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Pindar’s *Olympian Ode 2* is one of two odes, the other one being *Olympian Ode 3*, that celebrates Theron’s victory at the chariot race in *Olympia*. Time and its connection to justice, pleasure and pain are the dominant theme of *Olympian 2*. Pindar most succinctly expresses this notion in another composition, fragment 167: ἀνδρῶν δικαίων Χρόνος σωτήρ ἀριστος, “time is the best savior of just men.” One’s ethical choices in the present, that is to say whether one chooses to live in accordance with justice or not, will affect one’s time in the future, in this life or the next. At the same time, Pindar implies that one’s choices and what happens are predetermined. The notions of reward and punishment themselves imply a rationalization of pleasure and pain: a life of pleasure, a world of pleasure may await him who suffers justly in the present: gratification may be postponed and is subject to spatialization and stabilization into a mythical realm where the ordinary intrusion of pain has no place.

In order to assess the thematization of time in this ode, a comparative survey of the distribution of relevant words in this ode and the other Pindaric odes is in order.

The word χρόνος occurs as many three times in *Olympian 2*. Only in *Pythian 4*—a significantly longer poem—and *Olympian 10* does it occur more times four times respectively). In *Pythian 3*, χρόνος occurs three times as well. If we now turn to the distribution of the words πότμος, μοῖρα, αἰεί and αἰών, we find that their total is eight in
Olympian 2 versus six in Nemean 7, five in Pythian 4, four in Pythian 3, Nemean 10 and Isthmian 6 respectively. From a lexical standpoint, Olympian 2 thus belongs to the most explicitly time-oriented odes.

|     | Χρόνος | Κρόνος | Κρονίδης | Πότμος | Μοίρα | Αἰεὶ | Αἰῶν
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 1 = 7 (5)</td>
<td>2 (line 46, 57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (55 μοιρίδιον, .99)</td>
<td>3 (64, 67, 90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 2 = 5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (39)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (34, 72, 75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 3 = 9 (4)</td>
<td>2 (115, 96)</td>
<td>2 (4, 94)</td>
<td>1 (57)</td>
<td>1 (86)</td>
<td>1 (84)</td>
<td>1 (108)</td>
<td>1 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 4 = 13 (5)</td>
<td>4 (55, 78, 258, 291)</td>
<td>4 (56, 115, 171, 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (127, 145, 196, 255 = μοιρίδιον)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (256)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 5 = 4 (2)</td>
<td>1 (121)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (118)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 6 = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 8 = 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 9</td>
<td>= 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 10</td>
<td>= 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 11</td>
<td>= 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth 12</td>
<td>= 3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (12, 30 μόρσιμον)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 1</td>
<td>= 6 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>1 (111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 2</td>
<td>= 14 (8)</td>
<td>2 (70, )</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>1 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 3 =</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 4</td>
<td>= 4 (1)</td>
<td>2 (10, 27)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 5</td>
<td>= 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 6</td>
<td>= 8 (2)</td>
<td>3 (97, 36, 56)</td>
<td>3 (64, 61 29)</td>
<td>2 (42, 79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 7</td>
<td>= 3 (1)</td>
<td>1 (94)</td>
<td>1 (67)</td>
<td>1 (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 8</td>
<td>1 (28)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (43)</td>
<td>1 (15)</td>
<td>1 (86)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 6 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 10</td>
<td>4 (7, 55, 102, 85)</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 12</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oly 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 1</td>
<td>2 (69, 46)</td>
<td>2 (16, 72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 3</td>
<td>1 (49)</td>
<td>1 (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 4 = 2 (6, 43)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>1 (42)</td>
<td>1 (61 μόρσιμον)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 5 = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>1 (40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 6 = 2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (57, 1, 2 (39,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44 &amp; 41 μόρσιμον</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 9 = 5 (3)</td>
<td>2 (19, 28)</td>
<td>1 (29)</td>
<td>2 (44, 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 10 = 5 (4)</td>
<td>1 (76)</td>
<td>1 (57)</td>
<td>2 (20, 53)</td>
<td>1 (59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne 11 = 2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>1 (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 1 = 2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (52)</td>
<td>1 (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 2 = 1</td>
<td>1 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist ¾ = 5 (4)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>2 (22, 60)</td>
<td>1 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 5 = 2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (28)</td>
<td>1 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 6 = 4 (4)</td>
<td>3 (62, 18, 46 μοιρίδιον)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 7 = 3 (3)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>1 (41 μόρσιμος)</td>
<td>1 (42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist 8 =</td>
<td>1 (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2: the ode opens with a question (τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;) and ends with a question (καὶ κεῖνος ὅσα χάρματ’ ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν, / τίς ἄν φράσαι δύνατο;).

The answer to both questions is Theron, the laudandus. The triple repetition of τίν(α) anticipates on a phonetic level the first and last consonants of Theron’s name, the only distinction being the aspiration of Theron’s initial aspirate plosive (t vs. t + h). The chiastic t(h) and n’s in the very first interrogative unit of the poem τίνα θεόν not only matches the phonetic frame of the laudandus’ name, it also matches his name in terms of metrical resolution. When Θήρωνα first appears on line 5, it is surrounded by ἀκρόθινα one line above (as if a cross between τίνα and Θήρωνα), τετραορίας on the same line and γεγονητέον on the next line.

Pindar’s recourse to a question, the answer to which is Theron, as a ring compositional device for framing the entirety of his ode serves a number of purposes, one of which, I will suggest, is to present the entire poem as a riddle that elicits the laudandus’ patronymic Ainesi-damos. Pindar goes out of his way to emphasize the significance of Theron’s father’s name by semanticizing it on two different occasions: Αἰνησίδάμου and ἐγκωμίων are juxtaposed in lines 46 and 47 in which the alternative meaning ‘praise’ of Αἰνησίδάμου is glossed by the adjacent occurrence of ἐγκωμίων; similarly, line 95 Θήρωνος, ἄλλ’ ἄινον ἐπέβα κόρος located near the end of the ode takes advantage of the quadruple polysemy of ἄινος as 1) a riddle, 2) a story, 3) a eulogy and 4) the name of Theron’s father. The subtle allusion to Ainesidamos in line 95, whereby a
word of the same family as the name appears, without instantiating the name itself, recurs in line 23 in πένθος δὲ πίνει βαρό out of which the name of Pentheus can be teased.

4: Ἡρακλέης occurs frequently in Pindar’s odes but the reference in Olympian 2 to reincarnation invites us to explore an “Orphic” reading of the hero’s name and an “Orphic” reading of the text as a whole: “Orphism” and “Pythagoreanism,” it seems, had a firm footing in Sicily, hence the possibility that the laudandus and his Sicilian entourage were receptive to what appears to have been an extremely ancient religious and philosophical movement conventionally referred to as “Orphism.” Accordingly, it bears noting that Diels-Kranz fr. 13 equates Herakles with Time (ὠνομάσθαι δὲ Χρόνον ἄγήραον καὶ Ἡρακλῆα τὸν αὐτόν), arguably the key theme of Olympian Ode II. The Orphic Hymn 12 to Herakles describes him as the ‘father of time’ (3):

Ἡρακλὲς ὀμβριμῶθυμε, μεγαθενές, ἀλκίμε Τιτάν,
καρτερόχειρ, ἀδάμαστε, βρυῶν ἀθλοῦσι κραταιοῖς,
αἰολόμορφος, χρόνου πάτερ, † ἄιδιε τε † ἐὐφρων

It is remarkable that Pindar’s Olympian Ode II similarly refers to Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ (17). Complementarily, aforementioned Orphic Hymn to Herakles also addresses him as παγγενέτωρ (6).

Herakles, archetypal hero, embodies the hero’s conquest of time with the completion of his twelve labors, patterned after the twelve months in the year¹: akin to the English year and ἦρως, which Pindar tellingly places two lines apart from Herakles in our ode (τίν’ ἦρωα, 2), Herakles’ own name means “the glory of Hera” goddess of time and seasonality, the one who decides the moment in the Iliad at which the sun is to set on the fatal evening that Patroklos perishes. Cognate with Herakles, Hera and ἦρως are the

¹ On the solar features of Herakles, see Schweitzer 1922.
Horai, goddesses of the seasons. It is significant to Olympian 2 that the Horai are the daughters of Themis in the Hesiodic Theogony because Pindar’s ode establishes a clear connection between time and justice: in time, justice will be rewarded and injustice punished. The poet thus evinces his espousal of dominant modes in traditional Greek thought.

We noted earlier phonetic structures and key paronomasias that conjure up the laudandus’ name and patronymic: it is now fitting to note that ἥρως in line 2 is contained within the name of Θ-ήρω-ν, which is already decomposed in line 2 of the Ode: τ-ι-ν-α θε-νυ, τ-ι-ν’ ἥρω-α. As we shall see, Theron’s victory at the Olympian contest for the four-horse chariot as well as his uneasy victories as a war leader (cf. ἔρεισµ’ Ἀκράγαντος, 6) earn him the title of hero.

Several parallelisms tie the archetypal hero Herakles and T-herο-ν besides their shared Theban ancestry. Just as Olympia owes its splendor to the first-fruits of war, which Herakles collected against his nemesis Augeas “Sunlight,”3 Akragas owed its wealth and splendor to Theron’s military victories. Pindar seems to fuse Herakles’ ἀκρό-θνα with Theron’s own Ἀκρά-γας by placing ἀκρό-θνα in line 4 between Ἡρακλέης in line 3 and Θήρωνα in line 5, which is further concretized by Ἀκρά-γαντος in line 6.

Olympian Ode 10, which is also dedicated to a victor from Magna Graecia,4 links Herakles’ ἀκρό-θνα at Olympia and the dominant theme of Olympian Ode, time:

καὶ πάγον

2 Demosthenes 19.249 or IG 2.1191.
3 I am suggesting that Augeas’ name and identity tells us something about Herakles himself. Compare Hera-kles’ antagonism with Hera. An Etruscan plate I saw at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts shows the face of Herakles and right above him the sun and the moon. For the mirror image principle between gods and heroes, see Nagy 2007. For the mirror image principle between human antagonists, see my “The Hero-Hero Antagonism.”
4 Hagesidamos.
Here, time (Χρόνος), a quasi-philosophical substitute of Hera in Herakles’ afterlife, sanctifies the hero’s generosity with his war-prizes: implicitly, the promise is made that Time will also reward victors generous to poets. The Orphic overtones in this excerpt may be discernible in Pindar’s choice of the word πρωτογόνῳ, reminiscent of Protogonos, a major god in Orphic cosmogony. Olympian 10 is also interesting because we find again Pindar collocating Kronos with Khronos in the context of the foundation of the Olympian festival. As we shall see, the common ground between the two is not merely phonetic. According to Pausanias 5.7.6-9, the Olympic games originated with a foot race staged by Herakles and his brothers the Idaean Dactyls in the age of Cronus. If this myth, as Hubbard convincingly argues, goes back to the archaic period, then the first mention of Herakles at the outset of Olympian 2 would have brought to mind Time in general, and more specifically the blessed age of Cronus, past but also potentially future.

7 - ἐρείσμ’ Ἀκράγαντος “bulwark of Akragas” anticipates ἄμαχον ἀστραβή κίονα “invincible, unflinching pillar” of 81 applied to Hector, bulwark of Troy. The similar diction with which Theron and the Trojan Hector are couched points to Theron’s pride in his Theban ancestry, hence Trojan ancestry, since Thebans considered Hector to be a

5 Quoted by Hubbard 2007.
Theban hero of sorts: his bones, according to Pausanias, had been taken to Thebes to ensure the prosperity of the city. The Theban-Trojan connection mostly likely arises from the deep-seated parallels between the Theban and Trojan sagas in which the respective cities suffer epic, long-lasting sieges.

A commentator has remarked that it is very rare for Zeus to be described in poetry as both the child of Cronus and of Rhea. The mention of Rhea lends an Orphic coloring to the text since she is very prominent in the cult of Dionysos, himself inseparable from Orphism. The same commentator has also remarked that the mention of Cronus, even as a patronymic, combined with the reference to the Olympic site in the next line inevitably brings to mind the hill of Cronus, explicitly mentioned in *Olympian* 10.50. The importance of this hill to the Olympic site was such that it is used synecdochically as a stand-alone synonym for the games in *Olympian* 8.17 and *Nemean* 11.25. In Pindar’s *Olympian* 2, the hill of Cronus is never mentioned but it is implied. Indeed, *Olympian* 2 distinguishes itself from other Pindaric Odes in that it is one of the very rare odes that explicitly refers to Cronus in other terms than in reference to Zeus “the son of Cronus”: at 76, Cronus is called πατήρ…μέγας “the great father” with the non-formualic adjective μέγας and πόσις ὁ πάντων Ἰπέας / ὑπέρτατον ἔχωσας θρόνον. Typically, the title ‘father’ among the gods goes to Zeus.

It will now be argued that the hill of Cronus where Herakles’ Olympian ἀκρόθινα were dedicated is linked with Theron’s citadel of Akra-gas through the common model of their assimilation to the paradisiacal tower of Cronus mentioned at 70 (Κρόνου

---

7 The only other possible example I have found is Nemean 5.7 ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἱρωας αἴχματας φυτεύθην- / τας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεῖν Νηρηίδων (7) Αἰακίδας ἐγέραρεν ματρόπολιν τε “the heroes sprouting from Cronus and Zeus” but even this reference could be a figure of speech for “Cronian Zeus.”
τύρσιν) and the Isles of the Blessed. We may first defamiliarize ourselves with the word παῖ in line 12, just as we did with Herakles in line 3, and propose that filiation (and fatherhood) in *Olympian* 2 bears a privileged connection to the abstract notion of time’s generative power: how time splits itself into different periods of alternating qualities and quantities. Let us survey the occurrences of the word παῖς in our ode. First, 2.31-34:

> ἠτοί βροτῶν γε κέκριται (30)
> πείρας οὖ τι βανάτου,
> οὐδ’ ἤσσυμον ἀμέραν ὑπότε παιδ’ ἄελιον
> ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ τελευτάσομεν·
> ὄοι δ’ ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλαι (33)
> εὐθυμιαν τε μέτα καὶ πόνον ἐς ἄνδρας ἔβιαν.

In conformity with the conspicuous temporalization of fatherhood in line 17 (*Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ*), here the daily cycle is characterized as ‘the child of the sun’. Conversely, humans—the subject of τελευτάσομεν—are assimilated to the sun by virtue of the parallelism of their ‘completing’ the day at the same time as the sun completes his own course and via their appropriation of the sun’s traditional epithet ‘tireless’ (ἀτειρεῖ), usually ἀκάμας (e.g. Ἡέλιον δ’ ἀκάμαντα: *Iliad* 18.239) but also ἀτειρῆς, as in Empedokles 84.32-33 applied to the light of the eye, itself understood in antiquity as an emanation of the sun:

> φῶς δ’ ἔξω διαθρόσκον, ὁςον ταναώτερον ἦν,
> λάμπεσκεν κατὰ βηλὸν ἀτειρέσιν ἀκτίνεσσιν

Here the unit of the day is a ‘child.’ In *Olympian* 2.82, reference is made to the child not of the Sun but of *Dawn*, Ἀους τε παιδ’ Αἰθίοπα. The mother Dawn has more obvious ties to temporal cycles than her child Memnon but even Achilles’ nemesis retains ties to the recursivity of time through the aetiology of the morning dew representing the
tears the goddess periodically sheds for her slain son. Similarly, a specific bird species would fly round his tomb every year, split into two groups and slaughter each other above his grave. The third child, Dionysos (φιλεὶ δὲ παιζ ὁ κισσοφόρος) is not prima facie a temporal entity but the subtle allusion to his enabling the post-mortem translation of his mother Semele to Olympus plays up the god’s redemptory role in ensuring happier times for his devotees beyond the time of death.

The parallelism between the victorious Herakles and the victorious Theron is coupled with their acts of justice and piety: whereas the former dedicates his first-fruits to the foundation of the Olympian site, the latter is said to be just in his regards for strangers. The text implies that Theron’s Olympic victory and the wealth of his city are in part a divine reward for his justice, which is also inferable from the statement in the first antistrophe that Theron’s ancestors “added wealth and glory to their native virtues” (πλούτον τε καὶ χάριν ἔγων / γνησίαις επ᾽ ἄρεταις). Noteworthy is the parallelism between prosperity in this life as a reward for good deeds and prosperity in the afterlife as a reward for good deeds. Prosperity in this life anticipates and resembles prosperity in the afterlife.

With this in mind, we may note that the enablers and beneficiaries of the wealth of Akragas in the first antistrophe is not Theron himself but the καμόντες (8), which Race in his commentary simply paraphrases as “who suffered”; but this plural aorist active participle also means “the Dead” or “those who have toiled [in this life], as in Iliad 23.72. This reading allows their acquisition of a “holy abode” by an indefinite river, which Pindar could have named if he so chose (ἱερὸν ἔγχον οἰκήμα ποταμοῦ, 9) to be construed

---

8 Ovid, Metamorphoses.
as their acquisition of a holy settlement by *the* primordial river Ocean in the Isles of the Blest or any such similar paradise at the ends of the earth. Tellingly, we find this same collocation of καμόντες and an indefinite river ποταμόν in the Homeric *Iliad*, 23.73-74:

\[
\text{τῆλέ με εἵργονσι ψυχαί εἴδωλα καμόντες,}
\]

\[
ούνδέ μὲ ποι μισεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐσσιν
\]

The river in question is that of the otherworld, but it could be the unmarked Ocean—also bordering on Hades in the *Odyssey*—or the gradually marked Acheron. The subsequent collocation in the same antistrophe of wealth (πλοῦτον, 11) and the impressionistic allusion to Cronus and his hill that is reminiscent of his tower (Κρόνιε παί Ἄρεας...13) are consonant with this archetypal superimposition.

Further facilitating this assimilation are Theron’s own ties to Thebes where the city’s acropolis was actually also known as the μακάρων νήσος. The mythological resonance of Sicily points in the same direction: accounts from the Hellenistic period onward, which are likely to go back to the archaic period and beyond, place the abode of the fabulous Cyclops in Sicily, whose land in the Homeric *Odyssey* clearly represents a multiform of the paradisiacal land of plenty. The identification of Sicily *Trinakria* “the three-cornered island” as *Thrinakie* the island of the Sun in the *Odyssey* appears to have taken place early on. If Sicily in the imagination of mainland Greeks was the land of the Cyclops, the statement that the καμόντες were “the eye of Sicily” (Σικελίας...ὄφθαλμός) lends itself to an additional hermeneutic coloring alongside the traditional (equally valid) understanding that the wealth and prestige of Akragas were

---

9 There may be allusions in Alcaeus 38A (P. Oxy. 1233 fr. 1) to an Acheron river undifferentiated from the Ocean, that is to say without necessarily the chthonic quality it acquires in the classical period.

10 For example, Theocritus, *Idylls* 7.158.

11 Sick 1996: 132ff. Astonishingly, Sick even posits an IE origin for the name of the island of the sun by comparing *Thrinakie* to the Sanskrit *Trinaka*, the paradisiacal third vault of heaven in the *Rg Veda*. He explains the initial aspiration in Greek as a result of contamination with θρίναξ “trident, pitchfork.”
such that the city gazed and shone all over Sicily. Thus, Pindar deliberately ambiguates the status of Akragas and Sicily as either a prosperous land of this world or the next. The end of *Olympian* 3 may imply that Theron’s Akragas was not far from the pillars of Herakles, in other words from the ends of the earth:

\[
\text{Νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἑσχατίαν}
\text{θὴρων ἀρεταισὶν ἰκάνων ἀπτεται}
\text{oὐκοθέν Ἡρακλέος}
\]

then truly has Theron now reached the furthest point with his achievement and from his home grasps the pillars of Herakles.\(^\text{12}\)

13 – πόρον τ᾽ Ἄλφεοῦ. Occurring 4 lines only after οἰκῆμα ποταμοῦ, Pindar draws an obvious parallelism between the unspecified river of Sicily and the river of the Olympian site. The land of the Alpheios, with its Hill of Cronus and the adornment of Pindar’s songs (ἰανθείς ἄοιδαῖς), mirrors the splendor of Akragas and the blessed places of the otherworld. Indeed, the phrase πόρον τ᾽ Ἄλφεοῦ “passage of Alpheios” anticipates the Διὸς ὁδὸν “road of Zeus” at line 70. Both phrases, moreover, include or are adjacent to references to Zeus and Cronus (Κρόνιε παί Ἱέας: 13; παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν: 70) as well as rivers (ἐκεανίδες ἄυραι: 71).

15 - λοιπῷ γένει. The poet’s exhortation to Zeus to preserve Akragas’ future generation, while on the one hand countervailing the elements in the poem uniting this world and the happy otherworld, is well-founded in view of the foil of the past: in 41-42, the γένος of Oedipus—Theron’s distant ancestor—succumb to mutual slaughter (σὺν ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ γένος). What happened in the past could happen again.

15-17 - ἐν δίκα τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν ἀποίητον οὐδ’ ἄν / Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ / δύναιτο θέμεν ἔργον τέλος. This is an odd sentence in and of itself and in light of what

\(^{12}\) Translation: Race (Loeb).
follows. Time’s inability to undo the outcome of just and unjust deeds is stating the obvious because father time is what generates their outcomes anyway. While Pindar’s sentence betrays a lack of logic, the choice of the words οὐδ’ ἄν is designed to recast Time as the most powerful entity in the universe while at the same time seeking to affirm its own limitations. This is another way of saying that all things have consequences and that whatever happens is a predetermined link in an endless chain of causes and effects. ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ in the next sentence (18) and ὅταν θεῷ Μοῖρα πέμπῃ (21) reaffirm the same determinism, implying that those who are able to forget their woes owe it not to free agency but to fate. Nevertheless, this determinism is not haphazard or gratuitous because the nobly-fated overcomes pain with noble joys and the allotment of riches.

19 - πῆμα θνάσκει “pain dies.” Pindar’s application of a verb denotative of the lifespan of human beings to an emotion is characteristic of Olympian 2’s tendency to anthropomorphize non-human entities: already we saw the day conceived of as a child; in 93, the city itself begets (τεκεῖν) Theron.

21 - ἀνεκάς ὀλβον ψηλόν. Here again we find the related notions of wealth and prosperity associated with a vertical movement upward or an elevated station: the allusive Hill of Cronus in the first antistrophe and the tower of Cronus to come in line 70. From an etymological standpoint, the poet’s association of ὀλβον with heights is in keeping with the original meaning of ὀλβον, “that which goes to the sun,” cf. Sanskrit svarga. This movement upward could not be rendered more forcefully than by Semele’s post-mortem translation to Olympus (whether instantly after she is struck by Zeus’ thunderbolt or after going down to Hades, we cannot tell). The strophe of triad B amplifies the
upward movement of happiness with the symmetrical fall of its opposite, grief (πένθος δὲ πίτνει βαρύ: 23). The great sorrow Semele bears at the end of her life is redeemed by great happiness in the afterlife.

25 - ζωεί μὲν ἐν Ὁλυμπίοις ἀποθανοῖσα βρόμῳ κεραυνοῦ seems deliberately ambiguous. On the one hand, one can take βρόμῳ κεραυνοῦ as the agent of Semele’s death, “she was killed by the bellowing of a thunderbolt.” But βρόμῳ κεραυνοῦ can also be the agent of her new life “she lives on Olympus by means of the bellowing of the thunderbolt.” In support of this ambivalence, Ἑλύσιον “Elysium,” a multiform of Olympus, is cognate with ἐνηλύσιον “a place struck by lightning.” In fact, it would appear that the sacred site at Thebes of Semele’s translation by thunderbolt was part of the “Isle of the Blessed” on the acropolis. The agent βρόμῳ κεραυνοῦ is also significant because it unites Zeus’ thunderbolt (κεραυνοῦ) and Dionysos’ epithet Βρόμιος (= βρόμῳ). This pair Zeus-Dionysos as the paradoxical agent of Semele’s death and life explicitly recurs two lines below as Semele’s benefactors: καὶ Ζεὺς πατήρ, μάλα φιλεὶ δὲ παῖς ὁ κισσοφόρος.

Β Antistrophe - τὸν ὁλὸν ἀμφὶ χρόνον (30)... ὄσαι ὁ ἀλλοτ’ ἀλλαῖ

There is something magical about the repetition of χρόνος throughout the ode. In this particular antistrophe, Pindar means to verbalize impressionistically the pair Κρόνος - Ὁρέα. Throughout Olympian 2, Pindar capitalizes on the quasi-identical sound structures between Κρόνος and χρόνος to suggest a fusion between the two: for instance, Pindar calls both Cronus and Time ‘father’ in the poem and juxtaposes the qualifier ‘of all’ πάντων to both: Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ (17) and πατήρ...μέγας...πόσις ὁ πάντων Ὁρέας / ὑπέρτατον ἔχοισας θρόνον (76-77), which, though it applies to Rhea, may also
apply to Cronus by hypallage. Even at 30, this association of time with totality occurs (τὸν ὀλὸν ἀμφὶ χρόνον, 30) in conjunction with the unwilting life Ino is granted in the sea as Leukothea. The fact that Ino’s immortal life takes place after her having experienced mortality suggests an association of χρόνον in τὸν ὀλὸν ἀμφὶ χρόνον with Cronus the god since he rules over righteous mortals in the otherworld after their death.

**Epode B** - In this particular stanza, Pindar maintains but nuances his determinism. On the one hand, he speaks of the εὔφρονα πότμων of Theron’s family but allows for painful times. Such re-vers-als (πῆμα… παλιντράπελον: 37) do not seem to result necessarily from any guilt or unjust deed committed by Theron or his family, although the reference in the ode to Oedipus and his cursed offspring may imply the continued impact of “an original sin” on his distant descendants, including Theron’s family. Epode B also displays numerous structural and lexical parallels with Antistrophe A: first, both stanzas focus on Theron’s ancestors (καμόντες, 8; τῶν, 36; Λῆον, 38); the verb ἄγει (36) / ἄγων (11) has ὀλβῷ (36) / πλοῦτόν (11) as its indirect / direct object; to αἰῶν…μόριμος of line 10 corresponds μόριμος υἷός of line 38. Even the father and son antagonism between Laios and Oedipus in Epode B (ἐκτεινε Λῆον μόριμος υἷός, 38) is reflected in Antistrophe A in the tacit antagonism between Cronus and his son Zeus (Κρόνιε Πᾶς: 12).

At this opportunity, I will now advance the hypothesis that the very myths of the three divine generations and Oedipus’ patricide were originally myths about temporal cycles and that Pindar, together with other contemporary songwriters and the educated elite, was cognizant of the ‘allegorical’ meaning of these myths. This possibility is worth investigating in the case of *Olympian Ode 2* because its central theme is arguably time.
At 82-86, Pindar implies that a number of the things he describes in his ode have a hidden or allegorical meaning (πολλά μοι ὑπ’ ἄγκώνος ὡκέα βέλη / ἐνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας / φωνάζεται συνετίσιν ἐσ δὲ τὸ πάν ἐρμανέων / χατίζει). This does not prove in any way that what I am about to propose is correct, but it should alert the reader of this ode (as of others) that things are not always as they seem in Pindar’s odes and the poet encourages the audience to look out for multiple layers of interpretation to his lines.

While categorically condemning his political affiliations, I follow the Indo-Europeanist Jean Haudry in his view that the myth of the three divine generations Uranus / Cronus / Zeus symbolized the daily succession of the Night Sky (Uranus), Twilight (Cronus) and Day Sky (Zeus). Originally, Zeus was not merely a spatial entity but a spatio-temporal entity. As *Dyews “the sunlit sky” (Burkert), the domain of Zeus was originally restricted to the sunlit part of the sky in the daytime, not the nighttime — the domain of Uranus. In the Hesiodic Theogony, Zeus’ grandfather is always referred to as Οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις, which is evidence that the sky in question was not any type of sky but rather specifically the night sky when stars are visible. Evidence for Zeus’ original restriction to the day sky, as opposed to the night sky, may be found in the Iliad when it is said that even Zeus would not impinge on the domain of the night. As for Cronus who comes between Οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις and Zeus, he was a twilight god (morning twilight and evening twilight). In the Hesiodic Theogony, he catches his father

---

13 I realize that many scholars would rather indict such scholars as Jean Haudry with a damnatio memoriae but I feel that it is important to make a distinction between an individual’s scholarship, which may be good, and their political or personal choices. When I lived in France, Jean Haudry was the most influential Indo-Europeanist and so I have read many of his works. While I regret and am deeply saddened by his status as a member of the Front National, I feel that he should be given the same treatment as Martin Heidegger and Salvador Dali whose philosophical and artistic merits should not be judged by their political affiliations, howbeit lamentable.

14 In traditional Roman religion, a distinction was also made between Jupiter and Summanus, god of nocturnal thunder.
off guard at nightfall, which corresponds to the liminal period of twilight. The use of a sickle to shear off his father’s testicles manifests the demarcating, separative function of twilight; the shedding of blood the red color of dawn and dusk. Haudry even proposes a Greek etymology for the god’s name in keeping with his foundational act: ὂρος is to the root *ker “to shear” what κλ-όνος “battle-rout” is to the root *kel or θρ-όνος to the root *ther (IE *dher).

From the point of view of Olympian 2, the location of the tower of Cronus in the isle of the Blessed by the river Ocean (ὠκεανίδες, 71) places it in the same outermost zone as the Odyssey’s Aeaean Island, the abode of dawn (and presumably dusk):

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμὸι λίπεν ὄδον Ὀκεανοίοι

υῆς, ἄπο δ’ ὕκετο κύμα θαλάσσης εὐρυπόρω

νήσον τ’ Ἀιαίην, ὅθε τ’ Ἡθος ἤργεινεῖς

οἰκία καὶ χοροὶ εἰσί καὶ άντολαὶ Ἡλιοίοι15

Accordingly, Pindar’s description at 61 of ἴσαις δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεί, ἴσαις δ’ ἀμέραις ἄλλων ἔχοντες, instead of being construed as “a continual equinox” as Race does, could be construed rather as “a continual twilight,” an equal mixture of night and day. For Cronus to have a tower in such a land, as in Olympian 2, or to rule over it, as in the Hesiodic Theogony, would cohere with his primordial identity as “twilight god.”

For the myth of Oedipus, I offer a similar temporal origin whose naturalistic meaning, I contend, was still understood by Pindar and other songwriters. Most modern classicists shy away from explanations grounded in nature and tend to speak of “naturalistic” explanations in a derogatory way. For my part, I am not convinced by the majority’s avoidance of the subject or by their facile skepticism and defend the view that the forces of nature played a significant part in shaping the myths and the narratives of

---

15 Odyssey 12.1-4
the ancient Greeks and other ancient peoples.

After explaining in her book *Splitting the Difference: Gender and Myth in Ancient Greece and India* how the daily setting of the sun became an archetype of mortality in ancient Indian literature, Wendy Doniger goes on to write that "the foot of Yama, like the foot of Oedipus, is the clue to the riddle of old age and death. Yama inherits his lameness as well as his mortality from his father, the Sun."

With his deformed foot, Oedipus, I propose, was originally a solar figure. His father Laius, literally "Left" may also mean "West" because the Greeks prayed to the gods in the direction of the East, so what was “left” automatically meant “western” and what was “right” automatically meant “eastern” (*Iliad* 12.238-240):

...οὐδ’ ἀλεγίζω
eἲτ’ ἐπὶ δεξι’ ἵωσι πρὸς ἕῳ τ’ ἤλιον τε,
eἲτ’ ἐπ’ ἀριστερὰ τοῖ γε ποτὶ ζῴονη ἡρόεντα.

Here, Hector denies to Polydamas the significance of the direction of the flight of birds: the events that follow, however, will give the lie to his secular stance.

Laius himself is the grandson of Nycteis, the daughter of Nycteus “the man of the night.” As the “West,” Laius stands for the darkness of dusk or by extension the darkness of the night. A riddling allusion to Oedipus’ ties to the sun *qua* master of time is perhaps discernible in Sophocles’ *OT* at 1080-1083:

ἐγὼ δ’ ἐμαυτὸν παῖδα τῆς Τύχης νέμων
τῆς εὗ διδούσης οὐκ ἀτιμασθήσομαι.
τῆς γὰρ πέρας μητρὸς: οἱ δὲ συγγενεῖς
μηνές με μικρόν καὶ μέγαν διώρισαν.16

Oedipus’ eventual loss of sight is typical of solar figures. We may compare him with Samson in the Semitic tradition whose name, cognate with *Shamash*, literally means

---

16 I thank Gregory Nagy for point this passage out to me.
of the sun”: the eventual blindness of solar figures is predicated on the polysemy of the word for ‘blind’ in many languages: τυφλός and αἰδής in Greek, caecus in Latin either mean “blind” or “invisible” so to say that the sun is invisible at night amounts to his being blind. For Oedipus to kill his father amounts to saying that the sun “kills” the night in the morning, just as Zeus god of the Day Sky succeeds Cronus god of the twilight.

Immediately comparable typologically with Oedipus in ancient Greek mythology is Orion whose blindness is healed by his walking toward the morning sunlight in the east. Adducing a variety of arguments, notably Orion’s and Oedipus’ common association with the name Merope (the woman Orion attempts to rape / Oedipus’ foster mother), Karl Kerényi suggests that Orion and Oedipus are descended from the same mythological archetype.

The location of Oedipus’ patricide at a crossroads is significant: crossroads were associated with Artemis/Hekate, the multiplicity of whose features stem from her primordial identity as a moon goddess. Jocasta may be analyzed as “the bright moon” (Io- “moon” and –kaste “bright”) or “Solitary Shiner” (ios = alone), which amounts to the same thing. The variant of her name in the Odyssey Epi-kaste “the one shining

---

17 I am told by my friend Sasha Prevost that one of the words for blind in ancient Hebrew alam means “blind” and “secret, concealed.”
20 Carin Green does a great job of explaining how such features as the hunt and crossroads are idiosyncratic of lunar deities in her book The Cult of Diana at Aricia, 2007, Cambridge University Press. The notion that Artemis/Hekate was originally not lunar, despite its popularity among classicists nowadays, is misguided. In Pindar’s Olympian Ode 3, also dedicated to Theron’s victory at Olympia, the only goddesses explicitly associated with equines are the moon (χρυσάρματος/…Μήνα: 19-20) and Artemis (Lambda̱ς ἡπσόσα θυγάτηρ: 26). In an ode in which the goddess’s epithets and bynames are multiplied—at 30, she is referred to as Ὄρθωσία—Pindar most likely subtly implies the identity between the moon in her golden chariot and Leto’s horse-driving daughter.
21 Eustathius of Thessalonike, Commentarium in Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem 92.14-15: Καὶ τὴν ἑκάτερα ἡμέραν Τινην καλοῦσι τινες, ἐνθάδε βοῦς θην ἐν ἀγάλματι τῆς Ἰοῦς, ἤτοι τῆς σελήνης. Ἰο γὰρ ἡ σελήνη κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἀργείων διάλεκτον
above” and the alternative name of the mother of Oedipus’ children Eury-ganeia “shining broadly” seem to corroborate Jocasta’s lunar origins. So the contest between the solar Oedipus and the nocturnal Laius for Jocasta is a contest for the possession of the moon, hence the significance of the crossroads to the fatal patricide. We know from Proclus’ commentary on Hesiod’s Works and Days that at Athens at least a hieros gamos between the Sun and the Moon was a model for weddings between men and women. Laius’ rape of Chrysippus “Golden Horse,” which is sometimes provided as an aetiology for his future doom, may perhaps be construed as the completion the daily cycle: here “darkness rapes the sun in the evening,” in other words darkness follows sunlight (instead of sunlight following darkness). Thus, the prominence of the myths of the three divine generations and Oedipus’ patricide in Olympian 2 gain maximal relevance to the dominant theme of Time in the poem if they arose and were still partly understood as myths inspired from temporal cycles.

45 – Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἄρωγὸν δόμοις. On a literal level, Pindar pays homage to Thersandros, son of Theron’s ancestor Adrastos, whose daughter Theron’s Theban ancestor Polyneices had married. The explicit mention of Theron’s non-Theban ancestor Adrastos may also have an Orphic overtone, however, because the name could have also brought to mind Adrastea, Time’s Orphic consort, which when combined, are the generative cause of everything (Diels & Kranz fr. 54):

ψυκτουμασθαι δὲ Χρόνον ἄγηραιον καὶ Ἡρακλῆα τὸν αὐτὸν. συνεῖναι δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν Ἀνάγκην, φύσις οὐσαντὴν αὐτὴν καὶ Ἀδράστειαν, ἀσώματον διωργιωμένην ἐν παντὶ τοῖς κόσμοι, τῶν περάτων αὐτοῦ ἐφαπτομένην. τωτὴν οίμαι λέγεσθαι τὴν τρίτην ἄρχην κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐπιστῶσαν, πλὴν ὅτι ἄρσενόθηλον αὐτὴν ὑπεστήσατο πρὸς ἐνδείξειν τῆς πάντων γεννητικῆς αὑτίας

its name was Khronos (Unaging Time) and also Herakles. United with it was Ananke (Inevitability, Compulsion), being of the same nature, or Adrastea,
incorporeal, her arms extended throughout the universe and touching its extremities. I think this stands for the third principle, occupying the place of essence, only he [Orpheus] made it bisexual [as Phanes] to symbolize the universal generative cause.  

The collocation in line 45 of Ἀδραστίδαν and ἀρωγόν, which Race aptly translates as “savior” is reminiscent of Χρόνος as σωτήρ in Pindaric fragment 167 ἀνδρῶν δικαίων Χρόνος σωτήρ ἄριστος. Interestingly, the alternative name of Time’s Orphic consort Adrastea, i.e. Necessity (Ἀνάγκη), is also present in Olympian 2 at 60:

τὰ δ’ ἐν τῷ Διός ἀρχῇ
アルバム κατὰ γάς δικάζει τις ἐχθρᾶς
λόγον φράσαις ἀνάγκα.

Necessity here manifests its punitive power in the time and realm after death. What this time and realm are, Pindar does not yet say but his opposing it to “the realm of Zeus here” (ἐν τῷ Διός ἀρχῇ) invites one to posit “the realm of Cronus” made explicit later in the poem at 75-76 in which the judge of the dead Rhadamanthys is seated next to Cronus himself.

48-49 - Ὄλυμπις μὲν γὰρ σὺτὸς / γέρας ἔδεκτο, Πυθώνι δ’ ὀμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεῶν.

Earlier, we suggested that both Olympia and Akragas are subtly equated with archetypes of Greek paradise in strophe and antistrophe A. Here again, the reward Theron receives in Olympia—whose name fittingly derives from Olympus, the abode of the gods—parallels the reward the just will receive in the afterlife. Pindar shows this in his diction with his repeated use of the medio-passive verb δέχομαι: at 49, we find γέρας ἔδεκτο applied to Theron in the here and now, whereas line 62 reads ἐσλοὶ δέκονται βίοτον, applied to the just in the afterlife.

The second important element in this sentence Πυθώνι δ’ ὀμόκλαρον ἐς
ἀδελφεόν contains a reference to Theron’s brother’s victories at other athletic venues, Delphi and the Isthmus. Doing so fits into the poem in a number of ways. First, it acts as a positive foil and forms a diptych with the brothers Eteocles and Polyneices alluded to in the previous stanza: the happy fortunes of the brothers Theron and Xenocrates in contrast with the unhappy fortune of their fratricidal ancestor Polyneices illustrates Pindar’s enunciated principle παλιντράπελον ἄλλῳ χρόνῳ (37).

50-51 - τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων / ἄγαγον. This is Pindar’s second specification in the ode that the victories in question are with the four-horse chariot: already at line 5, the poet already specified τετραορίας. I would now like to suggest that the four-horse chariot had a special affinity with the horses of the sun; this is not to say that two-horse chariots could not also be solar (they were), or any other number for that matter: all horses were linked more or less with the horses of the sun. I would posit that the reason why a four-horse chariot was perceived as more “solar” than a two-horse chariot is because it was a greater feat to drive a four-horse chariot than a two-horse chariot and, since the model of the ideal and most skillful charioteer was the Sun, the mastery of the relatively rare but well-known four-horse chariot reminded viewers of the Sun’s own mastery of his horses.

To build my case, we must take a look at four-horse chariots in archaic and classical Greek literature and elsewhere (I insist, however, that alternative examples of two-horse solar chariots are not counterexamples but merely multiforms, depending on how one idealizes charioteering). To begin with the ode itself, the very fact that the four-horse chariot race required twelve laps, as explicitly stated by Pindar (51), presents a solar element: it is very difficult to imagine how the ancient Greeks could not have connected
in their minds the twelve laps of a horse race with the twelve months of the year. In the *Odyssey*, the only reference to a four-horse chariot is when Odysseus achieves his *nostos at dawn* in the ship of the Phaeacians to which it is compared: clearly, the Phaeacian ship likened to a four-horse chariot is likened to the nocturnal boat of the sun, of which Mimnermus and archaic vase paintings are aware. In the classical period, the Parthenon pediment at Athens shows the sun drawn by four horses.23

Unexplained in the *Iliad* is the very number of horses Hektor manages to drive: *four* (*Iliad* 8.185). Looking outside of the *Iliad*, Philostratos remarks upon the uniqueness of Hektor’s ability to keep four horses under control, which he says “no other hero could do” (*Heroikos* 19.2). The *Iliad* seldom speaks of Hektor’s *four* horses but their names are revealed outside the context of this scene at 8.185:


\[\Xi\alpha\nu\theta\varepsilon\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \Pi\delta\alpha\rho\gamma\varepsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \A\i\theta\omega\nu\ \Lambda\alpha\mu\pi\varepsilon\ \tau\epsilon\ \delta\acute{i}\eta.\]

As one reads this line, one is struck by the latter two: Lampos is also one of the horses of *Dawn*24 and Aithon “Blazing” is one of the four horses of *the Sun*25. As for Xanthos and Podargos, one cannot fail to be reminded of the horses of Akhilleus: Xanthos (‘Golden’) is also the name of one of Akhilleus’ immortal horses and Podargos (‘Quick/Bright-footed’) is the masculine of *Podarge*, who is the mother of Akhilleus’ immortal horses: she conceived Xanthos and Balios by the mythical *stream of the river Ocean* (παρὰ ῥόον Ὀκεανοῖο) where the sun rises and sets. According to a *uaria lectio*

---

23 Savignoni 1899: 271.

24 *Odyssey* 23.246.

25 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 2.153-4 (the other three horses being Eous and Phlegon).
pointed out by Nagy, *Eridanoio*—the setting of Phaethon’s crash—substitutes for *Okeanoio* at 16.151 as the location where Akhilleus’ immortal horses were conceived.

The Rhodians precipitated *four* horses and a chariot into the sea as a dedication to the Sun; in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*, the Ethiopians are about to sacrifice a team of *four* white horses to the Sun (9.28); the chariot of king Latinus—*Sol*’s grandson around whose head gleams a halo of *twelve* rays—is the only chariot described in the *Aeneid* as being pulled by *four* horses (12.160). Outside of the Greco-Roman world, in Scythia and in areas dominated by related Iranian tribes, the same connection between the sun and *four*-horse chariots is made. As far as India, “we know that the earliest Surya icon carved in stone comes from a Bodhgaya rail belonging to about the first century BC, showing the deity seated on a chariot drawn by four horses.”

While no other living hero than Hektor in the *Iliad* ever drives a team of *four* horses, Nestor tells a story couched in a riddle in which the solar symbolism of a team of *four* horses shines through (*Iliad* 11.697-702):

```
ἐκ δ’ ο’ γέρων ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶν μέγ’ οίων
εἰλετο κρινάμενος τρικόσι’ ἡδε νομής.
καὶ γὰρ τῷ τρεῖος μέγ’ ὀφείλετ’ ἐν Ἑλιοδί δή
τέσσαρες ἀθλοφόροι ὑποὶ αὐτοίςιν ὕψων
ἐλθόντες μετ’ ἄεθλα· περὶ τρίποδος γὰρ ἐμέλλον
θεύσεσθαι· τοὺς δ’ αὖθὶ ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αὔγειας.
```

26 Holm & Clark 1911: 489.
29 On *Iliad* 15.679-685 where Aias is compared to an extraordinarily skilled man riding a team of *four* horses, see “The first victim of Aias.”
κάσχεθε, τὸν δ’ ἐλατηρίφει ἀκαχήμενον ἵππον.

The old man seized a herd of cows and a big flock of sheep, choosing three hundred for himself as well as the cowherds and shepherds. For a great debt was owed to him in bright Elis, four prize-winning horses with their chariot which had gone to the games, for they were to run for the tripod. But Sunlightias30 the lord of men withheld them and sent their driver away grieving for his horses.

In my modified translation of Lang’s original, I departed from the translator’s rendition of αὐτοῖσιν δρεποιν as “with their chariots” in the plural but rather emended it to the singular “with their chariot,” following the Liddell & Scott entry ὄχος “carriage, used by Hom. in heterocl. neut. pl. ὄχεα, even of a single chariot, ‘ἐξ ὄχεον’ Il.4.419, etc. (so Pi.O.4.13, P.9.11), and in poet. dat. ὄχεσφι, -σφι, σὺν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφι’ Il.4.297, cf. 5.28, 107.”

Neleus appropriates 300 cows and sheep plus an unspecified number of cowherds and shepherds, in compensation for the four horses and their chariots which “Sunlightias” the lord of men was supposed to have given him for presumably winning the race. Because the four horses are worth the number of days in the annual cycle of the sun31 and because they remain in the possession of Sunlight-ias (Ἀู่γε-ιας), the solar symbolism of the four horses can be inferred.

To go back to Olympian 2, the solar implications detectable in this stanza (τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων) continue in epode B that follows, in which Pindar compares “the wealth embroidered with virtues” (53) gained from the completion of the twelve laps at the four-horse chariot race to “a conspicuous star, the truest light for man” (ἀστὴρ

30 Augeias = Auge + name suffix –ias (cf Aine-ias) is the son of the Sun according to Apollonios Argonautika 1.172 and Apollodorus 2.5. In the Liddell & Scott, the first translation for the base noun auge is “light of the sun.”
31 For a comparable use of equalizing the number of animals with the number of days in the year, cf. Eumaios in the possession of 360 male pigs (Odyssey 14.20).
ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατον ανδρὶ φέγγος: 55-56). The imagery is further concretized when at last in strophe Δ the largest star in an otherworldly sky, the Sun, appears (ἁλιον ἔχοντες).

52-53 - τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν / περόμενον ἁγιοίας δυσφρονήν παραλύει. Pindar here rephrases what he articulated in antistrophe B whereby our “completion of the child of the sun” is no guarantee against the advent of “streams of pains.” Here, Pindar focuses on the fate of the one who succeeds at athletic events, i.e. release from anxieties. Implicitly, the majority who lose are not released from anxieties.

67 - τοὶ ὁ ἀπροσόρατον ὅχεοντι πόνον. Noteworthy is the similar etymological semantics of ἀπροσόρατον “which cannot be seen” and Αἰδής “sightless.” Pindar may be indulging in a paronomasia.

69 - μείναντες. The implication, again, is that suffering unconnected to sin may be experienced. If such is the case, however, one will be rewarded in the afterlife.

70 - ἔτειλαν Διὸς ὅδὸν. The notion of ‘completion’ is important in Olympian 2. The same root occurs at 33, τελευτάσομεν in reference to the completion of our tasks at the end of the day; at 40, τέλεσσεν in reference to the completion of the Pytho’s oracles; τέλος at 17 in reference to Time’s inability to undo the effect or result of what has been done. Conversely, ἄκραντα γαρυῖτον “chatter with no accomplishment” at 80 betrays the thematization of ‘completion’ or lack thereof in Olympian 2.

72-73 - ὥκεανίδες / αὐραὶ περιπνέοισιν. As in the Odyssey, one of the characteristics of Greek paradises is the presence of the wind, which is fitting in light of the semantic inseparability of the wind from the notion of breath and life. Conversely, Tartarus in
Iliad 8.480-481 is characterized by the absence of wind: ἴμενοι οὐτ’ αὐγής Ἰππέριονος Ἡλίοιο / τέρποντ’ οὐτ’ ἀνέμοισι, βαθὺς δὲ τε Τάρταρος ἀμφίς.

Epode Δ - The stanza almost begins with πατήρ (76) and ends with µάτηρ (80). The πατήρ is Cronus and technically the µάτηρ is Thetis but Pindar seems to fuse the identities of Rhea and Thetis so that the µάτηρ could also be Rhea in a way. In Alcman 5, fr. 2, col. ii PMG, Thetis is the goddess of creation that organizes and gives shape to matter. As the mother of the Olympian Gods endowed with “the highest throne of all” (77), Rhea and Thetis have obvious affinities. In Olympian 2.35, her apparent etymologization as ‘flow’, ‘flux’ (ῥοαί) further tightens her bond with Thetis, goddess of the sea.

83 - πολλά μοι ὑπ’ / ἀγκώνος ώκέα βέλη / ἐνδον ἐντί φαρέτρας. Pindar’s self-assimilation to an archer serves a number of purposes, one of which may be inferred from its immediate juxtaposition to Achilles’ laying low of Hector, Cycnus and Memnon. From a linear standpoint, one is inclined to think of Achilles’ own death by Apollo and/or Paris, which follows the death of the son of Dawn. The identities of the Theban Pindar and Trojan Paris temporarily overlap, paralleling the poet’s earlier emphasis on the links between Theron, Thebes and Troy: for a moment, one is tempted to think that the poet takes up the cause of Theron and Troy and shoots the arrow that kills Achilles and avenge the deaths of Hector, Cycnus and Memnon. But Pindar skillfully uses his self-assimilation to the archer Paris to change the topic and engage in a polemic with what appears to be poetic rivals. At 91 and following, Pindar further subverts the contextually lethal connotations of his archery and invests it with a positive meaning as he aims his bow, now clearly of praise, at Akragas and Theron.
Pindar’s pledge of telling the truth in his encomium of Theron speaks to his earlier statement at 66 that those who abide by their oaths will enjoy the company of the gods in the afterlife (ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν τιμίους θεῶν οἴτινες ἔχαρον εὔροκίαις ἄδακρυν νέμονται). Thus, if Pindar’s praise of Theron is true, they may both qualify for the tower of Cronus in the afterlife. But here again, there is no need to wait, because the Emmenidas is actively turning his Akragas into an isle of the Blessed of the here and now with his victories and munificence: the poet ascribes to the laudandus’ hand the epithet ἀφθονέστερόν (94), applied in traditional Greek epic to the paradisiacal lands of bounty.

That no one has surpassed Theron in his munificence in a hundred years serves the dual purpose of stressing the uniqueness of the laudandus and highlighting the significance of time in the poem.
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