

ALMUT FRIES

Pindar, Hieron and the Persian Wars History and Poetic Competition in Pythian 1, 71 – 80*

Summary – In Pi. Pyth. 1, 71–80 the battles of Himera and Kyme, in which the Deinomenid rulers of Syracuse defeated the Carthaginians and Etruscans in 480 and 474 BC, are equated with the battles of Salamis and Plataea. In particular, the idea of a supreme effort for preserving Greek freedom, frequent in contemporary poetic celebrations of the Persian Wars, is transferred to the western conflicts. This paper reviews the textual evidence and argues that Pi. Pyth. 1, 71–80 perhaps specifically recalls Aeschylus' description of Salamis in Persai (353–432) and the praise of the Spartans in Simonides' Plataea Elegy (fr. 11 + 13 IEG²). Pindar's ostensible aim of raising Hieron's pan-Hellenic profile therefore acquires a second dimension: the Deinomenids not only achieved military successes equivalent to those of the mainland Greeks, but they also deserve to be praised on the same literary terms.

1. Introduction

Pindar's Pythian 1, which celebrates Hieron of Syracuse for his victory in the Delphic chariot race of 470 BC and his re-foundation of Katane (modern Catania) as the city of Aitna in 476/5, acquired almost instant recognition for its artistic qualities and justly now counts as one of the greatest surviving Greek lyric poems.¹ But it is also a priceless historical document because by placing Hieron's athletic triumph in the wider context of his martial and socio-political exploits (and those of his family, the Deinomenids) it provides a unique perspective on the events that affected Greek Sicily and Southern Italy between the years 480 and 470. Therefore Pythian 1 requires a line of interpretation which combines literary and philological sensitivity

* This article goes back to a paper given at the 147th Annual Meeting of the SCS (formerly APA) in San Francisco, 6–9 January 2016. I am grateful to Simon Hornblower for valuable comments on matters of history, to Christopher Collard for improving the written presentation, and to Angus Bowie for further refinements and much-needed encouragement. The two anonymous referees for Wiener Studien also have my thanks for their judicious assessment.

¹ Pythian 1 was one of best-known Pindaric poems already in antiquity, especially for its semi-mythical account of the eruption of Etna in 479 or 475 BC (Pi. Pyth. 1, 15–28), adapted first in [A.] PV 351–372. For Favorinus (*apud* Gell. 17, 10 ~ Macr. 5, 17; 7, 14), Virgil's description of Etna erupting (Aen. 3, 570–577) falls short of Pindar.

with constant attentiveness to its historical background – without descending into the severe historicism that has rightly been rejected for decades.

One passage that benefits especially from this approach is *Pyth.* 1, 71–80, where the battles of Himera and Kyme, in which Sicilian forces defeated the Carthaginians and Etruscans, are set on a level with the battles of Salamis and Plataea. As has long been recognised, Pindar's purpose here was to raise Hieron's pan-Hellenic reputation by implicitly equating the western power struggles with the historic victories of the mainland Greeks. A closer look, however, reveals a further dimension. It seems that Pindar strove to underpin this claim by competing on a literary level with the great poetic celebrations of the Persian Wars by Aeschylus and Simonides. The reason why this has escaped notice so far is probably our perennial problem in dealing with early Greek poetry: its fragmentary nature. Aeschylus' *Persai* survives intact, but significant portions of Simonides' *Plataea Elegy* were published only in 1992 (by Peter Parsons and Martin West simultaneously),² and we possess virtually nothing of his elegiac and/or lyric tributes to the battles of Salamis and Artemision.³ Nevertheless I believe that, with due caution, a case can be built now for a relationship between Pindar, Aeschylus and Simonides in *Pythian* 1, which may not be strictly 'intertextual' or 'allusive', but goes beyond the shared use of contemporary poetic *topoi*.⁴

2. Historical Background

In 480 BC the combined forces of Theron of Akragas and Gelon of Syracuse (Hieron's elder brother) defeated the Carthaginians near the northern Sicilian town of Himera, when its tyrant, Terillos, had invoked the help of his guest-friend Hamilkar against Theron's preceding aggressions. Gelon died in 478, two years after the victory from which he had gained much in prestige

² P. J. Parsons et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LIX, London 1992, 4–50 (P. Oxy. 3965); M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* II, Oxford ²1992, 118–122 (Simon. fr. 10–18 IEG²).

³ 'Salamis Elegy': Simon. fr. 5 (+ 6–9?) IEG²; 'Artemision Elegy': Simon. fr. 1–4 IEG². The rather confused *Suda* entry on Simonides (σ 439 Adler) also mentions a melic poem on the battle of Salamis, and we have two (partial?) lines from a melic poem on the battle of Artemision (PMG 533). Cf. West, *Simonides Redivivus*, ZPE 98 (1993), 2/3 = *Hellenica*. Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. II: Lyric and Drama, Oxford 2013, 112/113.

⁴ In what follows I quote Pindar from Snell-Maehler (*Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* I. *Epinicia*, Stuttgart-Leipzig ⁸1987) and Aeschylus from West (*Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Stuttgart-Leipzig ²1998). Editions used for the fragmentary texts are incorporated in the references. Unattributed translations are my own.

and wealth, and Syracuse passed to Hieron, who had also fought at Himera and now did his best to consolidate and extend the political influence of the Deinomenids. In 476/5 he re-founded Katane, situated on the southern slopes of Mt. Etna, as the homonymous city of Aitna, which involved replacing the mainly Ionian population of Katane with Dorians from Syracuse and the Peloponnese (cf. the allusion to ‘Dorian migrations’ in Pyth. 1, 61–67). In 474 Hieron also achieved a military success to match that of his brother, when the Greek colony of Kyme on the Bay of Naples requested his aid in their struggles with the Etruscans. By that time, however, Hieron was already quite ill – with a disease to which he succumbed in 467. Deinomenid rule in Syracuse ended a year later, when Hieron’s younger brother Thrasyboulos was forced into exile and the city became a democracy. Aitna-Katane was restored to its original state in 461, with the return of its native inhabitants.

Our main historiographic sources for these events are Hdt. 7, 153–167 and D. S. 11 (20–26; 49; 51; 66–68; 76). Herodotus recounts a debate between Gelon and a pair of envoys from Athens and Sparta, in which he turns down their request for military aid against Xerxes, either because they do not wish to make him supreme commander, or at least admiral of the fleet (the mainland Greek version), or because he is already preoccupied with Himera (the Sicilian version). The basis for this story is unknown. Diodorus, by contrast, offers a straightforward account of the entire period, which probably draws on a combination of Ephorus, Timaeus and Philistus (of the late fifth to the third centuries BC) and is markedly more hostile towards Hieron than towards Gelon.⁵

Pindar’s Pythian 1 is different in that it represents a contemporary reaction to the incidents in a genre that has objectives other than historical precision, as *mutatis mutandis* do the works of Aeschylus and Simonides for the Persian Wars. But precisely for that reason they can give us a truer picture of the political and artistic atmosphere that obtained during one of the most momentous periods in Greek history.

⁵ For a balanced appreciation of Herodotus and Diodorus on the battle of Himera see recently K. A. Morgan, *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B. C.*, Oxford-New York 2015, 23–30. Cf. N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia: da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*, Firenze 1994, 304–321.

3. Pindar and Aeschylus

Pi. Pyth. 1, 71 – 80 runs as follows:

- 71 λίσσομαι, νεῦσον, Κρονίων, ἡμερον
 ὄφρα κατ' οἶκον ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ Τυρσα-
 νῶν τ' ἀλαλατὸς ἔχη, ναυ-
 σίστονον ὕβριν ἰδὼν τὰν πρὸ Κύμας,
 οἷα Συρακοσίων ἀρχῶ δαμασθέντες πάθον,
 ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὃ σφιν ἐν πόν-
 τῳ βάλεθ' ἀλικίαν,
- 75 Ἐλλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας. ἀρέομαι
 πὰρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν
 μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ' (ἀπὸ) τᾶν πρὸ Κιθαιρῶ-
 νος μαχᾶν,
 ταῖσι Μήδαιοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι,
 παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐδρον ἀκτὰν
 Ἴμέρα παιδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσαις,
 τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾶ,
 80 πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

“I beseech you, son of Kronos, grant that the war cry of the Phoenicians and Etruscans may remain quietly at home, now that they have seen their aggression fill their fleet with lamentation before Kyme,

such things did they suffer when overcome by the leader of the Syracusans, who cast their youth from their swiftly sailing ships into the sea and delivered Hellas from grievous slavery. I shall earn from Salamis the Athenians' gratitude as my reward, and at Sparta [gratitude] from the battle before Kithairon, in which the Medes with their curved bows suffered defeat; and [I shall earn gratitude] by the well-watered bank of the Himeras because I composed for Deinomenes' sons the hymn, which they won through valour, when their enemies were defeated.”

(tr. Race, adapted)⁶

Pindar's proposition here is that the Sicilian victories contributed as much to the freedom of the Greek world as the two battles which, against all odds, kept the Persians out of Europe (subsequently Himera and Salamis were even synchronised to the day: first in Hdt. 7, 166, as part of the 'Sicilian tradition').⁷ In this light Hieron evidently wished to see the achievements of

⁶ W. H. Race, *Pindar I. Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 1997.

⁷ Ephorus (FGrHist 70 F 186 = Schol. Pyth. 1, 146b Drachmann; cf. D.S. 11, 20, 1) even claims that there was a Persian-Carthaginian conspiracy for a two-pronged attack on

his family, especially perhaps if suspicions were growing that his brother and predecessor Gelon had not done his part in repelling Xerxes. But there is more to this passage.

First, it is very carefully constructed. The four relevant battles – Kyme, Salamis, Plataea and Himera – are arranged both chiasmically and in parallels: western and mainland Greek settings are presented in the order A·B·B·A, whereas sea and land battles appear in pairs (Himera was decided by land and most of the Carthaginian navy burnt before it could intervene).⁸ Secondly, we see here a masterpiece of Pindaric concision, which already puzzled ancient scholars. Pyth. 1, 71–75 describes the dire outcome of the battle of Kyme for the Etruscans (Τυρσῶν), but the Carthaginians are introduced by the initial epithet Φοίνιξ, so that one instantly thinks of Himera as well (resumed in 79/80, where the line between land and sea battle is blurred by the mention of ‘the well-watered bank of the Himeras’).⁹ What has not been pointed out so far is that the passage reads almost like a summary of A. Pers. 401–428, from the Persian Messenger’s poignant account of the battle of Salamis (353–432). There the Greeks attack the numerically far stronger enemy with a mighty war cry (402–405):

ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων, ἴτε,
 ἔλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ’, ἔλευθεροῦτε δέ
 παῖδας γυναῖκας θεῶν τε πατρῶων ἔδη
 θήκας τε προγόνων· νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀγών.

“Come on, sons of the Greeks,
 for the freedom of your homeland, for the freedom
 of your children, your wives, the temples of your fathers’ gods,
 and the tombs of your ancestors! Now all is at stake!”

(tr. Sommerstein)¹⁰

Greece, whereas Aristotle, with typical rationality, regards the parallel as coincidental (Poet. 1459a, 24–27). See R. Osborne, *Greece in the Making*, London-New York 2010, 327/328; D. C. Feeney, *Caesar’s Calendar. Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2007, 43–47.

⁸ Morgan (n. 5), 339/340; cf. Luraghi (n. 5), 362.

⁹ Schol. Pyth. 1, 137c Drachmann begins and ends as if both Etruscans and Carthaginians had attacked Kyme (Τυρσηνοὶ καὶ Καρχηδόνιοι, οἳ εἰσι Φοινίκων ἄποικοι, διεμάχοντο πρὸς Κυμαίους ... κατεύχεται οὖν ὁ Πίνδαρος εἰρηνικὰ καὶ ἀστασίαστα μένειν λοιπὸν τὰ πράγματα Καρχηδονίους καὶ Σικελιώταις). Only the Etruscans, however, are mentioned as having been defeated by Hieron. Cf. Morgan (n. 5), 336/337 with n. 69.

¹⁰ A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus I. Persians, Seven against Thebes, Suppliants, Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 2008.

As the Persians are overwhelmed in the narrow strait, many of them fall victim to the sea. Aeschylus evokes a vivid picture of utter confusion (418–428): war ships capsize or hastily try to turn round, corpses and debris cover the water and shores, survivors are mercilessly battered ‘as if they were tunny or some other catch of fish’ (424 ὥστε θύννους ἢ τιν’ ἰχθύων βόλον), and ‘a mixture of shrieking and wailing fill[s] the expanse of the sea’ (426/427 ... οἰμωγῇ δ’ ὁμοῦ / κωκύμασιν κατεῖχε πελαγίαν ἄλα). There could hardly be a better illustration of the unique adjective ναυσίστονος (‘filling the fleet with lamentation’), which qualifies the aggression of the Etruscans in Pyth. 1, 72 (ναυσίστονον ὕβριν ... τὰν πρὸ Κύμας) and for which they pay a price similar to that of the Persians in Aeschylus (Pyth. 1, 73/74). It therefore seems possible to draw a connection between Pythian 1 and Persai here.

One may object that there is only a limited number of ways to describe a naval battle in poetic Greek and that no direct verbal correspondences point to a relationship of Pythian 1 with Persai, as we later find between Aeschylus and Timotheus’ Persian *nomos*.¹¹ It will soon become clear, however, that the two passages belong in the same cultural and political environment, and as such they could reflect upon each other as soon as both were in existence. If one wishes to go further, it is worth suggesting that both Pindar and at least part of his original audience could have been familiar with Aeschylus’ Persai from when it was re-performed in Syracuse, at Hieron’s invitation, not long after its first production in Athens in 472. In that case detailed intertextual links were not required because those who had seen the play were likely to recall its treatment of Salamis when they heard Pindar’s description of the battle of Kyme, followed by the reference to Persian Wars.¹²

¹¹ Cf. e. g. the yoking of the Hellespont: Tim. Pers. 72–74 ἤδη θρασεῖα καὶ πάρος / λάβρον ἀγένη’ ἔσχες ἐμ/πέδα καταζευχθεῖσα λινοδέτω τεόν ~ A. Pers. 68–72 λινοδέσμφ σχεδία πορθμὸν ἀμείνας / Ἀθαμαντίδος Ἑλλάδας, / πολύγομφ ὄδισμα / ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλὸν ἀγένη πόντου, 747/748 ... καὶ πέδαις σφυρηλάτοις / περιβαλὸν πολλὴν κέλευθον ἦνυσεν πολλῶ στρατῶ; Tim. Pers. 77/78 ... ἐγ-/κλήσει δὲ πεδία πλόιμα νο{μ}μάσι ναύταις ~ A. Pers. 723 καὶ τόδ’ ἐξέπραξεν, ὥστε Βόσπορον κλῆσαι μέγαν;

¹² On Aeschylus’ Persai and its re-performance in Syracuse as part of the post-war celebrations of the 470s see e. g. O. Taplin, Aeschylus’ Persai – The Entry of Tragedy into the Celebration Culture of the 470s?, in: Dionysalexandros. Essays on Aeschylus and his Fellow Tragedians in Honour of Alexander F. Garvie, edd. D. Cairns - V. Liapis, Swansea 2006, 1–10 and A. A. Lamari, Aeschylus and the Beginning of Tragic Reperformances, Trends in Classics 7 (2015), 202–204. Taplin’s argument resembles mine in that he recognises the possibility of poetic competition (especially with Simonides) in the presence of common themes, such as the glorification of Plataea, and the appeal to epic status, as witnessed by the proem of the Plataea Elegy (Simon. fr. 10 + 11.1–20 IEG²)

Our evidence for the Syracusan revival of Persai is admittedly quite late. Eratosthenes is quoted to that effect in Schol. Ar. Ran. 1028 (f) Chantry, and the Life of Aeschylus adds that the ‘guest performance’ considerably increased Aeschylus’ reputation (Vit. Aesch. 18, TrGF III φασιν ὑπὸ Ἱέρωνος ἀξιοθέεντα ἀναδιδάξαι τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ λίαν εὐδοκιμεῖν). While this probably also relies on Eratosthenes directly or indirectly, I see no reason to doubt the information. Why should anyone have invented it, given that Aeschylus was already connected to Hieron by virtue of marking the foundation of Aitna with his festival drama Aitnaiai (‘Women of Aitna’ or ‘Nymphs of Mount Etna’)?¹³ In fact, since we have no firm dates for the production of either Aitnaiai or Persai in Sicily, many scholars now assume that Aeschylus put on both plays during one visit in 471 or 470,¹⁴ although ἀξιοθέεντα in the Life of Aeschylus perhaps implies that he had already impressed Hieron on a previous occasion. However that may be, if 470 is the year that saw Persai in Syracuse, the play could have been performed there after Pythian 1, and my argument collapses. But the case for a contextual relationship between the two texts remains strong, especially if we call Simonides to witness.

4. Pindar, Simonides and ‘Simonides’

Aeschylus was not the only contemporary poet who memorialised the Persian Wars as a supreme struggle for the preservation of Greek freedom.¹⁵ This interpretation of the events had almost immediately become a literary topos, no doubt inspired by a genuine feeling of relief.¹⁶ Pindar himself, in a

and the combination of Persai with two other tragedies and a satyr-play set in the mythical past.

¹³ The interpretation of the play-title as ‘Nymphs of Mount Etna’, referring to a chorus of local nymphs, sisters or companions of the heroine Thalia, who was abducted by Zeus to become the mother of the Sicilian Palici, has been reasserted by L. Poli-Palladini, *Some Reflections on Aeschylus’ Aetnae(ae)*, RhM 144 (2001), 312/313. Cf. A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus III. Fragments*, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 2008, 6/7.

¹⁴ E. g. A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus’ Supplices. Play and Trilogy*, Bristol ²2006, 49/50; id., *Aeschylus. Persae*, Oxford 2009, liii/liv with n. 132; Sommerstein, *Aeschylean Tragedy*, London ²2010, 6 + 15 (notes); A. Duncan, *Political Re-Performance of Tragedy in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*, Trends in Classics 7 (2015), 298 with n. 2.

¹⁵ In addition to Pers. 402–405 (above), cf. e. g. 194–196, 234 and 242.

¹⁶ On the emergence and possible origin of the ‘freedom war’ ideology see K. Raaflaub, *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*, Chicago-London 2004, 58–89. The German original of the book (München 1985) was written before the publication of the Plataea Elegy.

dithyramb for the Athenians, applied it to the battle of Artemision (fr. 77 Sn.-M. ὄθι παῖδες Ἀθηναίων ἐβάλλοντο φαένναν / κρηπίδ' ἐλευθερίας), and several pseudo-Simonidean epigrams similarly praise the Greek achievements in individual battles or during the entire period of war ('Simon.' Ep. 10; 15; 16; 18; 20(a) FGE).¹⁷

Of these epigrams the most important one for our purpose is 'Simon.' Ep. 20(a) FGE, the first two couplets of the much-discussed Athenian honorary inscription IG I³ 503/4 = CEG 2 (lapis A, 1). It was formerly restored to a fair extent from another Athenian stone fragment (Agora I 4256 = SEG XVI 22), which Meritt had identified as coming from a late-fourth-century epigraphic copy of our poem.¹⁸ The date and reference of this piece have recently been severely doubted,¹⁹ but I have still incorporated most of its contributions in half-square-brackets because they illustrate the likely content of the inscription.²⁰ Some textual progress seems to have been made in the first line, where Matthaiou found traces of the letter Σ before AIEI,²¹ which

¹⁷ With the possible exception of no. 15, all these epigrams have a good claim to being (near-)contemporary with the Persian Wars, if not perhaps to Simonidean authorship (D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, revised and prepared for publication by R. D. Dawe and J. Diggle, Cambridge 1981, 200/201, 211/212, 213/214, 219–223, 229/230). Nos. 16 and 20(a) are inscriptional and have been included in the 'corpus' by modern scholars.

¹⁸ B. D. Meritt, *Epigrams from the Battle of Marathon*, in: *The Aegean and the Near East. Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman*, ed. S. S. Weinberg, Locust Valley (NY) 1956, 268–280.

¹⁹ S. V. Tracy, *The Date of Agora I 4256*, *Horos* 14–16 (2000–2003), 141/142; A. P. Matthaiou, *Eis Ag. I 4256*, *Horos* 14–16 (2000–2003), 143–151. Cf. e. g. A. Petrovic, *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*, Leiden-Boston 2007, 160/161; id., *Marathon in Pre-Herodotean Sources*, in: *Marathon – 2,500 Years*, edd. C. Carey-M. Edwards, London 2013, 48; E. L. Bowie, *Marathon in Fifth-Century Epigram*, in: *Μαράθων. Η Μάχη και ο Αρχαίος Δήμος. Marathon. The Battle and the Ancient Deme*, edd. K. Buraselis-K. Meidani, Athenai 2010, 209.

²⁰ The second half of the third verse had been anticipated by F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Perserepigramme von der athenischen Agora*, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 205. He compared AP 7, 258, 3 (= 'Simon.' Ep. 46, 3 FGE) *αἰχμηταί, πεζοί τε καὶ ὠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶν*, from an epigram in memory of the Greek victory over the Persians at the Eurymedon in 468. On the correspondence with Pyth. 1, 74 see below.

²¹ A. P. Matthaiou, *Ἀθηναίοισι τεταγμένοιισι ἐν τεμένει Ἡρακλέος* (Hdt. 6, 108, 1), in: *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrester*, edd. P. Derow - R. Parker, Oxford 2003, 197 with n. 24. In addition to autopsy, Matthaiou refers to the photograph of lapis A in J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum. Ein Bilderatlas epigraphischer Denkmäler Attikas*, Berlin 1935, pl. 9(2), where the traces can at best be guessed at by the non-expert.

would rule out ... κλέος ἄφθιτον (αἰεῖ), suggested by]ος ἄφθι[in Agora I 4256 = SEG XVI 22:

ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετῆν[.....]ς αἰεῖ :
 [.....]ν[.]ρ[.....]]νέμοσι θεοί[]
 ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοί τε [καί]]δκυπόρων ἐπὶ νῆδ]ν :
 ἡελλά[δα μ]ἔ πᾶσαν δούλιο]ν ἔμαρ ἰδῆν].

1 ἀρετῆ]ς φθιμῆνδων λάμπει κλέος]ς αἰεῖ Matthaïou: alii alia (vid. IG I³ 503/4 et Petrovic 2007 (n. 19), 158) 3 fin. iam suppl. Hiller von Gaertringen cl. AP 7, 258, 3 (= ‘Simon.’ Ep. 46, 3 Page)

“The valour of these men [.....] fame always
 [.....] [the gods assign].
 For on foot and [on swift-moving ships] they prevented
 all Hellas from [seeing the day] of slavery.”

As the inscription stands, it promises everlasting fame to the Athenian war dead, who would have been named in the casualty list that was part of the monument,²² because on land and at sea they defended Greece from Persian oppression. It is now all but agreed that at least this portion of the inscription refers to Salamis – either as part of a general appreciation of the Persian Wars or together with one of the great land battles²³ – and that it dates to shortly after 480 or 479. If Plataea lay behind πεζοί (v. 3), there would be a close parallel with the juxtaposition of the two battles in Pythian 1, and it has plausibly been suggested that Pindar paraphrases the inscription.²⁴ The dithyramb in which he praises the Athenian contribution to the

²² The monument is now reconstructed as having consisted of three or more stone stelae standing on a common base of at least four marble blocks with a combined length of ca. five metres. Three of these blocks, on which the epigrams are inscribed, are preserved. The existence of the stelae, which would have carried the casualty list, has been deduced from incisions in the upper surface of the blocks. See A. P. Matthaïou, Νέος λίθος του μνημείου με τὰ ἐπιγράμματα γιὰ τοὺς Περσικοὺς πολέμους, *Horos* 6 (1988), 118–122; id. (n. 21), 195/196; J. Barron, All for Salamis, in: ‘Owls to Athens’: Essays in Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover, ed. E. M. Craik, Oxford 1990, 135/136; Petrovic 2007 (n. 19), 160, 162–164.

²³ First Hiller von Gaertringen (n. 20), 205/206. Cf. e. g. W. C. West III, Saviors of Greece, *GRBS* 11 (1970), 271–282; Barron (n. 22), 133/134, 137/138; Raaflaub 2004 (n. 16), 62; Petrovic 2007 (n. 19), 166/167; id. 2013 (n. 19), 50, 51/52. By contrast, Matthaïou (n. 21), 194–202 revived the argument that the entire monument was for Marathon. Yet the use of two different deictics (lapis A, 1, 1 ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ', A, 2, 1 ἐν ἄρα τοῖσζ') tells against this, as does the probable mention of ships in A, 1, 3.

²⁴ Barron (n. 22), 141; cf. Morgan (n. 5), 155/156, 338/339.

battle of Artemision (Pi. fr. 76 + 77 Sn.-M.) indicates that he spent time in Athens in the aftermath of the Persian Wars. We also find verbal correspondences between the epigram and Pythian 1. The epic-style ... ὠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶν (if the supplement is correct) has an almost exact equivalent in Pyth. 1, 74 ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν ὃ σφιν ἐν πόντῳ βάλεθ' ἀλικίαν (of Hieron at Kyme),²⁵ while both Ἑλλάς and a word from the stem δουλ- appear in the 'rescue-from-servitude' tag. The latter may seem obvious, but Pindar could have expressed the thought positively, in terms of preserving freedom, as he did in his dithyramb (fr. 77 Sn.-M. ὅθι ... ἐβάλοντο ... / κρηπιδ' ἐλευθερίας).²⁶

At the very least Pindar in Pyth. 1, 71-80 imbued Hieron's battles with epic grandeur²⁷ and the rhetoric of freedom that would have been widely recognised after the Persian Wars. But there may have been another resonance, more specific again for Hieron and the Sicilians. Our longest papyrus fragment of Simonides' Plataea Elegy contains two broken couplets which at the beginning of the narrative proper seem to present the battle of Plataea as part of a Greek war for freedom (Simon. fr. 11, 25–28 IEG²):

ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἱ Σπάρτ[η δούλιον ἤμ]αρ
...] ἀμυν[] . . []ω []
οὐδ' ἀρε]τῆς ἐλάθ[οντο]ν οὐρανομ[ήκ]ης,
καὶ κλέος ἀ]νθρώπων [ἔσσει]ται ἀθάνατο<ν>.

25/26 e. g. ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἱ Σπάρτ[η τε καὶ Ἑλλάδι (cf. 'Simon.' Ep. 16, 1) δούλιον ἤμ]αρ | ἔσχον] ἀμυνόμενοι μὴ τιν' ἰδεῖν φανερω]ῶ[ς (cf. 'Simon.' Ep. 20(a), 3/4) West 25 ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἱ Σπάρ[της ὄρμησαν καρτερον ἄλκ]α Parson's 27 e.g. φάτις δ' ἔχεν West (prob. Parson's) οὐρανομ[ήκ]ης I. C. Rutherford

"of the men, who for Sparta [] the day of slavery
] ward(ing) off [
nor did they forget their valour [] heaven-high
and their fame among men will be immortal."

Short of further evidence, we cannot even be sure about the longer supplements West printed, comparing 'Simon.' Ep. 20(a) Page (above) and

²⁵ The closest Homeric parallel is Il. 13, 57/58 τῷ κε καὶ ἐσσύμενον περ ἐρωήσαιτ' ἀπὸ νηῶν / ὠκυπόρων. Otherwise cf. Il. 10, 308. 320; 12, 156; 13, 110, Od. 4, 708 νηῶν (τ') ὠκυπόρων ... (at verse-beginning).

²⁶ Cf. 'Simon.' Ep. 10; 15, 3/4; 16, 1/2 FGE.

²⁷ Apart from Pyth. 1, 74 ὠκυπόρων ἀπὸ ναῶν (above), note 1, 73 Συρακοσίων ἀρχῶ (~ e. g. Il. 4, 115 Μενέλαιον ... ἀρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν; 14, 426 Σαρπηδὸν τ' ἀρχὸς Λυκίων) and 1, 78 Μήδειοι ... ἀγκυλοτόξοι (~ Il. 2, 848 ... Παιόνας ἀγκυλοτόξους; 10, 428; Stes. fr. S88, 9 PMGF = 103.9 Finglass (Iliou Persis) – υυ – υυ – × –]ονες ἀγκυλοτόξοι).

Ep. 16, 1/2 Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐλεύθερον ἤμαρ ἀέξειν / ἰέμενοι θανάτου μοῖραν ἐδεξάμεθα. Simon. fr. 11, 25/26 IEG² clearly contains forms of Σπάρτα and ἀμύνω, but δούλιον ἤμιαρ is not the only possibility. Parsons proposed ἀνδρῶ]ν, οἱ Σπάρτ[ης ὄρμησαν καρτερὸν ἄλκ]αρ.

If West is right, however, there is again a parallel with Pyth. 1, 71–80, and it may even be possible to argue that this supports his reconstruction. Pindar introduces the battles of Salamis and Plataea as a poet of praise who could hope to earn the gratitude of the Athenians and Spartans as a reward for his efforts (75–78), as indeed he expects to be remunerated by Hieron for Pythian 1 (79/80). We do not know who commissioned Simonides' Plataea Elegy and on what occasion it was first performed, but an attractive idea that has been advanced repeatedly (with some variation) is that it was at a public ceremony to celebrate the victory and honour the war dead of Plataea under Spartan leadership.²⁸ The Spartans at any rate are prominent in the fragments. Immediately after the praise of their valour in Simon. fr. 11, 25–29 IEG² (above), they are seen marching into battle, led by Pausanias and accompanied by their local heroes, the Tyndaridai, or Dioscuri, and Menelaus (Simon. fr. 11, 29–34 IEG²):

οἱ μὲν ἄρ' Εὐ]ρώταν κα[ὶ Σπάρτ]ης ἄστου λιπόντ[ε]ς
 ὄρμησαν] Ζητὸς παισὶ σὺν ἱπποδάμοις
 Τυνδαρίδα]ις ἥρωσι καὶ εὐρυβίηι Μενελάω[ι
 πατ]ρώτης ἠγεμόνες π[ό]λλεος
 τοὺς δ' υἱὸς θεῖοιο Κλεο]μβ[ρ]ότου ἕξ[α]γ' ἄριστ[ο]ς
]αγ . Παισάνη]ς.

29 suppl. Lobel 30 ὄρμησαν West: ἐξέλασαν Parsons: ἐξήλθον Fowler 31 Τυνδαρίδα]ις West: ἀγνωτότα]ις Parsons 32 e. g. ἐσθλοὶ West

“[From the Eu]rotas and from [Sparta’s] town they marched
 accompanied by Zeus’ horsemaster sons,
 [the Tyndarid] Heroes, and by Menelaus’ strength,
 [those doughty] captains of [their fath]ers folk

²⁸ Especially A. Aloni, L’elegia di Simonide dedicata alla battaglia di Platea (Sim. fr. 10–18 W²) e l’occasione della sua performance, ZPE 102 (1994), 9, 16–22; id., The Proem of the Simonides Elegy on the Battle of Plataea (Sim. Frs. 10–18 W²) and the Circumstances of its Performance, in: Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece, edd. L. Edmunds-R. W. Wallace, Baltimore-London 1997, 23–27 = The Proem of Simonides’ Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of its Performance, in: The New Simonides. Contexts of Praise and Desire, edd. D. Boedeker-D. Sider, Oxford-New York 2001, 98, 100–104; D. Boedeker, Simonides on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythotic History, ZPE 107 (1995), 220–225.

led forth by [great Cleo]mbrotus' most noble [son,]
 ... Pausanias."
 (tr. West)²⁹

Not much later in the poem, as the armies are approaching the battlefield, the 'sons of Doros and Heracles' are opposed to the Medes (Simon. fr. 13, 8–10 IEG² ὄφρ' ἀπὸ μὲν Μήδ[ων ...] / καὶ Περσῶν, Δώρου δ[ὲ ...] / παῖσι καὶ Ἡρακλέος [...]), which on the Greek side places the emphasis "on the Peloponnesian Dorians, that is ... the Spartans".³⁰

It is tempting to connect these passages with Pindar's extensive treatment of Aitna's new Dorian constitution (Pyth. 1, 61–66):

61 τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἔλευθερία
 Ὑλλίδος στάθμας Ἱέρων ἐν νόμοις ἔ-
 κτισσε· θέλοντι δὲ Παμφύλου
 καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι
 ὄχθαις ὑπο Ταῦγέτου ναίοντες αἰ-
 εὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγίμιου
 65 Δωριεῖς, ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας ὄλβιοι
 Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι, λευκοπῶλων
 Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι
 γείτονες, ὧν κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς.

"for whom [Deinomenes] Hieron founded that city with divinely fashioned freedom under the laws of Hyllos' rule because the descendants of Pamphylos and indeed of Heracles' sons, who dwell under the slopes of Taygetos, are determined to remain forever in the institutions of Aigimios as Dorians. Blessed with prosperity, they came down from Pindos and took Amyklai, to become much acclaimed neighbours of the Tyndaridai with white horses, whose fame in battle flourished."

(tr. Race [n. 6], adapted)

We should probably not attach too much weight to the fact that both Simon. fr. 13, 10 IEG² and Pi. Pyth. 1, 63 feature the traditional genealogy of the Dorians as descendants of Heracles or the Heraclidae. The context is different after all. Yet this does not apply to the mention of the Tyndaridai. In the Plataea Elegy the Spartans are destined for success both because they are valiant and because they have heroic assistance (whether Simonides

²⁹ West, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1993.

³⁰ West 1993 (n. 3), 7 = 2013 (n. 3), 119.

actually names the Tyndaridai or not).³¹ Similarly, Pindar in Pyth. 1, 65/66 calls the Peloponnesian Dorians the ‘much acclaimed neighbours of the Tyndaridai ... whose fame in battle flourished’ (Δωριεῖς ... Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι γείτονες, ὧν κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς) – with a concluding relative clause that leaves open whether its antecedent is the Dorians or the Tyndaridai. The passage refers to mythical pre-history, but it would not have taken much in 470 also to find in it a reflection of recent events and, if the Plataea Elegy was known in Sicily (cf. below), perhaps even an echo of Simonides’ portrayal of the battle.

Support for this interpretation comes from the observation that both Pindar and Simonides use the Trojan War as a foil for contemporary conflicts, a trope most famously employed by Herodotus at the beginning of his Histories. Pindar in Pyth. 1, 50–57 compares Hieron to Philoctetes for taking part in the battle of Kyme despite physical illness (and so, implicitly, becoming the saviour of the Greeks),³² whereas the proem of the Plataea Elegy (Simon. fr. 10 + 11, 1–20 IEG²) is a magnificent hymn to Achilles and the power of poetry to perpetuate fame, the main objective also of the epinician.

But if Pindar knew the Plataea Elegy, through (re-)performance and/or early written distribution, and if he had it in mind when he composed Pythian 1,³³ could he expect his Sicilian audience to notice the similarities, as *ex hypothesi* in the case of Aeschylus’ Persai? Very probably. There is ample evidence that Simonides, like Aeschylus, stayed in Sicily, and at Hieron’s court, in the later 470s, even if we do not believe all the details (Simon. test. 55–61 Poltera). It is hard to imagine that he was not asked to perform his poetic accounts of the battles that saved Greece from Persian occupation.

³¹ Simon. fr. 11, 31 IEG² Τυνδαριδαίτις ἦρωσι καὶ εὐρυβίτη Μενελάω[ι is West’s reconstruction (*apud* Parsons [n. 2], 35). Parsons himself suggested ἀγνωτάτο[ις ἦρωσι ..., but the proper name seems preferable as resolution to the preceding ‘kenning’ Ζηνὸς πασι σὺν ἱπποδάμοις (cf. e. g. Tyr. fr. 2, 12/13 IEG² ... Κρονίων καλλιστεφάνου πόσις ἼΗρης / Ζεὺς ...).

³² Cf. I. L. Pfeijffer, Propaganda in Pindar’s First Pythian Ode, in: The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies, edd. K. A. E. Enenkel-I. L. Pfeijffer, Leiden - Boston 2005, 26/27, 30.

³³ In favour of Pindar’s familiarity with the Plataea Elegy, see A. Schachter, Simonides’ Elegy on Plataia: The Occasion of its Performance, ZPE 123 (1998), 26, 29, on possible echoes of it in Paeon 6. Unfortunately, this poem cannot be securely dated, but some time after the Persian Wars seems reasonable. Cf. I. C. Rutherford, Pindar’s Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre, Oxford 2001, 331 n. 95.

5. Conclusion

After a careful examination of the evidence, it appears that Pindar helped Hieron's ambition to win pan-Hellenic recognition for his achievements not simply by equating the battles of Himera and Kyme with those of Salamis and Plataea. We should also recognise a subtle literary game. Pindar transferred to the western Greek conflicts some of the political rhetoric and poetic language applied to the Persian Wars, and did so in a way that seems to evoke two of their finest literary commemorations: Aeschylus' *Persai*, if we accept the necessary chronology of its Syracusan revival, and Simonides' *Plataea Elegy*. The message to Hieron, the Sicilians and any future audiences then was simple: 'I, Pindar, honour the contributions of the Deinomenids to the freedom of the Greeks from barbarian oppression with an encomium to rival those conferred upon the mainland Greeks.' It was certainly not for lack of effort that Pindar failed to dispel the doubts over Gelon's motives for refusing to assist the common cause in the east.

Almut Fries
The Queen's College
Oxford OX1 4AW
United Kingdom
almut.fries@classics.ox.ac.uk