

PINDAR'S ΚΟΙΝΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ
AND PANHELLENISM IN OLYMPIAN 10*

Panhellenism has increasingly become a topic of scholarly interest in contemporary studies of archaic and classical Greek culture. Broadly understood, Panhellenism refers to a sense of shared cultural identity between Greeks who live in geographically separated locales. In general, Hellenists working on Panhellenic identity formation have asserted several different causes for the phenomenon. If not explicitly in discourse, in terms of a joint Greek campaign against the Trojans, Panhellenism can already be found in Homer's *Iliad*. Scholars have argued, furthermore, that, through trade and colonization (in the late 'Dark Age' and early Archaic period), the Greeks' engagement with others gave them an increasing awareness of themselves. The Persian wars, similarly, have often been cited as an important factor in the development of Panhellenism. After the Greeks defeated the Persians, they developed a more polarized view of themselves in relation to others. A further reason for Panhellenic identity formation was the increasing importance of the Panhellenic sanctuaries and festivals, oracles such as Delphi, and the dispersion of Homeric texts.¹ While all of these phenomena, and others, were significant factors in the origin and development of Panhellenism, the last factor, particularly how Panhellenic sanctuaries aided in Greek identity formation, is integral to my current concerns.²

*) For helpful comments and criticism on an earlier version of this paper I would like to thank the editor of this journal, Bernd Manuwald, as well as Michael Haslam, Lauren Grace Kilroy, Kathryn Morgan, Seth Schein, and Bernd Vine.

1) For an influential view on literary Panhellenism see G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore 1990) 60–73 and passim.

2) This is not the place for an extended overview of Panhellenism. For a good overview and references to phenomena noted here see S. A. Ross, *Barbarophonos: Language and Panhellenism in the Iliad*, CP 100 (2005) 299–316, 301. Two monographs by J. Hall have been particularly influential on Greek identity formation, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 1997), and *Hellenicity* (Chicago 2002). On Panhellenism see particularly the latter 205–208.

This paper contributes to discourse on Panhellenism by offering a new reading for the phrase κοινὸς λόγος in line eleven of Pindar's Olympian 10.³ Modern scholars have offered interpretations of the phrase that I feel are inadequate, and I shall discuss them below. I shall contend that the phrase means 'common tale' or, with somewhat more nuance, 'Panhellenic narrative'. The more nuanced translation derives from reflecting on the content of the centerpiece mythological narrative in Olympian 10. Further support, as we shall see, comes from comparative study with Olympian 7. In closing, I briefly draw out the interpretive possibilities for this reading within its broader historical and poetic context. I shall suggest that this poem and others like it show Pindar engaging with themes of Panhellenic concern specifically in terms of narrative practice.

Pindar's tenth Olympian begins, as usual in epinician, with nondiegetic text. Pindar says that he has forgotten about Hagesidamos' ode, recognizes that he now needs to fulfill his debt (l. 8), and implies that he will do so. More specifically, he will pay out a κοινὸς λόγος for the sake of friendly grace (ll. 11–12). Pindar then gives his reason for telling this κοινὸς λόγος (γάρ l. 13). He introduces Ἀτρέκεια, 'Strictness', who seems to be an oblique reference to contractual propriety. More specifically 'she' seems to refer to Pindar's need to praise Hagesidamos in epinician song.⁴ Pindar, thereafter, makes some brief references to Hagesidamos and his competition, comparing Hagesidamos' fight to that between Kyknos and Herakles. Pindar mentions a debt that Hagesidamos owes

3) For discussions of Olympian 10 see particularly: D. L. Burgess, Pindar's Olympian 10: Praise for the Poet, Praise for the Victor, *Hermes* 118 (1990) 273–281, H. Erbse, Bemerkungen zu Pindars 10. olympischer Ode, in: *Silvae: Festschrift für Ernst Zinn zum 60. Geburtstag*, hrsg. v. M. von Albrecht and E. Heck (Tübingen 1970), T. K. Hubbard, The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry (Leiden 1985) 60–70, G. Kromer, The Value of Time in Pindar's Olympian 10, *Hermes* 104 (1976) 420–436, P. J. Nassen, A Literary Study of Pindar's *Olympian* 10, *TAPhA* 105 (1975) 219–240, W. Race, Pindar (Boston 1986) 116–120, W. J. Verdenius, Commentaries on Pindar, Volume 2, *Olympian Odes* 1, 10, 11, *Nemean* 11, *Isthmian* 2 (Leiden 1988) 53–86, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 218–224, E. Wüst, Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter: Interpretationen der 12 vorsizilischen Siegeslieder des sechsten Paians und der zehnten olympischen Ode (Tübingen 1967) 256–279.

4) See, for example, Verdenius (above, n. 3) 62. On the historical importance of commerce and contractual strictness to Western Lokroi see, for example, Nassen (above, n. 3) 224–226.

to Ilas, probably his trainer,⁵ and analogizes this to the debt of Patroklos to Achilles. In the second and third triad, Pindar narrates Herakles' battles with the Moliones and Augeas and his concomitant foundation of the Olympic sanctuary. In the fourth triad, the first Olympic games and the festival celebrations form the body of the narrative. In the fifth triad, Pindar exits the centerpiece narration and returns, in closing, to Hagesidamos and his victory in boxing at Olympia.

Since the phrase κοινὸς λόγος needs to be understood in its broader poetic context, I begin by addressing two textual concerns in Olympian 10. The first is a probable textual crux in line nine, and the second is the phrase's place in dense poetic imagery. I print here the text of Snell / Maehler⁶ and offer a translation for the syntactically self-contained antistrophe of the first triad:

ἔκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος
 ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος.
 ὅμως δὲ λῦσαι δυνατὸς ὄξειαν ἐπιμομφὰν
 τόκος †θνατῶν· νῦν ψᾶφον ἐλισσομένην
 ὅπᾳ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον, 10
 ὅπᾳ τε κοινὸν λόγον
 φίλαν τείσομεν ἐς χάριν.

For time to come came from afar
 and shamed my deep debt.
 But nevertheless interest †of men†
 can remove bitter reproach;
 now as a flowing wave submerges a rolling pebble, 10
 so shall we pay out a common tale
 for the sake of friendly grace.⁷

5) According to the scholiast, whose suggestion modern commentators frequently follow; see, for example, Nassen (above, n. 3) 227, Verdenius (above, n. 3) 64.

6) B. Snell and H. Maehler (Hrsg.), *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Pars I *Epinicia*, Eighth ed. (Stuttgart 1987).

7) *Χάρις*, as usual in Pindar, proves difficult to translate. On *χάρτις* as poetry see M. M. Willcock (Hrsg.), *Pindar, Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, and 7* (Cambridge 1995) 18. See also W. Race (Hrsg.), *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes* (Cambridge 1997) 4. For athletic achievement's demand to be sung in song through a reciprocal act of poetic *χάρτις* see Gregory Nagy, *The "Professional Muse" and Models of Prestige in Ancient Greece*, *Cultural Critique* 12 (1989) 133–143, 138.

First of all, let us briefly note the apparent textual crux. In line nine, the $\theta\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ of the better manuscripts, for metrical reasons, may be wrong.⁸ W. Race, in his recent Loeb edition,⁹ has accepted C. Fennell's¹⁰ emendation $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$. With this suggestion incorporated into the text, Race translates, "let him (Hagesidamos) see now"; this reading suggests a performative context. Hagesidamos, the victor, will watch as Pindar,¹¹ through performance, pays on his debt, the belatedness of the poem.¹² While the suggestion is attractive, it remains inconclusive.¹³ Fortunately, the crux does not render particularly unclear the broader meaning of the antistrophe.

In addition to the textual crux, we should address the highly poetic language of the passage. While the primary meaning of $\psi\acute{\alpha}\varphi\omicron\varsigma$ (l. 9) in the picturesque simile is 'pebble', the noun can (as several others have noted)¹⁴ frequently refer to a 'marker of debt'. Here the primary (pebble) and secondary meaning (marker of debt) of the noun seem to be activated simultaneously. Pindar, analogous to a wave washing away a pebble, will wash away his belatedness through offering a particularly elegant poem.¹⁵ The $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, 'interest', that Pindar refers to, as several scholars have suggested,

8) The metrical structure of Olympian 10 derives from a mixture of ionic and aeolic metra. The phrase $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\omicron\varsigma \theta\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ ruptures the strophic responson, upheld in the other nine metrically responding passages of strophe and antistrophe within the five triads. For a conspectus metrorum see Snell/Maehler (above, n. 6) 35–36. See also Verdenius (above, n. 3) 53.

9) Race (above, n. 7) 163.

10) C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, Second ed. (Cambridge 1893) ad loc.

11) I use 'Pindar' throughout as convenient shorthand for the narrative voice of his epinician poems, without either asserting or denying any relationship with the historical Pindar.

12) This would include the debt of the poem itself.

13) The passage has received a fair amount of scholarly conjecture. The better MSS read $\theta\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$, the inferior MSS read $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$. Schneidewin suggested an imperative: $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau' \acute{\omega}\nu$; Hermann suggested $\delta\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$, 'beneficial', in apposition with $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$; Mommsen suggested $\gamma\epsilon \tau\acute{o}\kappa\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$. For further emendations see Douglas E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972* (Amsterdam 1976) 51. Verdenius (above, n. 3) 59 has suggested that the emendations are unnecessary: "there is no difficulty in the correspondence $\cup\cup\cup-$, commonly taken as a bacchius, and $\cup--$."

14) See, for example, B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885) 215, Race (above, n. 7) 117, Verdenius (above, n. 3) 60.

15) For further discussion of the 'wave' and the 'pebble' metaphor see, with reference to previous discussion, Hubbard (above, n. 3) 62–63. As Hubbard cautions, we should keep in mind that Pindar's 'lateness' may be a conventional conceit. See too Nassen (above, n. 3) 223–224. She too discusses, with reference to fur-

may be read as the particularly ornate stature of the poem.¹⁶ As B. Gildersleeve noted, “the shame is not in the debt ... but in the delay”.¹⁷

There are three particularly prominent modern interpretations of the phrase κοινὸς λόγος.¹⁸ The multivalency of both the noun (λόγος) and adjective (κοινός) have resulted in these interpretive turns.¹⁹ Κοινός, without a delimiting modifier, leaves vague to whom the λόγος is common, while commentators have activated the common meaning of λόγος ‘tale/narration’, its frequent meaning ‘account’, as well as ‘poem’ broadly understood. This leaves open, especially in combination, several possibilities in interpretation.

One interpretation sees in κοινὸς λόγος a contractual agreement between Pindar and Hagesidamos, poet and patron, for the commissioning and deliverance of this ode.²⁰ This ‘contractual reading’

ther bibliography, the problem of taking this admittance of negligence as historic circumstance rather than poetic conceit. I agree with the majority of commentators on this passage in the believe that some historical circumstance has caused a delay. As Hubbard (above, n.3) 61 remarks, “O. 10 unquestionably does refer to some kind of ‘lateness’ characteristic of the ode as a whole”.

16) This of course is open to interpretation. In line with this suggestion see, for example, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (above, n.3) 219. E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962) vol. 1,1, Verdenius (above, n.3) 59.

17) Gildersleeve (above, n.14) 214. The delay is marked text-internally at line three, and as we know text-externally Pindar had other important commissions for the year 476 BC: Olympian 1 for Hieron of Syracuse, and Olympians 2 and 3 for Theron of Akragas, all of which may have taken precedence.

18) The roots κοιν- and λεγ-/λογ- used as a phrasal unit develop a widespread technical meaning in Greek in the classical period: ‘take counsel’. In Herodotus the phrase κοινῷ λόγῳ χρώμενοι refers to deliberative process (see e.g. 1.141, 1.166, 2.30). In Thucydides the phrase λόγοις κοινοῖς χρώμενοι (4.64.4) means ‘take counsel’. Euripides too develops this meaning; see for example his *Tr.* 54, *Or.* 1098. The collocation becomes particularly productive with the verb κοινολογέομαι and the noun κοινολογία; see, for example, LSJ s. v.

19) A good example of the interpretive confusion can be found in Lehnus’ gloss on the passage, “*Koinós* controverso: «cui noi ci uniamo»; altri, l’*inno* che è frutto de un «comune accordo» o più brutalmente «l’ammontare convenuto (tra noi)». Altri ancora, fuori del linguaggio commerciale: «publico», o un racconto «che riguarda tutti» (Aristarco); cfr. *O.* 7.21–2, 13.49”, L. Lehnus (Hrsg.), *Pindaro: Olimpiche* (Milan 1981) 175.

20) Farnell (*The Works of Pindar*, London 1930–32, 80) comments on κοινὸν λόγον τείσομεν: “I have adopted Schneidewin’s explanation ‘I will pay an account agreed upon between us’. This agrees best with context, where debt and bookkeeping are twice referred to; but the other explanation given by the scholiast and based on Aristarchos, ‘we will repay him with a tale that concerns all men,’ must be reckoned with, especially in view of *O.* vii 21 ζῶνὸν ἀγγέλλων διορθῶσαι λόγον”.

may first arise due to items early in the poem that share in an accounting lexicon (τόκος l. 9, ψᾶφον l. 9, λόγον l. 11, τείσομεν l. 12).²¹ Since Greek, however, both does not use the phrase λόγον τείσομεν to express the absolution of debt, and because a pellucid meaning is at hand, I suggest, with other scholars, that we should discard this reading. Since the victor or his family regularly commissioned epinician poems, the historical circumstances of epinician patronage fostered the development of this ‘contractual’ reading.²²

The second interpretation believes that the ‘poem’ is ‘common’ to the victor, his family, and community. Boeckh²³ suggested “κοινὸς λόγος est carmen commune victori cum commissantibus, familia, patria”. Dissen²⁴ suggested “communem laudem (quum tria canenda sint)”. Dissen has Boeckh’s “carmen commune victori cum commissantibus, familia, patria” in mind, when he explicitly comments that ‘three things must be sung’: the victor with his fellow revelers, the victor’s family, and his broader community. Boeckh and Dissen are apparently suggesting that the commonality of the poem is not based on the fact that the ode was commissioned for Hagesidamos alone, but that others close to Hagesidamos (including his family and community) are part of the contract of praise.²⁵ Gildersleeve agreed with this interpretation when he glossed the phrase as “‘the general account’. What is due to the victor and the victor’s home”.²⁶ This second group of com-

21) See, for example, Mezger’s gloss, “κοινὸν λόγον: die gesammte Rechnung – λόγος kann, wie Kayser richtig bemerkt, in diesem Zusammenhang, wo von χρέος und τίθειν die Rede ist, nichts anderes als Rechnung heissen; dann darf aber auch κοινός weder mit Boeckh auf den Sieger und sein Volk (wie O. 7,21), noch mit Schneidewin auf Dichter und Sieger, sondern nur auf die Vereinigung von Zins und Kapital bezogen werden. Unter den Zins (τόκος) hat man jedoch nicht mit Mommsen und den alten Auslegern ein anderes Gedicht (O.11), sondern eine besonders reiche, über die Verpflichtung hinausgehende Ausstattung des gegenwärtigen Liedes zu verstehen”, see F. Mezger, *Pindari Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880) 427–428.

22) Nassen too, in line with Farnell, follows this interpretation; see Nassen (above, n. 3) 222. On commissioning in general see, among much else, L. Woodbury, *Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: Isthmian 2.13*, *TAPhA* 99 (1968) 527–542.

23) A. Boeckh, *Pindari Epinicionum interpretatio Latina cum commentario perpetuo* (Hildesheim 1963 [Original Leipzig 1821]) 199.

24) Dissen apud Schneidewin, *Pindari Carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis*, Vol. II. *Commentarius*, 141.

25) As Mezger (above, n. 21) too understands their suggestions.

26) Gildersleeve (above, n. 14) 215. Ellen Wüst followed in this same tradition when she glossed the passage, “abgesehen davon, daß ‘eine Rechnung bezahlen’

mentators developed a specific reference for κοινός. They believed the commonality referred to the victor, his family, and community. When Boeckh glossed λόγος as “carmen”, ‘song’, he seems to have been thinking of the poem in general, while Dissen and Gildersleeve, less restrictive with “laus”, ‘praise’ and ‘general account’ respectively, were not particularly specific as to how λόγος means ‘praise’ or what specifically ‘the general account’ entails.

A third interpretative group believes κοινὸς λόγος is relevant to a larger group than poet and patron, or even the immediate family of the victor (e. g. Race, Verdenius,²⁷ Eckerman). This third interpretive group believes that λόγος refers neither to contracts nor to the poem itself but rather to a theme, tale, or narrative. Race in his Loeb translation renders the phrase κοινὸς λόγος as a “theme of general concern”. If, as I believe, our most recent of English translations leads us in an interpretively productive direction, we still need a more explicit interpretation of what this ‘theme of general concern’, or as I suggest ‘common tale’, is.²⁸

niemals λόγον τίειν heißen kann, zeigt auch das Adjectiv κοινός, daß λόγος nicht vom Bild her verstanden ist, trotz τείσομεν. Λόγος als Rede der Menschen über jemand ist für Pindar = Ruhm”, Wüst (above, n. 3) 262.

27) Verdenius (above, n. 3) 61: “Not ‘the debt plus the interest’ (e. g. Me[zger]), or ‘the account between us’ (e. g. Farn[ell], Latt[imore], Nassen, 222 n. 9), for Fenn[ell] rightly observes that τίειν λόγον can hardly mean ‘to settle an account’. The meaning is ‘an account addressed to the community’: cf. Vilj[oen], 44–45, and see my note on O. 7, 21 ζυνὸν λόγον”. The word ‘account’ in English has several meanings. From this passage of commentary, however, Verdenius clearly refers to a narrative account rather than business accounting.

28) In addition to the readings noted above we could consider the scholia more directly. Since the scholia, however, are not as pellucid as one may like, I relegate them to this footnote in which I offer text, translation, and brief notes. For the text I follow A. B. Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Vol. I, *Scholia in Olympionicas* (Leipzig 1903). The several suggestions of the scholiasts indicate that the phrase κοινὸς λόγος caused considerable difficulty already in antiquity.

15a. κοινὸν λόγον: Ἀρίσταρχος κοινὸν λόγον τὸν ὕμνον, οὗ πολλοὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσι: πολὺκοινὸς γὰρ καὶ εὐεπίφορός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ λέγειν. (Aristarchus says that κοινὸς λόγος is the hymn which many people want, because it is common to many and inclined to recitation). This reading apparently assumes the commonality of the λόγος lies in several people’s interest in the hymn / λόγος because it is ‘general’, but this remains vague (On the frequent difficulty of interpreting the Greek word ‘hymn’ see A. Harvey, *The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry*, CQ 5 [1955] 165–168.). When Aristarchus glossed the ‘hymn’ of Olympian 10 as πολὺκοινός, ‘very common’, I wonder if it was the centerpiece narrative of the poem that motivated his suggestion.

I suggest that Pindar, with the phrase κοινὸς λόγος, refers to his own soon to follow narrative that is rich in mythology, topology, and aetiology. Κοινός, following this reading, refers to the ‘common’ subject matter of the myth (λόγος): the foundation of the Olympic sanctuary, the first competitions, and the first festival celebrations. This centerpiece myth, as a celebration of the Panhellenic sanctuary at Olympia and the Olympic games, is ‘common’ because it is shared by all Greeks and is not relevant to only the victor and his immediate home community.

I suggest that Pindar begins his κοινὸς λόγος after the passage on Hagesidamos and his specific victory (approximately the epode of the first triad). Roughly the next three triads of the poem are devoted to Herakles’ foundation of the Altis, the first athletic contests, and the celebration of the first Olympic games. These three triads, I believe, comprise Pindar’s κοινὸς λόγος. Since the narrative focuses on Herakles’ foundation of the sanctuary at Olympia and offers a depiction of the first Olympic games and the concomitant celebrations, all Greeks can share in this myth: Olympia was a Panhellenic sanctuary. Pindar, in this centerpiece myth, does not base his narrative on myth that might be immediately relevant to only the victor, his family, and his home polis. The κοινὸς λόγος ends, after typical Pindaric semantic overlap between triads, with the beginning of the fifth triad.

15b. κοινὸν λόγον: ἕτεροι μὲν τὸν περὶ τῶν πολλῶν λόγον· οἱ δὲ τὸν ὕμνον ἤκουσαν, ἢτοι ὅτι πλείονες αὐτοῦ μεθέξουσιν [οἱ νικηφόροι], ἢ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν ἔσται στομάτων. (Some say κοινὸς λόγος is the λόγος about most people / things, others understand κοινὸς λόγος to mean the hymn, either because more people will share in it or because it will be on many people’s lips). The first lemma of 15b explicating κοινὸς λόγος as a λόγος “about most people / things” offers little clear meaning. The only clear deduction we can make about this scholium is that the λόγος here is not identical with the ‘hymn’, since the second half of 15b offers a reading of the λόγος as the ‘hymn’. The second half of 15b apparently suggests that the λόγος is ‘common’ because other people will share in the hymn. This mirrors the reading of 15a that suggested the poem was ‘common’ because it was, as the Greek seems to suggest, good for recitation.

15c. ὅπα τε κοινὸν λόγον: ὅπως τὸν ὕμνον ἀποτίσωμεν προσφιλῶς τε καὶ κεχαρισμένως τῷ ἐγκομιαζομένῳ (so that we shall pay out the hymn both kindly and graciously for the victor who is being celebrated). The ancient scholia 15a and 15b lean towards favoring associating the κοινὸς λόγος broadly with the hymn itself, while 15c seems to interpret the passage in light of the immediately following lexical material, particularly the φίλαν ἐς χάριν phrase in line 12.

An important comparandum for the phrase κοινὸς λόγος in Olympian 10, as others have noted,²⁹ is the phrase ξυνὸς λόγος, ‘common tale’, in Olympian 7. At line 21 of Olympian 7, for the famed Diagoras of Rhodes, in a context analogous to that of its use in Olympian 10, Pindar self-referentially draws attention to the myth he will there narrate, while referring to it as a ξυνὸς λόγος. I provide the text of Snell / Maehler as well as a translation:

ἐθελήσω τοῖσιν ἐξ ἀρχᾶς ἀπὸ Τλαπολέμου
 ξυνὸν ἀγγέλλων διορθῶσαι λόγον,
 Ἡρακλέος
 εὐρυσθενεὶ γέννα.

I (shall) wish, while announcing for them from the beginning from Tlapolemos, to set straight a tale / narrative common to the broad-strengthened race of Herakles (20–23).

The ‘commonality’ (ξυνόν l. 21) is based on the tale being shared by both Diagoras and his father (the immediate antecedents of τοῖσιν mentioned in the previous stanza) as well as by the more inclusive ‘broad-strengthened offspring of Herakles’; this implicates both the victor and his father, as well as the broader community of Rhodians at large.³⁰

After this programmatic statement Pindar begins the myth / tale / narrative (λόγον l. 21) of Rhodes and her people. The analogue ξυνὸς³¹ λόγος in Olympian 7 suggests, through comparative evidence, that we are correct in connecting the κοινὸς λόγος of Olympian 10 with the aetiological myth of the Altis that Pindar there narrates.³² I contend that the comparandum allows us to

29) For example Boeckh (above, n. 23) ad loc., Farnell (above, n. 20), Lehnus (above, n. 19) ad loc., Verdenius (above, n. 3) ad loc.

30) On ξυνόν see also Verdenius (above, n. 3) 56.

31) At Isthmian 1.46 Pindar refers to epinician as a ξυνὸν καλόν, ‘common beautiful thing’. At Isthmian 6.69 with ξυνὸν ἄσπει κόσμον, ‘a decoration common to the city’, both the epinician poem and the athletic victory function as the κόσμον, ‘beautiful thing’. Ξυνὸν in these instances refers to the epinician poem and / or victory as being shared by the victor’s broader respective community / polis.

32) In the epinicians and fragmentary genres, Pindar uses the root κοιν- on eighteen occasions. The best comparandum for the phrase κοινὸς λόγος of Olympian 10.11 occurs at Pythian 3.2 in the phrase κοινὸν ἔπος. This phrase means some-

suggest that *λόγος* refers, in both Olympian 7 and 10, to the centerpiece ‘myth’ of the respective ode. It is a fascinating deduction in and of itself that Pindar thinks of his centerpiece myths as *λόγοι*, particularly as opposed to *μῦθοι*, since these terms in archaic and classical Greek discourse are highly important. On the three occasions that Pindar uses *μῦθος*, the noun always bears negative connotations,³³ while *λόγος* has a broader semantic range that incorporates both positive and negative connotations.³⁴

To recap, this paper offers two new interpretive turns. The first turn was to limit Pindar’s *κοινὸς λόγος* to the centerpiece myth of the poem.³⁵ Olympian 7 provided comparative philological evidence in support of this suggestion. Secondly, I have offered a new interpretation for the adjective *κοινός*, suggesting that the centerpiece myth of this poem is ‘common’ to all Greeks. Pindar’s description of this myth as ‘common’ is, thus, highly appropriate to the subject matter of the narrative.

In light of these findings, we can make a few speculations regarding the relevance of the phrase *κοινὸς λόγος* within the historical and cultural context of the ode. Here again we touch upon issues of Panhellenism. Why did Pindar choose this ‘common tale / Panhellenic narrative’ for Hagesidamos’ victory of 476 BC? Hagesidamos came from Western Lokroi, a colonial polis on the toe of Italy. Western Lokroi lacked the epic choric mythological heritage that many of the poleis of mainland Greece possessed. When praising a victor from Aegina, for example, Pindar could always turn to the Aeakid sagas for a myth relevant to the vic-

thing close to ‘common statement’, and its relevance is circumscribed to a common Greek community that would share in the desire for Cheiron to be alive to raise another Asclepius.

33) Olympian 1.29, Nemean 7.23, 8.33; noted also by A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar. Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten* (Berlin 1971) 49, D. Loscalzo, *Pindaro tra *mythos* e *logos**, in: *I lirici greci: Forme della comunicazione e storia del testo*, ed. by M. C. Fera and G. B. D’Alessio (Messina 2001) 168. See also Nagy (above, n. 1) 65–68.

34) See J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Hildesheim 1883 [reprint 1961]), W. J. Slater, *A Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) s. v. *λόγος*.

35) Race (above, n. 7) 117 partially anticipated my argument. He suggested that “the ‘interest’ that Pindar will pay on his debt will be the ‘account of common concern.’ Initially that applies to the forthcoming praise of the victor’s city, but in a larger sense it includes the ‘account’ of the first Olympic games later in the ode”. My reading constricts Race’s suggestion to the centerpiece narrative.

tor.³⁶ Perhaps it was the relative lack of strong epichoric myth in colonial Epizephyrian Lokroi that motivated Pindar's choice of this common, Panhellenic, tale on the origins of Olympia.

In addition to Olympian 10, Pindar also narrated the foundation of Olympia in Olympian 3 for Theron of Akragas, similarly a colonial polis in the West. Pindar, again, did something quite similar when he narrated the tale of the first chariot race at Olympia in Olympian 1 for Hieron of Syracuse. Olympians 1, 3, and 10 were for victories in the year 476, and all of them were for victors from Sicily and Magna Graecia. Olympians 1 and 3 were for the tyrants Hieron and Theron, while Olympian 10 was for the boy victor Hagesidamos.

As others have noted, the Western Greeks had particularly close connections with the sanctuary at Olympia.³⁷ This was due not only to the relative closeness of Olympia across the Ionian sea, but also to the cultural importance of Olympia. For colonies on the periphery of the Greek world the appropriation of symbolic capital was important; the Western Greeks were defining themselves in a, relatively speaking, new colonial world. The literary celebration of the place of victory, Olympia, in Olympians 1, 3, and 10, as an assertion of Olympia's cultural symbolic capital, allows Hieron and Syracuse, Theron and Akragas, Hagesidamos and Epizephyrian Lokroi, to develop geographic and cultural connections with Olympia, the most prestigious of Greek Panhellenic sanctuaries.³⁸

Contemporary critics have shown a growing interest in performance and reperformance scenarios for epinician poetry. In terms of first performance T. Gelzer has suggested that some odes may have been performed at the respective Panhellenic sanctuary where the victory was won,³⁹ while E. Krummen⁴⁰ has argued that

36) On Pindar's Aeakid epinicians see, most recently, A. P. Burnett, *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford 2005).

37) See, for example, S. H. Harrell, *King or Private Citizen: Fifth-Century Sicilian Tyrants at Olympia and Delphi*, *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002) 439–464.

38) Cf. Verdenius (above, n. 3) 54: "the function of the myth (sc. in Olympian 10) seems to be similar to that of the myth in O. 3, viz. to enhance the glory of the games, and indirectly that of the victor, by tracing back their origin to Herakles, the son of Zeus".

39) T. Gelzer, *Mousa Authigenes: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien*, *MH* 42 (1985) 95–120.

40) E. Krummen, *Pyrros Hymnos. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3) (Berlin 1990).

several of Pindar's odes were performed at public celebrations in the home polis of the victor. B. Currie has recently reminded us of the possibilities of reperformance, such as through informal sympotic song, performances organized by the victor's descendants, and performances subsidized by the polis at public festivals in the home polis of the victor.⁴¹ T. Hubbard, admittedly speculatively, has recently hypothesized that epinician odes may have been reperformed at the Panhellenic sanctuary, where the victory, for which the epinician ode was composed, was won.⁴² Inherent in all of these possibilities for performance and reperformance are issues of identity, both regional and Panhellenic.

Though our positive knowledge of the 'dissemination of epinician lyric' remains meager, we do know that Pindar and Bacchylides soon became Panhellenic poets, in the sense that their odes were known beyond the immediate community of a respective victor. This is represented, for example, through the allusion and parody of their poetic texts in Athenian drama.⁴³ It is a fascinating deduction that a profoundly important socio-cultural issue, Panhellenic identity, can be pinpointed in terms of specific narrative practice with Pindar's κοινὸς λόγος in his tenth Olympian ode. As a matter of mythopoiesis, 'Panhellenic narratives', such as Olympians 1, 3, and 10, show Pindar crafting odes relevant not only to the immediate victor and his family, but also to a much broader Greek audience.⁴⁴

Los Angeles

Christopher Eckerman

41) B. Currie, *Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes*, in: C. J. Mackie (Hrsg.), *Oral Performance and Its Context* (Leiden 2004) 49–69.

42) T. K. Hubbard, *The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reproduction, Written Texts*, in: C. J. Mackie (above, n. 41) 71–93.

43) See Currie (above, n. 41), Hubbard (above, n. 42).

44) I wonder if poems that do not restrict their mythical narration to epic choric myth may have been of particular interest to a broader Greek audience for reperformance. Evidence for such later Greek appreciation may come from the above discussed scholia 15a and 15b. The scholia are, nonetheless, too cryptic to bear the weight themselves of my conjecture. This conjecture would widen our appreciation beyond the importance of 'purple patches' and 'bravura openings' in terms of widespread Greek epinician consumption. See especially the important article of Currie (above, n. 41) 54.