis (480 BCE), followed by a thanksgiving ceremony after the Greek victory and the dedication of votive offerings to the sanctuary (a group of bronze images, or a *pinax* portraying the suppliants). This event was commemorated by an epigram traditionally attributed to Simonides (*Simon. ep.* 14 *FGE*). As I have recently discussed in Ranno, in *Corinth and Syracuse* 348–349, Pind. *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler would establish an implicit intertextual engagement with the epigram in question through specific rhetorical and stylistic strategies. From this perspective, also Pindar's description of the hetairai's religious activity (*fr.* 122.3–5 Snell–Maehler), with the emphasis on its frequency through the adverb πολλάκι ("often", 4), would function as an implicit intertextual trigger.

<sup>66</sup> See T. Stickler, *Korinth und seine Kolonien: Die Stadt am Isthmus im Mächtigegefüge des klassischen Griechenland* (Berlin 2010) 44–47, on the organization of the ritual by Xenophon and the commissioning of the σκόλιον as a demonstration of a pattern of beneficence toward the Corinthian community at large (see also briefly Hansen, *Hermes* 151 [2023] 390 n. 15).

the other Corinthian poems. From this perspective, this statement frames the issue of how the extensive focus on the hetairai is relevant not only to the praise of Xenophon, but also, and primarily, to the expectations of Pindar's male aristocratic patrons. In this light, the lyric speaker's doubt functions as a way of representing the potential tension between individual and collective expectations. The paradoxical image of the poet as "wedded to public women" (*fr.* 122.15 Snell–Maehler) metaphorically articulates the negotiation between ἴδιον and κοινόν, offering a sort of negative counterpart of the virtuous alignment of individual and public interests displayed in *Olympian* 13 (*Ol.* 13.49). The tension envisaged between Pindar's poetic product and the response of his recipients ultimately reflects upon Xenophon himself, since the praise of the hetairai emerges as an indirect celebration of Xenophon as their leader. Consequently, the poet's expressed doubt anticipates a possible negative reaction from the Corinthian aristocracy to the singular aggrandizement of one of their members.<sup>67</sup>

In summary, then, *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler are indirectly connected through a mechanism of intertextual triangulation, owing to the close relationship that both poems exhibit with Pindar's *Olympian* 13. In the case of *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, this connection extends far beyond a mere sharing of addressee and occasion (the celebration of Xenophon's athletic victories), encompassing a multi-layered complex of textual, thematic, and imagistic features. Alongside this more indirect link, the two fragmentary poems are also mutually bound by participation in a common set of ideological and metapoetic reflections: a shared concern with mediation and restraint, particularly in the socio-political sphere, and a shared engagement with questions of poetic—and specifically lyric—generification.

On the basis of these considerations, we may now appreciate a threefold intertextual dynamic, enacted through the anchoring of

<sup>67</sup> On Xenophon's organization of the ritual, and his recruitment of the group of hetairai, as a potential manifestation of a self-celebratory impulse, and more generally on the political implications of Pindar's σκόλιον (particularly in light of the song's relationship with *Olympian* 13) see Stenger, *Philologus* 155 (2011).

the three texts—whether real or imagined—to key sites within the civic topography of Corinth.

As noted above, the intertextual connection between *Ol.* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler activated by their respective generificating labels, ἐγκώμιον and σκόλιον, ultimately establishes a logically—and chronologically—oriented relationship between the two encomiastic poems for Xenophon, through the implicit evocation of a sequential order of performance occasions and spaces. Such a logical/chronological orientation, framed by this twofold mechanism of lyric generification, is further reinforced by the poems' reciprocal spazialization within Corinthian civic topography. On the one hand, the lower city constitutes the primary topographic setting of *Olympian* 13, as the location of both the Peirene fountain, where the Corinthian hero Bellerophon tames Pegasus in Pindar's mythical account (*Ol.* 13.61 ἐν ᾧστεϊ Πει- / ράνας; *Ol.* 13.63–64 τᾶς ὀφιώδεος υἱ- / ὄν ποτε Γοργόνης ἦ πόλλ' ἀμφὶ κρουνοῖς / Πάγασον ζευῆσαι ποθέων ἐπαθεν), and the sanctuary of Athena Hippiā, founded by the hero to secure the goddess' favor (*Ol.* 13.82 θέμεν Ἰππία βωμὸν εὐθὺς Ἀθάνᾳ).<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler explicitly

<sup>68</sup> A. Ziskowski, "Athena at Corinth: Revisiting the Identification of the Temple of Apollo," *Phoenix* 73 (2019) 164–183, has recently supported the hypothesis that the sixth-century BCE Archaic temple placed atop the hill above the forum/agora, generally attributed to Apollo, might have been dedicated to the cult of Athena Hippiā. For the attribution of the temple to Apollo, and a summary of the debate on this issue, see N. Bookidis, "The Sanctuaries of Corinth," in *Corinth XX* 247–259; N. Bookidis and R. S. Stroud, "Apollo and the Archaic Temple of Corinth," *Hesperia* 73 (2004) 401–426; Dubbini, *Culti* 98–103. For the hypothesis of a preexisting temple of Athena on the hill where the Roman 'Temple E' was later constructed, on the west side of the forum/agora, see Dubbini, *Culti* 140–142. The sanctuary of Athena Χαλινίτις mentioned by Pausanias (Paus. 2.4.1), presumably located along the Roman road to Sicyon south or west of the Odeon (see O. Broneer, *Corinth X. The Odeum* [Princeton 1932] 143–144; C. K. Williams II and O. H. Zervos, "Corinth, 1983: the Route to Sikyon," *Hesperia* 53 [1984] 83–122, at 101–104; W. Hutton, *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periēgesis of Pausanias* [Cambridge 2005] 161–162), might have been a Roman iteration of an earlier sanctuary dedicated to Athena: see Dubbini, *Culti* 134. On Athena Χαλινίτις, see also N. Yalouris, "Athena als Herrin der Pferde. Archäologischen Untersuchungen Pindars dreizehnter Olympie," *RhM* 7 (1950) 19–101, at 21–23; Dubbini, *Culti* 134–135; Lomiento, in *Corinto* 97–98 n. 7; Lomiento in

situates itself within the sanctuary of Aphrodite on the summit of Acrocorinth, which serves as the cultic setting for the thanksgiving sacrifice performed by Xenophon and the hetairai. The alignment of these two primary topographic poles along an ascending path, together with the explicit evocation of Xenophon's journey to Acrocorinth at *fr.* 122.18–20 Snell–Maehler—with phrasing and imagery echoing *Ol.* 13.29—ultimately serves to establish a coherent logical and spatial orientation for the poems' intertextual entanglements.

This logic-oriented dynamic, established through mechanisms of spatialization, ultimately extends to the dithyramb itself. In a manner analogous to *Olympian* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, the dithyramb likewise deploys a strategy of self-positioning within the Corinthian civic topography, achieved through explicit geographical references in the text (*fr.* 70c.9–10 Snell–Maehler φίλαν δὴ πόλιν [...]. σκόπελον γείτονα). Following Wilson,<sup>69</sup> the sequential arrangement of the “beloved city” (9) and the “neighboring rock” (10) suggests a two-stage ascensional journey of the god Dionysus to the performance venue: first, the god is invited to reach his sanctuary in the Corinthian agora,<sup>70</sup> and subsequently the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore near the Acrocorinth, as a divine ‘guest’ of the two goddesses. Regardless of any specific allusion to Dionysus' civic sanctuary, what emerges from Wilson's observations is that the lower city is generally evoked in the poem as one of the two main poles of Corinth's civic topography, alongside the Acrocorinth. This dual topographic reference implicitly functions as a strategy for situating the poem in an intermediate spatial position between these two poles. Consequently, this further supports the hypothesis that the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, located along the route from the city to Acrocorinth, serves as the performance setting of the dithyramb. Building on Wilson's observations, I propose an additional metapoetic layer of interpretation for the evocation of these topographic landmarks. In particular, these spatial references can be

Gentili et al., *Olimpiche* 606–607; Peri, *Olimpica* 96.

<sup>69</sup> Wilson, in *Sport and Festival* 173.

<sup>70</sup> See Paus. 2.2.6–7, on Dionysus' presence in the Corinthian agora; Dubbini, *Culti* 144–153.

read as sophisticated allusive mechanisms, in continuity with the analogous intertextual strategy of spatialization and textual allusion found in *Olympian* 13 and the σκόλιον. This dual topographic reference would implicitly evoke the two Pindaric poems that, regardless of their actual performance venues, gesture toward these two main poles of Corinthian civic topography: the lower city, as the primary setting of *Olympian* 13 (see above); the Acrocorinth, as the destination of the group of Corinthian hetairai led by Xenophon (*fr.* 122.18–20 Snell–Maehler). On metapoetic terms, the spatial self-placement of Pindar’s Corinthian dithyramb resonates in its intermediate positioning between the two members of the poet’s encomiastic ‘diptych’ for Xenophon of Corinth.

As a result, the associations established by the texts with these landmarks, arranged along an ascensional path from the lower city to the summit of the Acrocorinth—with the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore situated in between—ultimately function as an expedient to suggest a logical-sequential configuration of the poems themselves, conceived as textual members of a lyric ‘triad’.

The hypothesis that *Olympian* 13 also presupposes and deliberately gestures toward the dithyramb, in addition to enriching our understanding of the epinician ode, opens up the possibility that the dithyramb was not only chronologically proximate to *Olympian* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler, but that all three poems may have been conceived as part of a single, cohesive compositional project. Pindar’s Corinthian aristocratic patrons (the “lords of the Isthmus” mentioned at *Pind. fr.* 122.13–14 Snell–Maehler) may have taken advantage of Pindar’s dual poetic task for Xenophon and commissioned a third lyric composition, intended for the ritual activity of one of the city’s main religious cults: in particular, a cult associated with the choral lyric genre that Corinth itself, as explicitly stated in *Olympian* 13, proudly claimed as its own invention. However, even the hypothesis of an earlier or later composition/performance of the dithyramb does not preclude an intertextual reading of the poem in relation to Pindar’s encomiastic ‘diptych’ for Xenophon, nor does it exclude the possibility that the three works were commissioned together, and that their original purpose may likewise

have been to function as a cohesive set of compositions.<sup>71</sup> There is no evidence allowing us to establish the precise chronological order of composition and first performance of the three poems; at any rate, questions of relative chronology become secondary and are ultimately irrelevant to the investigation of intertextual connections which, as I have sought to demonstrate, do indeed exist and operate across these works.

*Conclusion: toward new interpretative insights*

In conclusion, an intertextual reading of Pind. *fr.* 70c Snell–Maehler, in relation to the two encomiastic poems for Xenophon of Corinth (*Ol.* 13 and *fr.* 122 Snell–Maehler), not only provides further confirmation of the dithyramb’s Corinthian setting, but also offers valuable insights into the poem’s lexical and imagistic choices, semantic implications, and communicative purposes. Moreover, this approach can shed additional light on the surviving traces of ancient scholarly engagement with the text, as evidenced by the discussion of the two marginal annotations in *POxy.* 1604.

More generally, an intertextual analysis of this kind enables a more insightful appreciation of the dithyramb, and of Pindar’s dithyramb in particular, as a lyric genre potentially open to cross-generic contaminations and influences: also, and especially, from the very same encomiastic poetry of which Pindar, together with his contemporary Bacchylides, was the foremost representative. More

<sup>71</sup> For the interpretation of Pindar’s eagerness to “know” Corinth (*Ol.* 13.3–4 γνώσομαι / τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον) as an allusion to his first poetic engagement with the city, proposed by Wilamowitz (U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* [Berlin 1922] 372), see J. Pinsent, “Pindar, *Nemean* 1.24 & *Olympian* 13.3,” *LCM* 8 (1983) 16; F. Ferrari (a cura di), *Pindaro. Olimpiche* (Milano 1998) 188 n. 2; Lomiento in Gentili et al., *Olimpiche* 307, 590; A. S. Sigelman, *Pindar and the Poetics of Immortality* (Cambridge 2016) 58; C. Eckerman, “On Praise and Restraint: Pindar’s Horai in the Proem of *Olympian* 13,” *Mnemosyne* 74 (2021) 498–504, at 499–500; Peri, *Olimpica* 24 (“lode come occasione di scoperta e approfondimento”). This would leave open the possibility of the dithyramb’s contemporaneity with, or posteriority to, the poetic ‘diptych’ for Xenophon. See however Eckerman, *Mnemosyne* 74 (2021) 500 (who proposes a different interpretation of Pindar’s phrasing in the proem of *Olympian* 13), and Peri, *Olimpica* 24, for criticism toward this kind of biographizing readings.

broadly, this analytical perspective proves highly valuable in counteracting an overly rigid internal distinction within the Pindaric corpus between the epinician odes, regarded as the privileged locus for analysing the *Nachleben* of Pindaric poetry, and choral lyric composed for cultic purposes, which is more often seen as firmly anchored to the occasionality of its performance and the specific ritual event in which it takes place. A closer examination of the creative and dynamic relationship that Pindar's religious choral lyric establishes with geographical contexts offers deeper insight into the ways in which this poetry potentially moves beyond a purely occasional configuration, tied to the immediacy of ritual circumstances, and ultimately emerges as closely interrelated with other forms of lyric composition, and open to connections and various forms of combinations with other songs within the Pindaric corpus. In other words, this intertextual reading of Pindar's fragmentary poetry can provide a more profound understanding of the modes of reception of his multi-genre lyric, and of its dual status as both performance poetry and literary text.<sup>72</sup>

Furthermore, a deeper analysis of Pindar's Corinthian poems and their mutual interrelations can offer insights into how the texts creatively engage with their spatial contexts—both broader geographical settings and localized topographies—through highly nuanced modes of interaction, as well as how this strategy of contextual self-placement actively shapes their subsequent reception.

Additionally, the value of examining cross-generic intertextual links through this specific case study lies in its ability to offer a compelling analytical perspective that has not yet been adequately taken into account by scholarship, and that may contribute to opening up new suggestive insights into the production of lyric poets of the

<sup>72</sup> See T. Phillips, *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford 2016), who addresses this relationship between textuality and performativity in relation to the later reception of Pindar's poetry as a literary work. See also on this interaction Sigelman, *Immortality* 50–85, who focuses on an inverse orientation of this relationship, examining the transition from the song as text to its first performance as the poem's 'future', within a broader discussion of the temporality articulated by the songs. Marinis, *Pindar* 18–56 (see above, n. 61), analyses in particular how this dual status is reflected in the terminology and semantic valences of key metapoetic terms, κῶμος and ὕμνος.

Archaic and Classical periods, on two main levels.

On the one hand, this case study allows us to demonstrate how alternative intertextual horizons, particularly spanning distinct lyric genres, can be opened beyond the epic-lyric dualism within which intertextual readings of Pindar have predominantly operated so far.<sup>73</sup> As a result, this analytical horizon can provide further impetus to push the boundaries of the exploration of intertextual possibilities within the poetic production of Pindar, and of Archaic and Classical poets more generally, beyond overly narrow circumscriptions and scholarly skepticisms toward intra- or cross-generic intertextual readings within the specific domain of lyric.<sup>74</sup> From

<sup>73</sup> The recent, cutting-edge discussion of intertextuality in Pindar and Bacchylides offered by A. D. Morrison, "Pindar, Bacchylides, Archaic Epic, and Intertextuality," in A. Kelly and H. L. Spelman (eds.), *Texts and Intertexts in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge 2024) 138–165 (see below, n. 74), likewise situates its analysis within this prevailing dual framework of intertextual relations between epic and lyric, which B. Currie, "Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry: the Special Case of Epinician," *TC* 13 (2021) 289–362, even circumscribes as the sole domain of genuine intertextual investigation for epinician poetry (see below, n. 74).

<sup>74</sup> The recent discussion by Currie, *TC* 13 (2021) (see above, n. 73) expresses skepticism toward intrageneric intertextuality in epinician poetry. For a more open-ended approach to the evaluation of intertextuality, understood as broader than the narrow category of allusion (on which Currie's analysis prevalently hinges) and not exclusively restricted to authorial intention, see Morrison, in *Texts and Intertexts*. See already A. D. Morrison, *Performance & Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Odes* (London 2007) 76–78, for a hypothesis of interaction among three Sicilian odes of Pindar (*Olympian* 6, *Nemean* 1, *Olympian* 1; see also briefly Morrison, in *Texts and Intertexts* 141–142). The intertextual reading proposed here, while engaging to some extent with the possibility of reconstructing an original authorial intention, nonetheless places emphasis on modes of reception by Pindar's audiences and readers, both contemporary (Pindar's Corinthian recipients) and later (the author of the marginal annotations in *POxy*: 1604 [fr. 70c Snell–Maehler]; Chamaeleon/Athenaeus [fr. 122 Snell–Maehler]), and ultimately emancipates itself from the need to posit a specific logical/chronological orientation: a requirement intrinsic to the concept of allusion, which leads for example Currie, *TC* 13 (2021) to reject an intertextual reading of the three Sicilian odes mentioned above, on the grounds that "the direction of influence can be argued as easily one way as the other". On this logical/chronological directionality of allusion, which becomes a secondary issue within a more open-ended intertextual approach,

this perspective, the present analysis situates itself within an already flourishing exploration of intertextual phenomena in Archaic and Classical literature, which is considerably helping to dismantle a strict divide between a supposedly ‘primal’ archaic literature and a ‘refined’ Hellenistic/Roman literary culture.<sup>75</sup>

On the other hand, this case study ultimately helps to foster the possibility of investigating intertextual processes within the poetic corpora of individual authors. This analytical perspective of ‘internal’ intertextuality carries suggestive interpretative implications. In particular, the analysis of this ‘Corinthian’ triad, with its internal connections, may contribute to a more insightful investigation of the modes of literary reception of Pindar’s poems, not only by placing greater emphasis on their dual status as performance poetry and material texts—the latter progressively asserting itself within the ongoing process of dissemination—but also by highlighting their potential for combinatory aggregation into broader textual units. Specifically, the establishment of intertextual networks among poems composed for distinct performance occasions and settings (in this case, within a same geographical context), as actively encouraged by their author, can be seen as a preliminary phase of those dynamics of interrelation and aggregation of poems that progressively led to their anthological collection as literary texts, and, ultimately, to the shaping of Pindar’s complete Hellenistic edition. As such, this analysis tends to align with a growing scholarly trend devoted to literary transmission and interpretative practices in antiquity, and seeks to offer fresh insights by highlighting how intertextuality can meaningfully contribute to investigating these processes, especially in a chronological phase spanning the poet’s lifetime and his later reception.<sup>76</sup>

In summary, although confined to a limited set of Pindaric compositions, this intertextual investigation may carry significant im-

see Morrison, in *Texts and Intertexts* 141 n. 13.

<sup>75</sup> In addition to Morrison, in *Texts and Intertexts*, and the other studies collected in *Texts and Intertexts*, see T. J. Nelson, *Markers of Allusion in Archaic and Classical Poetry* (Cambridge 2023).

<sup>76</sup> See in particular Phillips, *Library*; T. A. Hadjimichael, *The Emergence of the Lyric Canon* (Oxford 2019).

plications, not only for the interpretation of Pindar's poetry in the strict sense, but also, more broadly, for theoretical issues that lie at the forefront of contemporary criticism in Classical literary studies.

Universidade de Lisboa  
alessio.ranno@edu.ulisboa.pt  
ORCID: 0000-0002-4980-4099