

Pindar. *Olympian* 7: Rhodes, Athens, and the Diagorids*

1. Introduction

Over the last century and a half numerous articles, notes, and chapters of books, several commentaries, and two scholarly monographs have been devoted to *Olympian* 7¹. These have established the ode's ring-compositional structure and its conceptual responses, and they have clarified many of its linguistic and literary difficulties, although not without some ongoing controversy in both areas². However, the historical dimensions of *Olympian* 7 have not fared so well. They have sometimes been neglected, and sometimes dismissed out of hand³. The reception accorded to *Chapter* 8 of Bresson 1979, *Pindare et les Eratides*, a major investi-

* A preliminary version of this paper was presented to the Departmental Research Seminar of the School of Classics, University of Leeds, on 30 April 1997, and a revised Italian version to the Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Medievale of the Università degli Studi di Parma on 12 May 2004 at the kind invitation of Prof. Gabriele Burzacchini. I thank all those who attended these presentations and who contributed to the subsequent discussions. In the interval between the two presentations, I benefited from the stimulus provided by Dr. Barbara Kowalzig's paper *Fire, Flesh, Foreigners and Fruit: Greek Athena on Rhodes?*, given at the conference *Athena in the Classical World* in Oxford on 2 April 1998. I am further grateful to Prof. Douglas L. Cairns, Mr. J. Gordon Howie, Prof. John Marincola, and Prof. Ian Rutherford for their valuable critiques of earlier versions of this paper and their additional suggestions. All remaining errors are mine, and it should not be assumed that those named necessarily assent to my propositions.

¹ Pindar bibliography may be found in Thummer 1958, 1966, 1974, 1982; Bernardini 1966; Gerber 1969; Rico 1969; Fogelmark 1976; Gerber 1976, 1988, 1989, 1990, and the *Bibliographies* of Pfeijffer 1996 and 1999. The monographs referred to here are Bresson 1979 and Retter 2002.

² For a polemical survey of earlier treatments of linguistic details in *O.* 7, cf. Verdenius 1987, 40-88. Willcock 1995, 109-133 chooses between earlier interpretations, but generally with little or no argument. Retter 2002, to be read with the caveats of Gerber 2003, handles a few points of language at great length. Earlier bibliography on verbal and thematic responses is mainly noted by Verdenius 1987 – add, however, Schürch 1971, 45-49, Rubin 1980, and Sullivan 1982 – but Verdenius rejects absolutely such modes of analysis: for criticism of Verdenius' approach, cf. Vian 1974, reviewing an earlier version of Verdenius' commentary and objecting to his «hypoexégèse». The «select list of verbal echoes» at Willcock 1995, 112-113 is in effect another useful part-riposte to Verdenius.

³ E.g. the treatment of Young 1968 shows little interest in this topic, although Pouilloux 1970 and Defradas 1974 make useful contributions, as do remarks here and there in Morelli 1959, e.g. 82, 96f. On dismissal, cf. n. 4.

gation of *Olympian 7*'s historical, political and cultural background, was characteristic: it initially encountered partial or total disbelief, and in general it has received little attention⁴. Paradoxically, the insights into Pindar's compositional techniques offered by E.L. Bundy⁵ may have been in part responsible for the neglect of equally valid historical approaches to Pindar. The recent writings of Thomas K. Hubbard, Eveline Krummen, and Ilya L. Pfeijffer on other Pindaric odes⁶ have vigorously reasserted the vital role of their real-life background in their interpretation. But the relevance of the personalities and historical setting of *Olympian 7* to its meaning and function is still not generally acknowledged.

The essential facts behind *Olympian 7* are familiar. Its honorand is the famous boxer Diagoras. He hailed from Rhodian Ialysos, and his agonistic victories included one at Olympia in 464 BC, for which this ode was specifically written. Although Diagoras' father Damagetos was apparently still alive at this time (17-19), it is clear from Pindar's account that Diagoras by then was acting as head of his family, the 'Eratidae' or 'Diagoridae'. This could be explained on the hypothesis that Damagetos was no longer living on Rhodes but had either been exiled by the Athenians, or had fled the island after the forcible inclusion of Rhodes in the Delian League. The Eratidae were not merely one of the leading families of Ialysos, they were the premier family. They claimed direct descent both from king Eratos of Argos and from Aristomenes of Messene, and they had once been hereditary kings of Ialysos: Pausanias describes the almost certainly earlier⁷ and homonymous Eratid Damagetos who married Aristomenes' daughter as βασιλεύοντι ἐν Ἰαλυσῶ (IV 24,2); and the Eratidae may have been ruling as kings in Ialysos right up to Rhodes' entry into the Delian League. That is the simplest inference from Pindar's

⁴ Bresson 1979 was, however, given a critical but not dismissive appraisal by Bernardini 1983, esp. 85-87 and Ch. 6. On the other hand Verdenius 1987 rejected Bresson's historically based approach in its entirety, cf. e.g. «Pindar abstains from alluding to the political position of the Eratidae [...]» (56 n. 43, referring also to 87f. on ll. 94 and 95), and attacked his ideas many times, while Willcock 1995 did not press historical connections, or mention Bresson's views. Similarly Lehnus 1981, for chronological reasons, and Kirkwood 1982 fail to mention Bresson. Sfyroeras 1993 was more receptive to Bresson's interpretations, but he devoted only one summarizing paragraph (21f.) to the fifth-century history of Rhodes, and he understressed the antagonism of the Diagorids to Athens.

⁵ Bundy 1962a; 1962b; cf. also Young 1968.

⁶ Hubbard 1990; 1992; Krummen 1990; Pfeijffer 1995a; 1995b; 1999.

⁷ Bresson 1979, 149-152 discusses the genealogy of the Eratidae, notes earlier views and controversies, and shows general inclination for the version of Paus. IV 24,2f. (derived from Rhianus' *Messenikiaka*) which makes Aristomenes of Messene the great-grandfather of Diagoras. The dating of the Messenian War(s) is, however, highly controversial (mid seventh or early fifth century): cf. e.g. the various accounts in *KP*, *NP*, and *OCD*³ s.vv. *Messenien/Messenia*. The name Aristomenes is not uncommon on Rhodes, which underpins a link; on the cult of Aristomenes at his tomb on Rhodes, cf. Paus. IV 24,3; Morelli 1959, 28, 111. *IG* XII/1 8,4 may also refer to it. On Pindar's suppression of Aristomenes in *O. 7*, see below Section 3.3.

brief complimentary reference to Diagoras' father, the (second) Damagetos, as ὀδόντα Δίκῃ (17), a description which suits a king better than a magistrate, given that justice is predominantly a royal concern in early Greek literature⁸. The continued prominence in Rhodes of the Eratidae into the fourth century BC, their crucial role in the synoecism of Rhodes in 408/407 BC, and their leadership of several major campaigns against Athens in the second half of the fifth century BC are well known, as are the strategic location, wealth and populousness of Rhodes. All this makes neglect of the historical and political aspects of *Olympian* 7 seriously undesirable.

This paper explores how Pindar's engagement with the Eratidae determined his treatment of Rhodian mythical history in *Olympian* 7⁹. I take it as self-evident that Pindar, a Theban aristocrat as well as a professional poet, was well-informed about, and supportive of, the political views and interests of his predominantly oligarchic clientele in other Greek cities¹⁰. That is not to say that Pindar's involvement was so detailed that his epinicia could allude to rapidly changing, day-to-day events in those other cities¹¹. Apart from the logistical difficulties inherent in such a concept, a panhellenic poet must have been chary of dwelling overmuch on matters not of interest, or readily accessible, to all Greeks. On the other hand, Pindar's support for his patrons can reasonably be supposed to have involved underpinning their political positions in ways comprehensible to their fellow-citizens and not completely opaque to others; and his support doubtless included presenting in a favourable light his patrons' evaluations of the current and past actions of their home cities. Because progress in the politico-historical exegesis of *Olympian* 7 has been so chequered, some space must be devoted to reviving worthwhile proposals about *Olympian* 7 made by earlier scholars but neglected in the interval. However the overall direction of this paper is more radical than that of earlier scholarship: in particular new evaluations of the methods and purposes of the myths of *Olympian* 7 are offered, and all the myths of the ode are argued to be related directly to the specific political ends of the Eratidae (Section 3). Moreover it is proposed that *Olympian* 7 has a precise and identifiable political 'message' relevant to the year 464 BC (Section 4).

Two points should receive preliminary clarification. First, the hypothesis that *Olympian* 7 embodies the political claims and aspirations of Rhodes and of the Eratidae can stand independently of whether or not, as commentators have debated,

⁸ Cf. Hes. *Th.* 79-90 with West 1966, 183-185, referring also to *Op.*; Bacchyl. 5,6 with Maehler 1982 and 1997, *ad l.*; West 1997, 134-136. Bresson 1979, 150 argues that the entire *genos*, and not Damagetos alone, ruled Ialysos.

⁹ For a useful, brief overview of Rhodian mythography, cf. Craik 1980, 149-167.

¹⁰ Hubbard 1992 explores *N.* 9 in detail from a parallel viewpoint.

¹¹ This caveat reflects my caution about certain hypotheses advanced by Pfeijffer (above, n. 6) which envisage Pindar reacting to detailed political events in Aegina.

Pindar ever visited Diagoras in Rhodes. Such a visit seems to me *a priori* not unlikely. But it would be rash to argue that κατέβαν (13) must refer to a visit during which Pindar presented *Olympian* 7 to Diagoras: the ‘ego-figure’ who speaks here could equally well be choric – and/or κατέβαν could embody the conventional metaphor whereby ‘travelling’ stands for ‘writing poetry’¹². In any case Pindar must have had many opportunities to meet Diagoras and his family, including co-presence at various games, where he may well have spectated some of Diagoras’ contests. As will emerge, *Olympian* 7 contains details about Rhodian cult and topography which Pindar could most easily have learned either by autopsy or by personal contact, if not with Diagoras himself, then at least with his family or entourage.

Second, the identity of Kallianax, who is mentioned by name at line 93, needs to be reasserted. There is not the slightest doubt that Kallianax was the future husband of Kallipateira, daughter of Diagoras, the future son-in-law whose betrothal coincided with Diagoras’ victory and Pindar’s ode¹³. Pausanias twice explicitly states Kallianax’s relationship with Diagoras in accounts of the statues of the Diagorid victors which he saw at Olympia¹⁴. To deny Pausanias’ testimony on the ground that «this view makes the <Pindaric> sentence <i.e. lines 93-4> a kind of appendix and leaves the asyndeton unexplained»¹⁵ is completely unacceptable: the statue base of Eukles, son of Kallianax and Kallipateira, was found in the nineteenth century at Olympia, and its inscription, recut in the fourth or third century BC, reads:

[Εὐκ]λῆς Καλλιάνακτος Ῥόδιος.
[Ναυ]κύδης Πατροκλῆος ἐποίησε.
(*Olympia* 5,159)

Despite the breaks at the beginnings of the lines, the identification is certain: this is the base of the same statue by the sculptor Naukydes that Pausanias saw at Olympia and described:

¹² Cf. e.g. Lehnus 1981, 120 on l. 11: «l’azione del coro [...] è spesso materialmente presentata come un “giungere”»; Verdenius 1987, 52f. on l. 13, noting the views of some predecessors and observing that in many instances in Pindar: «the arrival of the poet seems to be a metaphor for the completion of his composition». On travel *per se* as a metaphor for poetic composition, cf. Cairns 1976, 301-303.

¹³ As argued by Pouilloux 1970. The degree of credence sometimes given to the scholiast’s alternative version (that Kallianax is an ancestor of Diagoras) seems strange: cf. the ambivalence of Willcock 1995, 132f., and the outright acceptance of the scholiast’s version by Race 1997, 119, 133.

¹⁴ VI 6,2 (quoted below), cf. VI 7,2 Διαγόρου δὲ καὶ οἱ τῶν θυγατέρων παῖδες πύξ τε ἤσκησαν καὶ ἔσχον Ὀλυμπικάς νίκας, ἐν μὲν ἀνδράσιν Εὐκλῆς Καλλιάνακτός τε ὦν καὶ Καλλιπατεῖρας τῆς Διαγόρου, Πεισίροδος δὲ ἐν παισὶν κτλ.

¹⁵ So Verdenius 1987, 86 on l. 93.

ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις Εὐκλῆς ἀνάκειται Καλλιάνακτος, γένος μὲν Ῥόδιος,
οἴκου δὲ τοῦ Διαγοριδῶν· θυγατρὸς γὰρ Διαγόρου παῖς ἦν, ἐν δὲ ἀνδράσι
πυγμῆς ἔσχεν Ὀλυμπικὴν νίκην. τούτου μὲν δὴ ἡ εἰκὼν Ναυκύδους
ἐστὶν ἔργον. (VI 6,2, cf. VI 7,2)

Olympian 7 is greatly illuminated by the identification of Kallianax as Diagoras' future son-in-law. To begin with, the appearance of the named future son-in-law of Diagoras at the end of the ode matches the generalising image at its start of an unnamed future son-in-law being given a precious cup at a betrothal ceremony¹⁶. Again, the sequence of thought of lines 87-95 is clear and logical on the assumption that Kallianax is Diagoras' future son-in-law. After invoking Zeus to honour the ode and Diagoras, Pindar adds «make glorious the descendants whom he <i.e. Diagoras> will share with Kallianax». The ode continues with the remark that the city (Ialysos) participates in the festal activity of the Eratidae. The implication is that Kallianax is a fellow Ialysian of another noble family. Finally Pindar ends with a reflection on the changeable winds of fortune. However else this sentiment functions, it must also be a 'weasel-clause'. The son of Kallianax and Kallipateira turned out to be the Olympic victor Eukles. But Pindar, for all that he was a poet and hence a 'prophet', could hardly have been sure that the betrothed pair would produce this Olympic victor. So he covered himself against a different eventuality. The syntax of lines 92f. is also clear: the sentence is only «a kind of appendix» in the sense that one's daughter's offspring are a «kind of appendix»; and the asyndeton remains «consecutive».

The alternative 'information' offered by the Pindar scholia about Kallianax is manifestly the product of ignorance and despair: they claim that he is an ancestor of Diagoras. Pouilloux pointed out that no such name is known among the Eratidae and, even more tellingly, he targeted the consequence of the scholiasts' claim, *i.e.* the need to interpret κοινὸν σπέρμα as ἔνδοξον¹⁷. The chronological argument that Kallianax could not be Diagoras' future son-in-law because that would make Kallipateira's son (Eukles) «well past 40» when he won his Olympic boxing victory¹⁸ is valueless: apart from commonsense reflections, *e.g.* that Eukles could have been born 15-20 years after the betrothal and that ancient boxing relied more on

¹⁶ On the fact that *O. 7* refers to a betrothal ceremony, not a marriage, cf. Braswell 1976, 240-242. The first sentence of *O. 7* has been subjected to tortuous interpretations which divorce the 'someone' of line 1 from the 'rich hand' of the same line (cf. *e.g.* Kurke 1991, 118-120, with bibliography). I cannot see how the straightforward rendering «as when someone <i.e. Diagoras> takes a cup [...] and presents it with a toast from his rich hand to his young <future> son-in-law (i.e. Kallianax), <a gift> from family to family» does not satisfy both Greek and common sense.

¹⁷ «Comment κοινὸν σπέρμα pourrait-il signifier ἔνδοξον?» (Pouilloux 1970, 209).

¹⁸ Cf. Verdenius 1976, 251f., although he drew back from this argument at Verdenius 1987, 86 n. 121. Bresson 1979, 173 n. 33 had already reasserted Pouilloux's position.

strength than agility, there is also the fact that in antiquity a betrothal could take place years before the marriage. Thus Kallipateira may have been a child in 464 BC, and may not have married for up to ten years.

2. Historical factors

At least four interlocking historical factors are importantly in play in the background to *Olympian 7*. They can be set forth briefly, particularly since all but the first have already been explored in connection with the ode by earlier commentators¹⁹.

The first factor is the medism of Rhodes in the Persian Wars. Even if no positive evidence were forthcoming, this could have been assumed as inevitable in the 490s BC, given the geographical location of Rhodes, which made it prudent for the Rhodian cities to try to maintain good relations with the continental power²⁰. Medism was probably also convenient for leading groups in the cities, including the Diagorids, since the Persians favoured ‘tyrants’ as rulers of their subject Greek cities. In fact, however, and despite the paucity of historical information about Rhodes from this period, its medism is well enough documented to be regarded as indubitable²¹. Aeschylus *Persae* 891-893 mentions Rhodes as one of Darius I’s conquests; and the tendentious claims of the *Lindian Temple Chronicle* of 99 BC are consonant with this testimony. The *Chronicle* (*FGrHist* 63 F 532d,1) tells of a Persian siege of the Lindos Athena temple, either during the suppression of the Ionian revolt (494 BC) or later (491/490)²². Athena appeared to the defenders, who were short of water since it was summer, saying that she would pray to her father Zeus to send rain, which duly came, so that an accommodation with the Persians, rather than a surrender, followed²³. This story is, of course, reminiscent of Pindar’s myth of Zeus raining gold upon Rhodes (πολὺν ὕσε χρυσόν, 50) in a context also involving Athena (see below). The *Chronicle* manifestly rationalises the medism of Rhodes, which doubtless capitulated to the Persians without much resistance. In the Persian Wars, then, Rhodians will have been active on the side of the Great King, presumably mainly in providing ships for his fleets. One notice of this activity, probably derived from Zenon of Rhodes, survives at Diodorus Siculus XI 3,8, where the presence in Xerxes’ fleet in 481-480 BC of forty ships of Rhodes, Cos,

¹⁹ Notably by Bresson 1979, Ch. 8.

²⁰ It is not known whether Rhodes controlled any of its *peraia* before the Persian wars. If it did, this will have been another factor encouraging Rhodian medism.

²¹ The sources and bibliography are conveniently collected by Berthold 1980, 32 nn. 1f.

²² On this passage, see now Higbie 2003, 42-47 (text and translation), 141-147 (commentary), 232-235 (discussion); she dates the event to 490 BC.

²³ Cf. also Burn 1984, 210f., 218.

and the Dorians living off Caria is recorded²⁴. Rhodes' medism also underlies the later attacks on Themistocles by Timocreon of Ialysos. Themistocles was clearly dealing with the cities of Rhodes in the 470s in consequence of their medism. The details defy recovery²⁵, but then or soon after, and at any rate before 470²⁶, the cities of Rhodes were enrolled in the Delian League.

Their enforced enrolment in the League is the second historical factor bearing on *Olympian* 7. Athens, in accordance with her normal practice, divided the Rhodian *poleis* into a larger number of tax-paying units, thereby inevitably weakening them politically²⁷. Moreover democratic institutions alien to Rhodes, and attested epigraphically at Lindos²⁸, were introduced in accordance with Athens' (again) customary and cynical practice of ousting from power traditionally influential aristocratic elements and replacing them with her own democratic supporters. The effects on Rhodes of some these measures, namely the restoration of certain former exiles, and the exiling or execution of other Rhodians, are echoed in Timocreon's attacks on Themistocles²⁹.

The third historical factor, the well-known and long-enduring hostility of the Diagorids to Athenian interests, was kindled or enhanced as a consequence of these events. As probable agents of medism on the island, and as the leading family of Ialysos, they will have been major sufferers from the entry of Rhodes into the Delian League and the imposition of democracy. The subsequent activities of the Diagorids – anti-Athenian, anti-democratic, and pro-Rhodian unity – were the result of this. Bresson 1979, 153-155 discussed these in detail, focussing particularly on the best-known activist, Dorieus the son of Diagoras, a man whose name is a political manifesto in itself³⁰. Dorieus and his relatives were expelled from Rhodes before 424 by the democratic faction at Ialysos and went to Thurii, from where they continued their anti-Athenian activities. At some point they were condemned to death by the Athenians³¹. Eventually they were restored to Ialysos by the Spartans, probably in 411, and with Spartan help brought about the synoecism of Rhodes at

²⁴ Cf. *FGrHist* 63 F 523. The historicity of this *testimonium* was called into question by Frost 1980, 182 on no stronger ground than Herodotus' silence about the matter. Frost's further assertions about the Greek oath of 481 (Hdt. VII 132), distinguishing between those who medized voluntarily and by force, are acceptable, but his conclusion that Rhodes was neutral in the Persian Wars is untenable in view of Aesch. *Pers.* 891-893 – not mentioned by him.

²⁵ Cf. Podlecki 1975, 51-54.

²⁶ Cf. Bresson 1979, 153.

²⁷ Cf. Bresson 1979, 157, 161 n. 51, exemplifying the process for the year 421/420.

²⁸ Cf. Accame 1938; Bresson 1979, 153.

²⁹ Plut. *Them.* 21,2-4. The situation is complicated by the fact that Timocreon had apparently himself been a medizer but was already in exile before Themistocles' arrival. Pro-Athenian Rhodians may have anticipated some of the latter's measures.

³⁰ Cf. also Berthold 1980, discussing oligarchic/democratic interactions in the late fifth and fourth centuries, and David 1986, challenging some elements of Berthold's account.

³¹ The date is disputed: cf. Berthold 1980, 33 and n. 5; David 1986, 161.

the new city of Rhodos in 408-407³². The name of Dorieus' nephew, Peisirrhodos, may well allude to the family's aspirations in this area³³. Dorieus had another brush with the Athenians in 407 and, although captured by them and under sentence of death, was released unharmed³⁴. From this point on the political alliances of the Diagorids became muddled. Another nephew of Dorieus, Diagoras II, was in the Spartan fleet which defeated Athens at Aigospotamoi in 404, but the Diagorids are then found collaborating with the Athenians in the revolt of Rhodes from Sparta in 397/396, and Dorieus himself was executed by the Spartans, his former allies³⁵. The Diagorids were finally expelled by the Rhodian democrats in 395³⁶. In general, however, and despite the late and temporary support of the Diagorids for Athens, they were before this consistently anti-Athenian.

The fourth historical (or historico-geographical) factor is more general in nature but must have influenced the way in which the Rhodians reacted to events of the fifth century BC; and it also features heavily in *Olympian 7*. This is the remarkable harmony throughout their known history of the three cities of Rhodes. In contrast, for example, with Euboea, with its seventh-century 'Lelantine War' between Chalcis and Eretria³⁷, no internecine warfare is recorded on Rhodes³⁸. This is unlikely to be due to the disappearance of evidence: all three Rhodian cities belonged to the Dorian hexapolis (later pentapolis); and, if this league had experienced civil war, we would surely have heard of it, as we hear of the expulsion from it of Halikarnassos³⁹. Moreover Pindar's claims, which follow one strand of Rhodian ktistic legend⁴⁰, that the original Greek settlers of Rhodes were a single group of Argive colonists under Tlepolemos and that the eponymous founders of the three cities of Rhodes were brothers, along with many other assertions which Pindar makes in *Olympian 7* (on which, see below), would have rung hollow if Rhodes had experienced an internal war. Hence they reinforce the conjecture that the cities had never been at war, as does the fact that Kameiros was still unwallled in 411 BC⁴¹.

³² On the process, cf. esp. David 1986.

³³ So Bresson 1979, 161 n. 50.

³⁴ David 1986, 161 n. 29.

³⁵ Paus. VI 7,6, cf. David 1986, 163.

³⁶ Bresson 1979, 155 notes that Diagoras II was priest of Helios in 399/398 and argues that the Diagorids were still in control of Rhodes when they admitted Conon's fleet in 396, only after which they were expelled; David 1986, 163 takes a similar position. Cf. now also Luraghi 1998, esp. 120-122.

³⁷ Cf. Parker 1997.

³⁸ This point was made by Bresson 1979, 31 and n. 60, who also stressed their adherence to the Dorian hexapolis (pentapolis).

³⁹ Hdt. I 144.

⁴⁰ Blinkenberg 1913 emphasized the separateness of the three cities' traditions; to the extent that this is correct, Pindar's unifying trend is all the more significant.

⁴¹ Thuc. VIII 44,1f. Berthold 1980, 33 n. 7 argues that the other Rhodian 'cities' were also unwallled.

The pre-408/407 settlement pattern of Rhodes, which was dissimilar to that of most other advanced areas of Greece, must in part have been responsible for the absence of inter-city strife there. Although the island contained three *poleis* (Ialysos, Kameiros and Lindos) none of them had a major urban centre. Settlement was in villages (some probably large) throughout the three territories. Each *polis* had a principal 'high place', primarily a sacred site, which could be referred to as an 'acropolis', as that of Ialysos is called by Pindar at line 49. These 'high places' were capable of being fortified, and, if the account in the *Lindian Temple Chronicle* has any historical value, the Athena temple at Lindos served as a fortification before 490 BC (above). But these were not the only sacred sites on the island; and only the one at Kameiros can be considered as a natural embryonic town centre at which some urbanisation began at an early date⁴². Analogies for the Rhodian settlement pattern with, for example, Arcadia and Aetolia are unsatisfactory since these were backward areas, whereas fifth-century Rhodes was already wealthy in agriculture and trade. Pindar accurately describes Rhodes as πολύβοσκον γαῖαν ἀνθρώποισι καὶ εὖφρονα μέλοις (63); and its resources as a trading center in the fifth century can be estimated in part from the *Athenian Tribute List* of 421/420 when it paid a total of 34 talents⁴³. A better analogy for the Rhodian pattern might be the large villages of Syria-Lebanon in this and later periods; climate, terrain and water supply are not dissimilar, and there may even have been cultural influence. Territorial disputes between three groups of villages each lacking an urban centre can have escalated less easily into war than those between *poleis* with central conurbations, particularly since the institutions of non-centralised states like the Rhodian cities will not have been in continuous function. Again, if the Rhodian *peraia* did exist before the fifth century BC, it would have offered the Rhodian *poleis* room for expansion without encroachment on their island neighbours, and a context in which Rhodians of all three cities would have needed to cooperate constantly. Finally, the fact that Rhodes lies across the ancient trade routes between Greece and the Orient meant that alternative livelihoods to agriculture were always easily available in trading, the provision of entrepôts, and piracy – and most early wars between Greek cities were over arable land.

True urbanisation did not take place in Rhodes island until 408/407 when the three *poleis* synoecised and founded the new city of Rhodos at the island's northern tip, a *polis* focused around yet another sacred site. This is not to say that the

⁴² The Italian excavators of Kameiros considered the early cistern there to date from the sixth or fifth century BC and to have provided enough water for 300-400 families: cf. «Clara Rhodos» VI 240.

⁴³ That this was a reasonable estimate of Rhodes' ability to pay can be seen from the Spartan levy on Rhodes of 32 talents in 412-411 BC after their 'liberation' of the island from Athens (Thuc. VIII 44,2 with Gomme-Andrewes-Dover, *ad l.*). The Spartans may simply have confiscated the tribute which otherwise would have been payable to Athens.

Rhodians were content to live as three (or more) separate communities and in an essentially village society down to 408/407. Undoubtedly synoecism of the three Rhodian *poleis* would have taken place earlier if it had not been hindered by the Athenians: its achievement so soon after Athens lost control of Rhodes was no doubt intended to strengthen Rhodes against any repeat takeover by Athens, as well as being one of those instant manifestations of local patriotism with which former tributary cities celebrated their ‘freedom’ from Athens. But it must also have represented a long-cherished aspiration; and it seems that this already lies behind *Olympian 7*.

3. Rhodian mythology

In the main Bresson’s reading of *Olympian 7* in terms of the political aspirations and activities of the Diagorids is assumed in this paper⁴⁴. It can be summarized as follows: the multiple agonistic victories of Diagoras celebrated by Pindar demonstrate the power and vitality of Ialysos (the ‘senior’ city, according to *Olympian 7*, 74) and of the Diagorids, who directed the eventual synoecism of the three cities of Rhodes in 408/407 to a new capital in the territory of Ialysos. Moreover *Olympian 7* reveals the Diagorids as already aiming at the synoecism in 464 BC as part of their anti-Athenian and anti-democratic policy. This is why *Olympian 7* celebrates Rhodes as a whole, gives Helios control of the entire island, makes Rhodes his wife, extends the glory of the Eratidae to encompass all of Rhodes, and links the three cities closely by making their eponymous founders three brothers, and their inhabitants of a common Argive origin. The two cults most prominently celebrated in *Olympian 7* are pan-Rhodian: that of Zeus Atabyrios, and that of Helios, who for Pindar is the principal deity of Rhodes, and who became the chief god of the new city of Rhodos, with his first priest an Ialysian. Helios’ refusal of an *anadasmus* is conspicuously aristocratic and so in line with the politics of the Diagorids⁴⁵.

The interpretations of the mythical and religious content of *Olympian 7* which will be advanced below differ to a large extent from those of Bresson 1979, both in their details and in their overall focuses of interest⁴⁶. But they continue to support Bresson’s political and historical conclusions.

⁴⁴ Bresson 1979, 156f.

⁴⁵ Bresson 1979, 19-21, cf. 24f., 33f.

⁴⁶ Bresson 1979, Chh. 1-6 handles the myths of *O. 7* with a different emphasis which includes, for example, much concern with the role of gold in Pindar, and he does so on the basis of different theoretical presuppositions. I have documented divergences from my own positions only sparingly; I note, however, that I do not share Bresson’s belief that Prometheus is actively involved in the context of the fireless sacrifice (Ch. 2), or his view of the help of Hephaestus (62)

3.1. The fireless sacrifices: pro-Rhodian and anti-Athenian aspects

The ‘fireless sacrifices’ to Athena are generally recognized as a cultic oddity within Greek religion, and their inclusion by Pindar in *Olympian* 7 is clearly intended to make a striking point. It is not immediately clear, however, what that point is. In 1993 Pavlos Sfyroeras proposed that Pindar intended to contrast the Rhodian rite implicitly with the torch race at the Athenian Panathenaea, a festival at which Diagoras had previously won a victory⁴⁷. Sfyroeras makes an attractive case for his hypothesis, noting that it has the advantage of introducing Hephaistos and Prometheus, the first of whom is certainly also present in *Olympian* 7, and the second of whom may be alluded to⁴⁸. Sfyroeras then asserts that the λάθα (45) which caused the Rhodian Heliadae to arrive at the summit of their acropolis without fire was a simple mishap: their fire went out on the way up. He cites in support of his view Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 292-294, where the old men climbing the acropolis of Athens with fire-pots sing:

ἀλλ’ ὅμως βαδιστέον,
καὶ τὸ πῦρ φυσητέον,
μὴ μ’ ἀποσβεσθὲν λάθῃ πρὸς τῇ τελευτῇ τῆς ὁδοῦ.

And he then claims that the verb λάθῃ at line 294 authorizes us to interpret Pindar’s noun λάθα as ‘failure to notice’ rather than ‘forgetfulness’ or ‘negligence’. Sfyroeras’ interpretation is not free of philological problems, and it introduces further, contextual difficulties. First, the sentence running from ἐπὶ τὸ φρενῶν (45-47) within which Pindar’s λάθας appears (it is quoted below) approximates to moralizing, and it seems excessively ponderous if the λάθα of the Heliadae was a mere mishap. Again, a Panathenaic competitor whose torch went out during the race lost the race, even if he finished first⁴⁹, whereas – and this will become clearer below – the Heliadae are conceived by Pindar as having won their race. Finally, the failure of

– which I rather see as trumping Attic claims since it pointedly negates the Athenian myth that Hephaestus attempted to rape Athena (on these myths, cf. L. Malten, *Hephaistos*, in *RE* VIII/1 [1912] 348f.), or Bresson’s different emphasis on the Telchines (64-71).

⁴⁷ Sfyroeras 1993, esp. 2-16; he admits that there are some contradictory features in ancient accounts of the torch race, and that some aspects of the race are unknown. *O.* 7,82 documents Diagoras’ Athenian victory.

⁴⁸ The argument of Sfyroeras 1993, 6 n. 27 that the phrase προμαθέος αἰδώς (*O.* 7,44) must for a Greek hearer or reader have conjured up Prometheus is worthy of consideration; nevertheless the phrase may constitute a shorthand example of what I have called in Section 3.3 ‘Suppression’ and ‘Overlay’.

⁴⁹ For the evidence, which includes Paus. I 30,2, cf. J. Jüthner, *Λαμπαδηδρομία*, in *RE* XII/1 (1924) 574-577. Sfyroeras 1993, 10 refers to this fact, but does not take account of its implications for his thesis.

the Heliadae to arrive at the summit with fire is not the only such ‘mistake’ in *Olympian* 7: there is also the killing of Likymnios by Tlepolemos, the founder of Rhodes, and the omission of Helios from the first territorial division among the gods. To reduce the Heliadae’s lack of fire to their torch going out on the way up the acropolis removes the fireless sacrifices from the category to which they obviously belong, namely the three ‘mistakes’ which are followed, in *Olympian* 7, not by punishment and ill-fortune for Rhodes and the Rhodians, but by their unexpected and conspicuous good fortune.

Apart from the difficulties inherent in Sfyroeras’ interpretation, there is available a more straightforward interpretation of the ‘fireless sacrifices’ myth which preserves its status as an egregious blunder, but which allows the myth to contribute to the greater glory of Rhodes. This interpretation emerges from a comparison of Pindar’s account with the two other versions of the myth which survive from antiquity (below), one of which (Diodorus Siculus) is anti-Athenian, as is Pindar’s version, and one of which (Philostratus) is pro-Athenian. These authors lived much later than Pindar, but, despite two verbal similarities between their accounts and that of Pindar⁵⁰, there is no reason to believe that either of them is derived from Pindar⁵¹. Rather they appear to represent two old and conflicting traditions which Pindar encountered, and between which Pindar chose. Pindar’s version is not only pro-Rhodian, but is so anti-Athenian as to rebut Athenian claims that Athens is the home of Athena. The texts are:

τότε καὶ φανσίμβροτος δαίμων Ὑπεριονίδας
μέλλον ἔντειλεν φυλάσασθαι χρέος
παισὶν φίλοις,
ὥς ἂν θεῶ πρώτοι κτίσαιεν
βωμὸν ἐναργέα, καὶ σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι
πατρί τε θυμὸν ἰάναι-
ἐν κόρῃ τ’ ἐγγχειβρόμῳ. ἐν δ’ ἀρετὰν
ἔβαλεν καὶ χάρματ’ ἀνθρώποισι προμαθέος αἰδώς·
ἐπὶ μὰν βαίνει τι καὶ λάθας ἀτέκμαρτα νέφος,
καὶ παρέλκει πραγμάτων ὀρθὰν ὁδόν
ἔξω φρενῶν.
καὶ τοὶ γὰρ αἰθοίσας ἔχοντες
σπέρμ’ ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὐ. τεῦξαν δ’ ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς

⁵⁰ I.e. (apart from the inevitable forms of θύω and its cognates found in all three) πρώτοι (Pind. and Diod. Sic.); θέμενοι (Pind.) / ἐπιθεῖναι (Diod. Sic.); λάθας (Pind.) / ἐπιλαθομένους (Diod. Sic.); νέφος and νεφέλαν (Pind.) / νεφέλην (Philostr.); ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς (Pind.) / ἄπυρα ἱερά (Philostr.).

⁵¹ Philostratus was aware that Pindar had written about Rhodian matters: cf. *Imag.* II 24,2, referring to a now lost Pindaric treatment of Theiodamas of Lindos (cf. fr. dub. 335,9 M.). But his account of the fireless sacrifices runs counter to that of Pindar without appearing to refer to it.

ἄλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει. κεί-
 νοισι μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν {Ζεὺς}
 πολὺν ὕσε χρυσόν· αὐτὰ δὲ σφισιν ὥπασε τέχνας
 πᾶσαν ἐπιχθονίων Γλαυκ-
 ῶπις ἀριστοπόνους χερσὶ κρατεῖν.
 ἔργα δὲ ζωῶσιν ἐρπόν-
 τεσσὶ θ' ὁμοῖα κέλευθοι φέρον·
 ἦν δὲ κλέος βαθύ. δαέντι δὲ καὶ σοφία
 μείζων ἄδολος τελέθει. (O. 7,39-53)

ἀνδρωθεῖσι δὲ τοῖς Ἡλιάδαις εἰπεῖν τὸν Ἥλιον <ὅτι> οἵτινες ἂν Ἀθηναῖοι
 θύσωσι πρῶτοι, παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἔξουσιν τὴν θεόν· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ λέγεται
 διασαφῆσαι τοῖς τὴν Ἀττικὴν κατοικοῦσι. διὸ καὶ φασι τοὺς μὲν Ἡλιάδας
 διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιλαθομένους ἐνεγκεῖν πῦρ ἐπιθεῖναι τότε τὰ θύματα,
 τὸν δὲ τότε βασιλεύοντα τῶν Ἀθηναίων Κέκροπα ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς θῦσαι
 ὕστερον. διόπερ φασι διαμένειν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τὸ κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν ἴδιον
 ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ, καὶ τὴν θεὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καθιδρῦσθαι (Diod. Sic. V 56,5-7)

καὶ θύσουσιν ἤδη τῇ Ἀθηναῖ δήμοι δύο ἐπὶ δυοῖν ἀκροπόλεων, Ἀθηναῖοι
 καὶ Ῥόδιοι, γῆ καὶ θαλάττῃ ... καὶ ἄνθρωποι γηγενεῖς, οἱ μὲν ἄπυρα
 ἱερὰ καὶ ἀτελῆ, ὁ δὲ Ἀθήνησι δήμος πῦρ ἐκεῖ καὶ κνίσαν ἱερῶν. ὁ
 καπνὸς δὲ οἶον εὐώδης γέγραπται καὶ μετὰ τῆς κνίσσης ἀναρρέων. ὅθεν
 ὡς παρὰ σοφωτέρους ἀφίκετο ἡ θεὸς καὶ θύσαντας εὖ, Ῥοδίοις δὲ λέγεται
 χρυσὸς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ρεῦσαι καὶ διαπλῆσαι σφῶν τὰς οἰκίας καὶ τοὺς
 στενωπούς νεφέλην εἰς αὐτοὺς ῥήξαντος τοῦ Διός, ὅτι κακεῖνοι τῆς
 Ἀθηναῖς ξυνῆκαν. (Philostr. Iun. *Imag.* II 27,3)

Diodorus' account, which derives from the second-century BC local historian, Zenon of Rhodes (cf. *FGrHist* 62 F 523)⁵², valuably states what Pindar's narrative merely hints at: in setting out to make their offerings the Heliadae were involved in a contest of priority with the Athenians for 'possession' of Athena; and Helios revealed the terms of the contest not only to his own children but also to the Athenians. Pindar's knowledge of these facts is reflected in his allusive use of πρῶτοι (42): compare the identical πρῶτοι of Diodorus V 56,5. Pindar's aims are revealed in the way he frames the rules of the contest so as to make it crystal clear that the Rhodians won. In his version the contest is not simply one of priority in making a sacrifice – for that would have raised the spectre of the Rhodians' offerings being disqualified as incomplete, as they clearly were in the tradition followed by Philostratus: contrast with Pindar's account the words of Philostratus: ἱερὰ ... ἀτελῆ (of the Rhodians sacrifice) and παρὰ σοφωτέρους ... καὶ θύσαντας εὖ (of

⁵² For the parallel role of a local historian in transmitting a tradition which Pindar had derived from cult, cf. Hubbard 1992, esp. 89.

the Athenians). Pindar copes with the objection that the Rhodians' did not complete their sacrificial rite by underlining their priority in erecting an altar and in laying a 'sacrifice' upon it: κτίσαιεν / βωμὸν ἐναργέα, καὶ σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι (42). Here θυσίαν tendentiously implies that this action constituted a completed sacrifice, and Pindar rapidly follows up this implication with τεῦξαν ... / ... ἄλσος (48f.), which further suggests that everything had been done properly in the sacral sphere. The version which Diodorus derived from Zenon was also clearly pro-Rhodian, although Diodorus/Zenon was perhaps less conscious than Pindar of the problems inherent in asserting a Rhodian victory, since he writes without qualification of the Rhodians «sacrificing» (θύσωσι, 5; κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν, 7) and then, without specifically mentioning the altar, he writes of their «placing the offerings on <it>». Diodorus/Zenon then notes that Cecrops subsequently sacrificed over fire and, on the ground of priority alone and without troubling himself about whether the Rhodians' actions genuinely constituted a sacrifice, he awards the palm to the Rhodians and locates Athena on Rhodes (διόπερ φασὶ ... τὴν θεὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καθιδρῦσθαι, 7). Like Pindar (λάθας, 45) Diodorus/Zenon emphasizes the Rhodians' 'forgetfulness' (διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιλαθομένους, 6). (This phrase, incidentally, is another powerful argument against Sfyroeras' interpretation of Pindar's λάθα.) But, unlike Pindar, Diodorus/Zenon feels the need to explain the 'forgetfulness' of the Rhodians, and so he advances their 'haste' or 'zeal' as an excuse.

Writing after Rhodes had emerged as a major power in the eastern Mediterranean, Diodorus/Zenon perhaps did not feel the need to deploy the sophistries which Pindar used to make the Rhodians emerge as victors. Pindar's devices extend beyond the verbal: Philostratus' pro-Athenian account reveals that the gold which Zeus showered upon the Rhodians was commonly regarded as a consolatory second prize in this contest. Pindar was obviously aware of that version: and this must be why he mentioned the shower of gold myth earlier in the ode, and retrojected it to the time of Athena's birth (34-38)⁵³. In this way, when the same shower of gold is mentioned again by Pindar immediately after the contest (49f.), the ode's hearers could understand this second account as a resumptive reference to the same (earlier) shower of gold⁵⁴, and in this way could avoid understanding the shower as a consolation prize. Then, as a precaution against any doubt that might be lingering in his audience's minds, Pindar follows up his renewed mention of the golden gift of Zeus with a longer account of Athena's blessings upon the island, which again confirms that the Rhodians won the contest, and with it Athena's presence and favor.

⁵³ Pindar's handling of this difficulty is paralleled by his treatment of Neoptolemus in *N.* 7 and of Pelops in *O.* 1.

⁵⁴ Bresson 1979, 132 n. 41 correctly rejects the view that there are two showers of gold. However, he believes that the first mention of the shower merely specifies the island to which Tlepolemos is to go. Presumably the shower of gold is somehow related to the worship of Zeus Hyetios (and of 'Hyetos') on Rhodes, for which cf. Morelli 1959, 52, 70f., 146f., 177.

3.2. A swarm of gods and heroes

Pindaric epinicia usually foreground cults and festivals, giving particular prominence to the major tutelary deities of the victor's city, and to panhellenic heroes associated with it. Often local gods and demigods feature strongly too. In this way the city both basks in the greater reflected glory of the Olympians and vaunts its individual identity through the prominence of its own more local protectors, who may, of course, like the higher gods and heroes, be shared with related or allied cities. *Olympian 7* certainly lives up to this description: Pindar's treatment of Zeus and Helios (and of their pan-Rhodian aspects in particular) has already been mentioned, and Athena's similar role will be discussed below. Moreover there is no lack of local heroes. Indeed the abundance of gods and heroes in *Olympian 7* raises the suspicion that Pindar is trying to achieve something in this ode which he does not attempt (because there is no need) in other epinicia, namely to include as many gods and heroes associated with Rhodes as are consonant with his political aims, and in this way to reinforce the pan-Rhodian impression given by his treatment of Zeus, Helios, and Athena. Of course some of the deities who appear in *Olympian 7*, Charis, Ouranos, and Gaia, none of whom are known to have received local cult on Rhodes, might be dismissed from the equation as mere narrative elements. But the ode still gives the firm impression that Pindar wanted the members of his pan-Rhodian audiences each to encounter his own local cult(s) in the ode⁵⁵. If this is correct, it would strengthen the notion that Pindar had either visited Rhodes, or had received painstaking descriptions of it from Diagoras or his entourage. However, it is not easy to establish that some of the gods and heroes mentioned in *Olympian 7* were worshipped on Rhodes in the mid-fifth century BC, since there is very little epigraphic evidence from that period and not enough archaeological evidence⁵⁶. But, if it is legitimate to place at least some reliance on later indications, then a plausible, if not compelling, pattern can be established.

Aphrodite (14)

Morelli 1959, 117 claims that the cult of Aphrodite had «scarsa importanza» for Rhodes. His testimonia (34f.) date from the third century BC on (none are from Ialysos), and he links the known Rhodian cult associations centering around Aphrodite with foreigners (117-118). Morelli's evidence is clear-cut, but his conclusions may be too sweeping. Lindos and Kameiros are better explored archaeologically than Ialysos, so the lack of information from Ialysos is unsurprising, and in fact this pattern repeats itself with other divinities. Moreover, later periods are far better

⁵⁵ For Rhodian cults and festivals in general, cf. esp. Morelli 1959.

⁵⁶ However, the recent and quite unexpected discovery of evidence for a cult of Kerkaphos, father of the three 'founders' of the Rhodian cities, at Ialysos (below n. 75) gives hope that this situation may change.

represented epigraphically in Rhodes, as elsewhere, than earlier. We may not, then, be able with confidence to deny Aphrodite a role in fifth-century Rhodes. Pindar's mention of her, her appearance at Diodorus V 55,6, and the later (third century BC) presence of a temple of Aphrodite in Rhodes town are all factors which argue for caution, especially since it seems that the new city was attempting to collect all the cults of Rhodes within its walls or nearby, rather as *Olympian 7* seems to be assembling (almost) all the Rhodian deities. This cult-assembly, both in *Olympian 7* and in Rhodes town, may have been a Diagorid concept.

Rhodos (14)

Morelli 1959, 67, 121f., 172f. documents from later inscriptions the cult(s) of the nymph Rhodos, of the deified and personified island of Rhodes, and of 'the damos of Rhodians'. He distinguishes (171f.) between the first two, perhaps unnecessarily. There is no evidence for cult of the nymph in the fifth century, but it is not impossible.

Helios (14, 39ff., 58ff., 70ff.)

The sun-god Helios (Doric 'Halios' on Rhodes) became the principal deity of the Rhodian state after the synoecism⁵⁷. This was undoubtedly due to the influence of the Diagorids. The earlier cult-site of Helios had been at Ialysos⁵⁸, and Helios may even have been the family god of the Eratidae, who may have had special priestly status or rights within his cult⁵⁹. The prominence of Helios in *Olympian 7* may well thus partly reflect his links with the Diagorids. Apart from *Olympian 7* the earliest attestation of the cult of Helios is a mid(?) fifth-century BC agonistic inscription from Rhodes on a bronze kalpis republished with a better reading by Alan Johnston⁶⁰: ἄθλον ἐγ' Ῥόδο παρ' Ἀλίο. Although the temptation is strong, Johnston judiciously abstained from making a direct link with Diagoras.

Herakles (22)

The Diagorids were Heraklids, and this is the primary reason for the divinised hero's presence in *Olympian 7*. The scholia on *Olympian 7* often mention Herakles in this connection, and they also link Herakles twice with Diagoras' victories at Olympia⁶¹; pos-

⁵⁷ Cf. Morelli 1959, 15-20, 94-99.

⁵⁸ Morelli 1959, 95-97, noting, however, that no traces of public cult prior to the synoecism have been found in any of the Rhodian cities, and proposing that Helios was the god of the Eratidae.

⁵⁹ Cf. Morelli 1959, 96; Diagoras II was priest of Helios in 399/398 BC, and another Diagorid held the post in the last quarter of the fourth century BC: cf. Bresson 1979, 155, 160 nn. 41, 44.

⁶⁰ Johnston 1977.

⁶¹ Drachmann 197 inscr. a ll. 4-7; 199 inscr. c ll. 7f.

sibly comparison was made at Olympia between the physiques of Diagoras and Herakles, which could be another reason for the presence of Herakles in *Olympian 7*. Finally Herakles' presence almost certainly also had a pan-Rhodian religious aspect. Morelli 1959, 53-56, 147-149 documents worship of Herakles on Rhodes from hellenistic evidence, with (again) nothing from Ialysos. But he declares (148) that the cult of Herakles on Rhodes was «molto antico» and that of Herakles Bouthoinas at Lindos «antichissimo». Of another report which circulated at Olympia and perhaps elsewhere Pindar discreetly says nothing. This was the notion that Diagoras, a man of great height and strength, was in fact the son of Hermes⁶². Hermes is, perhaps designedly, absent from *Olympian 7*, which instead stresses the continuity of the lineage of the Eratidae.

Zeus Atabyrios (23, 34, 43, 55ff., 61ff., 87ff.)

Zeus' frequent appearance throughout *Olympian 7* is emblematic of his importance on Rhodes, where he was worshipped under a number of cult-titles⁶³. But Pindar's final invocation of Zeus as the ruler of Atabyros (87-95) is particularly significant: the cult of Zeus Atabyrios is well documented⁶⁴, and it has been correctly described as having a «carattere panrodio»⁶⁵, although (yet again) it is not attested specifically for Ialysos. The physical location of Zeus-worship on Rhodes under the title Atabyrios also merits some emphasis⁶⁶. Mt Atabyros, where Zeus had a temple, is an impressive landmark, 1,215 metres high, partly heavily forested, often mist-covered and visible from afar. Although not comparable in height with, for example, the 2,916 metres of Mt Olympus in Thessaly, Mt Atabyros is significantly higher than any other point on Rhodes. It is, as Bresson again noted, on the boundary of Lindos and Kameiros⁶⁷, and it is within relatively easy reach of Ialysian territory. All three Rhodian *poleis* must have been strongly aware of the temple of Zeus on Mt Atabyros, and it may have been the center of a local amphictyony. Another temple of Zeus Atabyrios is recorded in the part-Rhodian colony of Acragas, founded from Gela with possible Lindian input; this transplantation of the name is significant evidence of the pan-Rhodian importance of the cult⁶⁸. Curiously, the only known Ἀταβυρίου Διὸς ἱερόν at the (later) Rhodes town seems not to have been a state temple but the meeting-place of an association of public slaves⁶⁹. Possibly the cult of Helios eventually eclipsed that of Zeus Atabyrios there.

⁶² Drachmann 196 inscr. a ll. 15-19; 199 inscr. c ll. 2-7.

⁶³ Morelli 1959, 45-52, 136-147.

⁶⁴ Morelli 1959, 46-49, 138-141.

⁶⁵ Morelli 1959, 140.

⁶⁶ For a discussion of the site, cf. «Clara Rhodos» I 88-91.

⁶⁷ Bresson 1979, 165. Verdenius 1987, 83 denies Bresson's clearly correct conclusion that, by mentioning Mt Atabyros, Pindar was endorsing the pan-Rhodian policy of the Eratidae.

⁶⁸ Morelli 1959, 140.

⁶⁹ Morelli 1959, 140f.

Apollo (31ff.)

The account in *Olympian 7* of how Delphic Apollo (mentioned only as ‘the god’) commanded Tlepolemos to found Rhodes is of course a ktistic commonplace. But for the Ialysian compatriots of Diagoras it must have had particular resonance, since the territory of Ialysos contained a very old and major Apollo temple of pan-Rhodian significance – that of Apollo Erethimios near modern Tholos⁷⁰.

Hephaestus (35)

The sole evidence for worship of Hephaestus on Rhodes is an early first-century BC inscription of a *koinon* which contained ‘Hephaestiai’ along with adherents of other deities and of men⁷¹. Morelli concluded that Hephaestus did not have public cult on Rhodes⁷². This conclusion might seem too sweeping, particularly given the paucity of evidence for many Rhodian cults. But, even if Hephaestus did have public cult on Rhodes, he was clearly not a major deity there, and this may be why he appears in *Olympian 7* as a narrative element only: he assists at the birth of Athena, who then usurps his role as the patron of artisans.

Athena (35ff., 50ff.)

Athena had a massive and very ancient cult presence in Rhodes, which included pre-hellenic elements⁷³. Her temples stood on each of the three ‘high places’, as later in Rhodos town too. The best known is, of course, the Lindos temple; but those on the summit of Kameiros and on the acropolis of Ialysos were equally preeminent in their territories. In each place Athena bore the *epiklesis* of the town; and in Ialysos and Kameiros, although apparently not in Lindos⁷⁴, she was worshipped as Polias. The prominence of Athena in *Olympian 7* is therefore another important pan-Rhodian element.

Moreover, the fact that Athena was omnipresent on Rhodes explains certain vaguenesses in Pindar’s story of the fireless sacrifices. Early in the ode (34ff.) Zeus showers gold on a «city» (πόλιν, 34) at the birth of Athena, but the identity of the city is not specified. Next (39ff.) Helios tells his children to sacrifice to Zeus and Athena; again the identity of these ‘dear’ or ‘own’ (41) children of Helios is left unclear. Then Pindar relates how these sons of Helios climbed up (ἀνέβαν, 48) and constructed an ἄλσος (48f.), *i.e.* a sacred space, ἐν ἀκροπόλει (49) for fireless sacrifices. But we are not told what acropolis they climbed or what temple (in

⁷⁰ «Clara Rhodos» II 77-116; its dimensions are 8,20m × 13,80m; cf. also Morelli 1959, 22f., 104f.

⁷¹ τὸ Ἀριστοβουλιαστῶν Σωτηριαστῶν Ἡφαιστιαστῶν Ἀγαθοδαιμονιαστῶν Μενεκρατείων τῶν σὺν Μενεκράτει κοινόν: cf. Morelli 1959, 56, 151-153.

⁷² Morelli 1959, 151.

⁷³ Morelli 1959, 2-13, 80-89.

⁷⁴ Morelli 1959, 80.

effect) they founded. This lack of specificity is, I believe, intentional: it would have allowed an inhabitant of any of the three cities of Rhodes to imagine that it was his city to which the myth referred. It could, of course, be counterargued that Pindar's ἄλλος (49) is an attempt at a 'pseudo-etymology' of 'Ialysos'. Such an etymology would be parallel to Pindar's 'derivation' in *Olympian* 6 of 'Iamos' (43) from ἰῶ (47) and it would be part of the Diagorid representation of their home town as the doyen of the three cities. If this etymology was indeed intended, then ἄλλος is a flattering wink to Diagoras' fellow-citizens of Ialysos. But the point remains that other Rhodians would still have been able to nurse their delusion that, not Ialysos, but their own city was meant. Similarly Pindar appears to be aiming at deliberate imprecision when it comes to the descendants of Helios. The three eponymous founders of the cities of Rhodes were actually Helios' grandchildren (70-74), not his children; and it was not they but their predecessors of one generation before, the seven sons of Helios, who made the fireless sacrifices. But none of the seven sons is named in *Olympian* 7, not even Kerkaphos, the father of the three founders, even though we now know that Kerkaphos received cult at Ialysos⁷⁵. Pindar seems to be exploiting the earlier ambivalence of παίσιν (41), and referring to Kerkaphos with the unobtrusive 'one' (73), so as to imply counter-factually that it was actually the three founders who made the fireless sacrifices. This would have been a compliment equally pleasing to the inhabitants of all three cities.

Lachesis (64)

A cult of the Μοῖραι is attested at Kameiros⁷⁶.

Tlepolemos (20ff., 77ff.)

Tlepolemos, whose bones were brought back from Troy and buried in Rhodes, had a Rhodian *heroon* and games were held there in his honour⁷⁷. Pindar's stress on the quasi-divine status of Tlepolemos naturally approximates him to Tlepolemos' ancestor Herakles, whose roles as Diagoras' ancestor and as founder of the Olympic Games are underlined by the scholia on *Olympian* 7 (above). In addition, by elevating Tlepolemos above the other heroes mentioned, the ode distinguishes clearly between the two *ktiseis* of Rhodes which it describes. Double foundations are not uncommon: the best known example is, of course, Rome, founded first by Aeneas and then much later by Romulus; but there are other, analogous, Greek cases too⁷⁸. The double foundation of Rhodes functions in part like the plethora of gods in the ode: it enriches the theological background and involves all Rhodians, each through the founder of his own city or through a Heraklid ancestor. But in part too the double

⁷⁵ Cf. «Arch. Delt.» XLVI (1991) B2. *Chron.* 484.

⁷⁶ Morelli 1959, 61, 162.

⁷⁷ Morelli 1959, 69f., 175f.

⁷⁸ Cf. Cairns 1979, 71-73.

foundation is designed to conceal, in typical Pindaric fashion, an even less creditable ‘foundation’ of Rhodes, i.e. by the Telchines (on whom see below). Tlepolemos offered Pindar yet another advantage: tradition held that he had ruled «all the Rhodians»⁷⁹, a further useful contribution to *Olympian 7*’s pan-Rhodian program.

3.3. Pindar’s further manipulations of myth

Pindar’s mythology can, of course, legitimately be studied from an anthropological and/or mythographical standpoint, and in order to discover what it can contribute to the history of cult. But Pindar was not a naïve reporter of received tradition but a sophisticated commissioned poet who was willing and able to distort and remodel traditional myths (i.e. to make ‘discoveries’ about them) in the service of his patrons. His methods, well-known enough to be set forth without cumbersome apparatus, are fourfold, and are often employed in various combinations: they are ‘Suppression’, ‘Denial’, ‘Overlay’, and ‘Anticipation’. Suppression can be exemplified uncontroversially from *Olympian 7*: the descent of Diagoras from Aristomenes of Messene might have been expected to provide an encomiastic topic in a poem celebrating Diagoras. But Pindar fails to mention Aristomenes in *Olympian 7* for contemporary political reasons⁸⁰: at this time the Messenians were in revolt against Sparta, the ally of the Diagorids, and were being aided by Athens, the Diagorids’ enemy. Similarly, as already noted, the absence of Hermes from *Olympian 7* was designed to avoid suggesting the idea that Diagoras was not his human father’s son.

Denial and Overlay in combination can be illustrated economically from *Olympian 1*, where Pindar’s celebrated generalising rejection of the myth that Pelops’ shoulder was gnawed by Demeter («I cannot call one of the gods a glutton», 52) is preceded by an alternative version (25ff.) which incorporates enough of the elements of the rejected version to account for the existence of the latter. Overlay, with an implication of Denial, has already been seen in *Olympian 7* (above Section 2) in Pindar’s version of the fireless sacrifice myth: this not only contradicts the pro-Athenian version but overlays the idea found in it that the shower of gold was a consolation prize. Anticipation is a subtler technique which is easily missed. It can be illustrated from *Nemean 7*. Two versions of Neoptolemus’ visit to Delphi (where he was killed) brought him there with hostile intentions. So in *Nemean 7* Pindar adopted a third version in which Neoptolemus has no such hostile intent. However, this third version contained a potentially troublesome concept: it explained that Neoptolemus was intending to ask the Delphic oracle how he might have children, having had none by Hermione. This element would, of course, have

⁷⁹ Diod. Sic. IV 58,8; V 59,6.

⁸⁰ So Bresson 1979, 151.

undermined the legitimacy of the Molossian ruling house of Pindar's day, which claimed descent from Neoptolemus. So Pindar practices Anticipation here by declaring in advance of his account of Neoptolemus' visit (39f.) that Neoptolemus' descendants have ruled in Molossia to this day, in this way anticipating and so excluding the undesirable element⁸¹.

Several mythico/historical aspects of *Olympian 7* besides the fireless sacrifices may be explicable in such terms, especially as the results of Suppression and/or Overlay. Notably, Pindar is silent about a number of other mythical and historical matters (apart, that is, from Aristomenes and Hermes) which are associated with Rhodes by other writers. We cannot, of course, be certain that these omissions are all deliberate, since Pindar could have been unaware of some myths found in later sources, or thought them irrelevant. But Pindar's silences are suspicious, and possible reasons for them could be supplied as follows:

1) The Heliadae are 'earth-born' in other sources (Diod. Sic. V 56,3; Philostr. *Im.* II 27,3), *i.e.* autochthonous. This element might have been suppressed by Pindar because it could have suggested that Tlepolemus and his followers were (later) interlopers in Rhodes.

2) One of the Heliadae, Tenages, was murdered by some of his Heliad brothers (Diod. Sic. V 57,2), after which the guilty parties emigrated from Rhodes. Pindar says nothing about this: it may be that, since he does relate the killing of Likymnios by Tlepolemos, he felt that a second murder might suggest a discreditable pattern⁸². A further undesirable element in Tenages' murder was that his brothers killed him διὰ φθόρον. This too may have discouraged Pindar from mentioning the murder, since it could have approximated the Heliadae too closely to the 'envious' Telchines, who are 'overlaid' by Pindar (see below 5).

3) Some Heliads who were innocent of Tenages' murder did not emigrate from Rhodes but settled in the territory of Ialysos and founded the city of 'Achaëa' there (Diod. Sic. V 57,6). Pindar does not relate this event: it would have contradicted the foundation legend of Ialysos.

4) Danaus (an Egyptian) founded the Athena Lindia temple, Cadmus (a Phoenician) founded a Poseidon temple on Rhodes and dedicated offerings at Lindos; Cadmus' Phoenicians intermarried with the Ialysians and provided their priestly class (Diod. Sic. V 58); later Althaimenes (a Cretan) came and lived in Kameiros and founded the temple of Zeus Atabyrios on its border (Diod. Sic. V 59). None of these myths appear in *Olympian 7*. Doubtless in Pindar's eyes these 'foreign interlopers' would have confused the Dorian record on Rhodes.

5) A major example of Overlay which has sometimes been misunderstood can be added before a final piece of Suppression is discussed. At lines 50-53 Pindar

⁸¹ Cf. Howie 1998, esp. 107-109 and n. 133.

⁸² Defradas 1974, 39-43 usefully shows how, even within the limits of the mythical narrative, Pindar contrives to whitewash Tlepolemos.

relates how Athena conferred every skill (τέχναν, 50) on the Heliadae after their fireless sacrifice so that they excelled in artistic work and their streets were full of statuary. Pindar is acknowledging the artistic achievements of the Rhodians, which in fact continued throughout the hellenistic and Roman periods. He ends: δαέντι δὲ καὶ σοφία μείζων ἄδολος τελέθει (53). There can be no doubt that Pindar has at the back of his mind the Telchines⁸³, those mythical craftsmen and first settlers of Rhodes, who had a bad reputation for, among other things, envy and the black arts⁸⁴. But Pindar systematically ‘overlays’ the Telchines by attributing their craft skills to the Heliadae and by ascribing to the Heliadae σοφία ... ἄδολος. Pindar is alluding here to another standard characteristic of the Telchines: δόλος. Nonnus, whose familiarity with earlier literature has increasingly been recognised⁸⁵, wrote thus about personified Envy:

καὶ Φθόνος ὅξυς ὄρουσε, καὶ ἀγκύλα γούνατα πάλλων
 ἦτε λοξὰ κέλευθα, δι’ ἡέρος· ἀνδρομέοις δὲ
 ὄμμασι καὶ πραπίδεσσιν ὁμοίως ἔσσυτο καπνῶ
 εἰς δόλον, εἰς κακότητα νόον τελχῖνα κορύσσων (D. VII 105-108)

Pindar, then, disassociates δόλος from the Heliadae because it was diagnostic of the Telchines. His technique here resembles his simultaneous reference to, and rejection of, divine cannibalism in *Olympian* 1 (above). Pindar’s Suppression / Overlay of the Telchines goes hand in hand with his suppression of the Tenages myth with its envy element (above), and with his masking of the Telchine association of Zeus Atabyrios. The name Atabyrios on one account was derived from that of a Telchine⁸⁶, but there is no hint of this in *Olympian* 7; Suppression / Overlay of this association too may be suspected. The elimination of the Telchines has, of course, more general motives: their linkage with envy in particular made them alien to the ethics of athleticism which inform Pindar’s epinikia; and from a Rhodian viewpoint, since the Telchines were the first inhabitants of Rhodes⁸⁷, they could have been construed as archetypal Rhodians by the malicious-minded⁸⁸.

⁸³ This does not imply agreement with Verdenius 1987, 57, 71 on l. 52 and Lehnus 1981, 122 on ll. 50-53, who believe that Pindar is identifying the Heliadae with the Telchines.

⁸⁴ The epithet ‘Telchinia’ is sometimes found applied to Athena, Apollo, Hera, and the Nymphs: cf. Diod. Sic. V 55,2; Morelli 1959, 53. Whatever its origins, this epithet was presumably thought from the fifth century on to refer to statues of these deities made by the craftsmen Telchines.

⁸⁵ Cf. Hollis 1976.

⁸⁶ Steph. Byz. p. 145 Mein. s.v. Ἀτάβυρον.

⁸⁷ Cf. H. Herter, *Telchinen*, in *RE* V/A1 (1934) 206f.

⁸⁸ Pindar’s reiterated emphasis on the shower of gold sent by Zeus may suppress/overlay another aspect of the Telchines: they were alleged to have the power to call up at will νέφη τε καὶ ὄμβρους καὶ χαλάζας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ χιόνα ἐφέλκεσθαι (Diod. Sic. V 55,3).

7) Poseidon (Ποσειδᾶν) was widely worshipped on Rhodes⁸⁹, and Poseidon played a major role in the foundation myths of Rhodes. And yet he is never mentioned in *Olympian* 7 – this is its most glaring mythical Suppression. The sea does appear frequently (at 13, 18f., 32f., 56, 61f., 69f.) and this possibly constitutes Overlay. What could lie behind this anomaly? Very speculatively a clan or city motive might be hypothesized: a *genos* or faction rivalling the Eratidae perhaps used the cult of Poseidon as its focus, just as the Eratidae seem to have been Helios worshippers. This hypothesis might find support in line 71 if Poseidon Hippios, who had a popular cult on Rhodes, especially at Lindos⁹⁰, is being ‘overlaid’ there in the phrase πῦρ πνεόντων ὀρχὸς ἵππων applied to Helios. Did the rival group perhaps worship Poseidon Hippios?

Whether or not this speculation is plausible, Pindar must also have had a more strategic reason for suppressing and overlaying Poseidon. Poseidon was probably too closely connected with the Telchines to be a comfortable element in *Olympian* 7. Diodorus Siculus V 55 narrates that the Telchines were the children of Thalatta and that they shared with the daughter of Ocean the task of rearing Poseidon. Later Poseidon became the father of the nymph Rhodos by the Telchines’ sister, Halia. His male children by Halia offended Aphrodite, who caused them to commit incest with their mother, upon which Poseidon buried them in the earth, and Halia threw herself into the sea and became Leucothea. Such unseemly events and associations may have made it difficult for Pindar to feature Poseidon; yet another good (lateral) reason for ignoring him could have been Pindar’s consciousness that in Attica Poseidon had vied with Athena for possession of the land (E. Wüsth, *Poseidon*, in *RE* XXII/1 [1953] 460f.)⁹¹.

3.4. The contemporary significance of the myths

The eponymous hero-founders of the three cities, the brothers Ialysos, Kameiros, and Lindos, are forgetful and do not take fire to the acropolis. The scholia tell us that the Rhodians still made fireless sacrifices; hence this is a piece of aetiology, much at home therefore in a *ktisis*. But it is more: as noted, this ‘misfortune’ is one of three in *Olympian* 7. It goes along with Tlepolemus’ loss of self-control and killing of a relative, and the accidental omission of Helios from the first division of territories among the gods. In all three cases the error does not lead to disaster but everything turns out well through divine action. Athena gives the Rhodians

⁸⁹ Morelli 1959, 63-66, 167-169: «il culto di Poseidone è molto diffuso a Rodi ed è certamente molto antico» (167).

⁹⁰ Cf. Morelli 1959, 64f., 168f.

⁹¹ The contest in εὐτεχνία between Poseidon, Athena, and Hephaestus narrated at Lucian. *Hermot.* 20 is presumably yet another variant of this story-type.

craft-skills after the fireless sacrifices, Apollo directs the murderer Tlepolemus to found Rhodes, and, when Rhodes emerges from the sea, Helios takes the island as his favoured possession and both parties are blessed in their relationship. Why does Pindar stress this theme so insistently?

A Bundyian explanation in terms of Pindar's strategies of praise, use of foils, and strategies for phthonos-avoidance would not fit the three 'mistakes' of *Olympian* 7: the errors cannot be foils to the unalloyed success of Diagoras and his family because their results are fortunate; nor, for the same reason, can they be a means of deflecting envy from the victor or his island. All three stories show the gods caring so much for Rhodes and the Rhodians that errors associated with Rhodes are compensated; hence the tales constitute encomium of the good fortune of Rhodes and of the Rhodians. But the question still remains why the 'mistakes' are an essential element in the forward progress of Rhodes. The fact that there are three mistakes makes the question even more insistent. If there had been one mistake, Tlepolemos' killing of a relative, it could have been explained as a typical ktistic element giving verisimilitude to a charter myth⁹². But three errors are too many to pass over without further explanation, even in a *ktisis*.

Bresson explained the errors as occurring because men are not in control of their own actions⁹³. That does not help. On the other hand, if we look for an explanation in the personal life of Diagoras up to 464, nothing concrete comes to mind. I suggest therefore that we look to the recent history of Rhodes for illumination. What near-contemporary mistakes or misjudgements by the cities of Rhodes might be the subject of Pindaric allusion? Inevitably the Persian Wars and their aftermath suggest themselves. But the 'mistake' on the part of Rhodes to which *Olympian* 7 alludes will not, I believe, have been her medism. As aristocrats the Diagorids will undoubtedly have been pro-Persian, possibly, but not necessarily, after initial resistance. The Rhodian 'mistake' will rather have been the island's subsequent accession under pressure to the Delian League and an accompanying move to 'democracy'. In this case, what will the fortunate outcome of this mistake be? I can only surmise that Pindar is hinting that, after its error, i.e. after joining the Delian League, Rhodes could now recover its independence through revolt from Athens. This hypothesis is not unproblematic. In this period the cities of the eastern Aegean had seen the Athenian fleet on its way to victory at the Eurymedon and they knew of the fate of Naxos⁹⁴. They were also aware that Thasos was currently under siege. The perspective of hindsight shows Thasos falling and Athens about to begin

⁹² The best known instance is Romulus' killing of his brother Remus during the foundation of Rome. Cf. also Bresson 1986 on the parallel legends of Althaimenes and other founders who either killed or broke off relations with family members.

⁹³ Bresson 1979, 136.

⁹⁴ Cf. Bresson 1979, 153. For the dates of the events mentioned in this paragraph, see now Hornblower on Thuc. I 100f.

aggressive expansion on various fronts, including ambitious projects in Cyprus and Egypt. But in 464 things must have looked very different: if the ‘Peace of Kallias’ was made in 465, many allied cities might have felt that the justification for the Delian League no longer existed and so have begun to contemplate defection. Moreover, with Athens embroiled in the long, difficult, and expensive siege of Thasos, Rhodians meditating on their own strong naval resources might well have been wondering whether the hour for revolt had come, particularly if there was really some prospect that Sparta might be interested in opposing Athens⁹⁵. So it is by no means impossible that such action was being urged on Rhodes at this time by the Diagorids; and indeed the last two lines of the ode do appear to be saying strongly that «it is ‘time for a change’». That no Rhodian revolt took place may be due to the fall of Thasos.

If the Diagorids were agitating in 464 BC for a concerted revolt by the Rhodian cities, then another feature of the ode should also be seen as a having political implications, since it complements and extends *Olympian 7*’s pan-Rhodian thrust. Pindar is greatly concerned at the end of *Olympian 7* (87-95), in the invocation of Zeus Atabyrios and in what follows, to involve the entire Rhodian population (and indeed others) in the victorious career and achievements of Diagoras.

.... ἀλλ’ ὦ
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, νότοισιν Ἀταβυρίου
 μεδέων, τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν,
 ἄνδρα τε πύξ ἀρετὰν εὐ-
 ρόντα. δίδοι τέ οἱ αἰδοίαν χάριν
 καὶ ποτ’ ἀστῶν καὶ ποτὶ ξεί-
 νων. ἐπεὶ ὕβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδόν
 εὐθυπορεῖ, σάφα δαεῖς ἅ τε οἱ πατέρων
 ὀρθαὶ φρένες ἐξ ἀγαθῶν
 ἔχρεον. μὴ κρύπτε κοινόν
 σπέρμ’ ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος·
 Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει
 θαλίας καὶ πόλιν· ἐν δὲ μιᾷ μοίρᾳ χρόνου
 ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλοιαι διαιθύσσοισιν αὖραι.

90
95

The notions that a victor brings glory to his whole city and that the whole city joins in the ensuing rejoicing and celebration run throughout epinician poetry; but Pindar seems to be going out of his way to emphasise them here, and the well-recognized

⁹⁵ Thucydides relates that, when initiating their defection, the Thasians asked the Spartans to help them by invading Attica, and that the Spartans would have done so had not their helots and some *perioikoi* revolted (I 101); doubts have, however, been expressed about this account: cf. Hornblower, *ad l.*

verbal ring-composition of the ode, which relates this passage to the beginning of *Olympian* 7, gives additional prominence to the final themes of the ode, implying that they are the logical conclusions to which *Olympian* 7 has come. The final themes thus embrace ξυνόν in 21 and κοινόν in 93 – albeit with different referents – along with emphasis on the city (which, as everything in the ode shows, is the whole island of Rhodes, not just Ialysos)⁹⁶ in ἀστών (90) and πόλις (94).

It looks, then, as though in 464 BC the Diagorids were seeking to present a political program which was not merely pan-Rhodian but which also cut across class-divisions within the cities of Rhodes. The same message would come across in ἐπεὶ ὕβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδὸν / εὐθυπορεῖ (90f.) in combination with αἰδοίαν χάριν (89). If such a one-nation message is present, the aristocratic Diagorids were using *Olympian* 7 to help woo the normally pro-Athenian democrats over to their opinion and so create national unity against the oppressor city, Athens. The three ‘mistake’ stories would have had a multiple appeal in such a political context: in each case the error was in part the result of diminished responsibility; and in each case the outcome was an improvement in the fortunes of Rhodes and the Rhodians. Under the political circumstances envisaged these would have been powerful arguments in 464 BC. If the mistake of the Rhodians, especially of the Rhodian ‘democrats’, was indeed to go along with the enrolment of the Rhodian cities in the Delian League, then this was certainly done at least in part under duress. Hence the myths of past Rhodian mistakes made with diminished responsibility would have been a tactful way of attempting to persuade the Rhodian democrats to change their minds about supporting the Athenians. The large dose of pan-Rhodian nationalism in *Olympian* 7 will have been a good stiffener to such persuasion, particularly since it will have cut across class divisions. As for the excellent outcomes of the past Rhodian mistakes, these will have suggested that revolt from Athens by a unified Rhodes would return Rhodes to the same state of divine favor and prosperity which followed those earlier mistakes.

The Rhodians did not revolt from Athens in 464, and Rhodes had to wait half a century for her independence and unification under the Diagorids. But, if the interpretations advanced in this paper are acceptable, Rhodes and the Diagorids were already on this path of rebellion and reunification well before the middle of the fifth century.

The Florida State University
Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge

FRANCIS CAIRNS

⁹⁶ The fact that *O.* 7 was inscribed, not at Ialysos but in the temple of Athena Lindia, is another, objective indication of the ode’s character; on the pan-Rhodian role of this temple before the synoecism, cf. Morelli 1959, 82.

Addendum

This paper was already complete when S. Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*, Oxford 2004, appeared in January 2005. The portions of this work treating *Olympian 7* and Rhodes (esp. 131-145, cf. also *General Index s.vv. Diagoras, Dorieus, Rhodes*) offer useful historical discussions, as well as helpful emphasis on the communal nature of Diagoras' victory and the political thrust of the ode.

Bibliography

Pindar bibliographies

- Thummer 1958, 1966, 1974, 1982 = E. Th., *Pindaros*, «Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft» XI (1958) 65-88; XIX (1966) 289-322; XXVII (1974) 1-34; XXXV (1982) 129-164.
 Bernardini 1966 = P.A. B., *Rassegna critica delle edizioni, traduzioni e studi pindarici dal 1958 al 1964* (1965), «QUCC» II (1966) 136-193.
 Gerber 1969 = D.E. G., *A Bibliography of Pindar 1513-1966*, Cleveland 1969.
 Rico 1969 = M. R., *Ensayo de bibliografía pindarica*, Madrid 1969.
 Fogelmark 1976 = S. F., *Pindaric bibliography*, «Eranos» LXXIV (1976) 69-102.
 Gerber 1976 = D.E. G., *Studies in Greek lyric poetry: 1967-1975*, «CW» LXX (1976) 132-157.
 Gerber 1988 = D.E. G., *Studies in Greek lyric poetry: 1975-1985*, «CW» LXXXI (1988) 439-479.
 Gerber 1989, 1990 = D.E. G., *Pindar and Bacchylides 1934-1987*, «Lustrum» XXXI (1989) 97-269; XXXII (1990) 7-292.

Other works cited

- Accame 1938 = S. A., *Un nuovo decreto di Lindo del V Sec. A.C.*, «Clara Rhodos» IX (1938) 211-229.
 Bernardini 1983 = P.A. B., *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro: la Nemea 4, l'Olimpica 9, l'Olimpica 7*, Roma 1983.
 Berthold 1980 = R.M. B., *Fourth century Rhodes*, «Historia» XXIX (1980) 32-49.
 Blinkenberg 1913 = Chr. B., *ΠΟΔΟΥ ΚΤΙΣΤΑΙ*, «Hermes» XLVIII (1913) 236-249.
 Braswell 1976 = B.K. B., *Notes on the prooemium to Pindar's seventh Olympian Ode*, «Mnemosyne» XXIX (1976) 233-242.
 Bresson 1979 = A. B., *Mythe et contradiction. Analyse de la VII^e Olympique de Pindare*, Paris 1979.
 Bresson 1986 = A. B., *Deux légendes rhodiennes*, in *Les Grandes figures religieuses. Fonctionnement pratique et symbolique dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1986, 411-421.
 Bundy 1962a = E.L. B., *Studia Pindarica I. The Eleventh Olympian Ode*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1962.
 Bundy 1962b = E.L. B., *Studia Pindarica II. The First Isthmian Ode*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1962.

- Burn 1984 = A.R. B., *Persia and the Greeks, the Defence of the West, c. 546-478 B.C.*, London 1984².
- Cairns 1976 = F. C., *The Distaff of Theugenis – Theocritus Idyll 28*, «PLLS» I (1976) 293-305.
- Cairns 1979 = F. C., *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979.
- «Clara Rhodos» = «Clara Rhodos; studi e materiali pubblicata a cura dell'Istituto Storico-archeologico di Rodi», Rhodes 1928-1941.
- Craik 1980 = E.M. C., *The Dorian Aegean*, London-Boston-Henley 1980.
- David 1986 = E. D., *The Diagoreans and the defection of Rhodes from Athens in 411 B.C.*, «Eranos» LXXXIV (1986) 157-164.
- Defradas 1974 = J. D., *ΔΙΟΡΘΩΣΑΙ ΛΟΓΟΝ: la septième Olympique*, in *Serta Turyniana*. «Studies in Greek literature and palaeography in honor of Alexander Turyn», edd. A. Turyn, J.L. Heller, J.K. Newman, Urbana 1974, 34-50.
- Drachmann = A.B. D., *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, I. *Scholia in Olympionicas*, Leipzig 1903.
- Frost 1980 = F.J. F., *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary*, Princeton, N.J. 1980.
- Gerber 2003 = D.E. G., Review of Retter 2002, «CR» LIII (2003) 9f.
- Higbie 2003 = C. H., *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past*, Oxford-New York 2003.
- Howie 1998 = J.G. H., *Thucydides and Pindar: the Archaeology and Nemean 7*, «PLLS» X (1998) 75-130.
- Hubbard 1990 = T.K. H., *Envy and the invisible roar: Pindar, Pythian 11.30*, «GRBS» XXXI (1990) 343-351.
- Hubbard 1992 = T.K. H., *Remaking myth and rewriting history: cult tradition in Pindar's Ninth Nemean*, «HSPH» XCIV (1992) 77-111.
- Johnston 1977 = A.W. J., *Rhodes, sunny side up*, «ZPE» XXVI (1977) 157f.
- Kirkwood 1982 = G. K., *Selections from Pindar*, ed. with an introd. and comm., Chico, CA 1982.
- Kurke 1991 = L. K., *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca and London 1991.
- Krummen 1990 = E. K., *Pysros Hymnon: festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*, Berlin 1990.
- Lehnus 1981 = L. L., *Pindaro. Olimpiche*, Trad., comm., note e lettura crit., Milano 1981.
- Luraghi 1998 = N. L., *Crollo della democrazia o sollevazione anti-oligarchica? Siracusa e Rodi in Aristotele, Politica 5,1302B25-33*, «Hermes» CXXVI (1998) 117-123.
- Maehler 1982, 1997 = H. M., *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, I-II, Leiden 1982, 1997.
- Morelli 1959 = D. M., *I culti in Rodi*, Pisa 1959.
- Olympia* V = W. Dittenberger-K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia (= Olympia*, edd. E. Curtius-F. Adler, V), Berlin 1896.
- Parker 1997 = V. P., *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frühgriechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart 1997.
- Pfeijffer 1995a = I.L. Pf., *Pindar's Eighth Pythian: the relevance of the historical setting*, «Hermes» CXXIII (1995) 156-165.
- Pfeijffer 1995b = I.L. Pf., *The date of Pindar's Fifth Nemean and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode*, «CQ» XLV (1995) 318-332.

- Pfeijffer 1996 = I.L. Pf., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII*, Diss. Leiden 1996.
- Pfeijffer 1999 = I.L. Pf., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII*, Leiden 1999 (revised version of Pfeijffer 1996).
- Podlecki 1975 = A.J. P., *The Life of Themistocles. A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence*, Montreal-London 1975.
- Pouilloux 1970 = J. P., *Callianax, gendre de Diagoras de Rhodes. A propos de la VII^e Olympique de Pindare*, «RPh» XLIV (1970) 206-214.
- Race 1997 = W.H. R. (ed. and tr.), *Pindar. I. Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1997.
- Retter 2002 = A. R., *Das Prooimion von Pindars siebter Olympischer Ode. Versuch einer integrierenden Lösung von Bezugsproblemen*, Innsbruck 2002.
- Rubin 1980 = N.F. R., *Olympian 7: the toast and the future prayer*, «Hermes» CVIII (1980) 248-252.
- Schürch 1971 = P. Sch., *Zur Wortresponson bei Pindar*, Bern-Frankfurt 1971.
- Sfyrroeras 1993 = P. S., *Fireless sacrifices: Pindar's Olympian 7 and the Panathenaic Festival*, «AJPh» CXIV (1993) 1-26.
- Sullivan 1982 = S.D. S., *A strand of thought in Pindar, Olympians 7*, «TAPhA» CXII (1982) 215-223.
- Verdenius 1972 = W.J. V., *Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode. A Commentary*, Amsterdam-London 1972.
- Verdenius 1976 = W.J. V., *Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode. Supplementary Comments*, «Mnemosyne» XXIX (1976) 243-253.
- Verdenius 1987 = W.J. V., *Commentaries on Pindar. I. Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14*, Leiden 1987.
- Vian 1974 = F. V., Review of Verdenius 1972, «RPh» XLVIII (1974) 334f.
- West 1966 = M.L. W., *Hesiod. Theogony*, ed. with proleg. and comm., Oxford 1966.
- West 1997 = M.L. W., *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 1997.
- Willcock 1995 = M.M. W., *Pindar. Victory Odes. Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*, Cambridge 1995.
- Young 1968 = D.C. Y., *Three Odes of Pindar: a Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*, Leiden 1968.