

# HIERON AGONISTES OR THE MASKS OF THE TYRANT

NINO LURAGHI

*L.E. Rossi  
in memoriam*

Especially during the late archaic period, Greek tyrants seem to have been enthusiasts of agonistic events, with a clear and consistent preference for the hippic competitions. Victories in the chariot races at the Panhellenic games are documented for a good number of tyrants from mainland Greece<sup>1</sup>, but of course, the most impressive evidence for this phenomenon is represented by the odes written by Pindar and Bacchylides in celebration of the victories of the tyrants of Syracuse and Akragas in hippic events at the Panhellenic games<sup>2</sup>. Because of the very high cost and total uselessness of racehorses, the horse and chariot races were reserved to the wealthiest among the Greek upper class<sup>3</sup>. For tyrants, this sort of event presented one additional advantage

\* This paper brings together and develops some observations that were sketched in LURAGHI 1994, complementing them with new ones and updating them in the light of new research. An early version of it was presented in Luigi Enrico Rossi's seminar, and more recently in Princeton. My sincere thanks go to all three audiences, and to Dr. Gianpaolo Urso for organizing the conference in Cividale and overseeing the publication of the proceedings with courteous efficiency. Immediately before submission, my colleague Andrew Ford has offered invaluable support in the form of corrections and suggestions. His keen eye has saved me from many an infelicity in style and substance. Scholarship on Pindar is endless, and any attempt at comprehensiveness in the footnotes would be self-defeating. Accordingly, references are kept to a minimum, and the commentaries to Pindar and Bacchylides are presupposed rather than quoted, with few motivated exceptions. All dates are intended BCE unless otherwise specified. This contribution is a very modest tribute to the memory of a distinguished scholar and an exquisite gentleman.

<sup>1</sup> Apart from the Western Greek tyrants, the list includes Myron of Sikyon (Olympics of 648, Paus. 6,19,1-2), Kleisthenes of Sikyon (Pythian games of 582, Olympics of 572; Paus. 10,7,6-7 and Hdt. 6,126 respectively), possibly Periander of Corinth (Olympics, date uncertain; Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 18), and Peisistratos (victory ceded by Kimon Koalemos, Hdt. 6,103). Note also the victory of Gelon, still tyrant of Gela, with the chariot at the Olympics of 488 (Paus. 6,9,4). On archaic tyrants and agonistic competitions, see CATENACCI 1992.

<sup>2</sup> For a full list of odes, preserved and fragmentary, and with certain or tentative dates, see CATENACCI 2006, 197. Documented victories of the Deinomenidai and their acolytes are listed in BONANNO 2010, 185-186, with references to the relevant evidence.

<sup>3</sup> Note the revealing terminology of Herodotus: the family of Miltiades the Elder was an οἰκίη τεθριπποτρόφος (6,35).

over athletic competitions. For them, it would have been extremely problematic to take a break from their despotic activities in order to train for the games, let alone to travel to the Panhellenic sanctuaries in order to participate, thereby offering their fellow-citizen an attractive occasion to overthrow their rule. Tyrants therefore preferred specialties that did not require their personal presence, as was the case with horse and chariot races, in which the competitors, the people whose names were proclaimed in case of victory, were the owners of the horses, and the jockeys or the charioteers played a rather secondary role, being usually professionals hired for the purpose.

In their participation in competitions, as in other aspects of their public persona, we can observe the complex and ambiguous relationship of tyrants with the competitive ethos that defined Greek social elites, encapsulated by the Homeric imperative αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπέροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων, an ethos of which tyranny was the ultimate, repressed, and logical consequence<sup>4</sup>. The archaic tyrant appears to have behaved as a sort of professional aristocrat<sup>5</sup>, engaging in a systematic and organized fashion into all the leisure activities that marked elite lifestyle in archaic Greece. In this perspective, his attitude to competitions appears to have been similar to his attitude to lyric poetry. It has often been remarked that tyranny seems to have encouraged the emergence of professional poets that can be observed in Greek literature from the second half of the sixth century<sup>6</sup>. The tyrant's symposion is precisely the environment where we see in action characters like Anakreon, surely an aristocrat and a poet, but probably, more of a poet and less of a politically self-conscious and engaged aristocrat than somebody like e.g. Alkaios. Symptotic poetry, a necessary feature of the aristocratic symposion, was organized by the tyrant through recourse to professionals, and by the same token, when it came to competitions the tyrant did not leave anything to chance. Rather than entering the arena, he invested heavily in horses and jockeys, taking advantage of his position of economic superiority with respect to any competitor – and once the victory had been achieved, he invested in victory odes, commissioning the best poets of the day, and in lavish victory monuments<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> On tyranny as an expression of the competition for power within the elite, see especially HEUSS 1946, followed most notably by STAHL 1987; DE LIBERO 1996; STEIN-HÖLKESKAMP 2009. On the ethos of archaic Greek elites as articulated in archaic poetry, FRÄNKEL 1969 and ADKINS 1972 are two classics; for a more explicitly sociological approach, see DUPLOUY 2006, who also integrates the archaeological evidence in a very persuasive and helpful way.

<sup>5</sup> Note the perceptive comments in KURKE 1999, 131-132 on the Deinomenidai as hyperaristocrats.

<sup>6</sup> See WEBER 1992, 42-51.

<sup>7</sup> In this, too, the Syracusan tyrants excelled: their dedications include two bronze chariots dedicated at Olympia by Gelon and by Deinomenes, Hieron's son, respectively (Paus. 6,9,4 and 12,1), and the monument of which the Delphic charioteer was part; see SMITH 2007, 124-130. In general, for an overview of Western Greek presence in the Panhellenic sanctuaries see ANTONACCIO 2007.

The choice to compete on equal footing with the cream of Greek social elite expresses the tyrant's wish to be seen (also) as an excellent member of this group. The magic *kleos* that shines on the victorious athlete was obviously a very attractive commodity for a tyrant, who wielded a de facto power, tied exclusively to his person, without a constitutional framework, a power that could legitimize itself only in charismatic terms<sup>8</sup>. At the same time, donning the robe of the victorious competitor was a tricky proposition for a tyrant. For a victorious athlete, victory translated itself into symbolic capital to be used typically in the competition for status and power within the city<sup>9</sup>. The tyrant was the man who had reaped the ultimate success in such competition, overpowering all the other players and thereby bringing the game to a standstill. He had already seized the first prize in the most important *agôn*. In his case, a Panhellenic victory could only be a confirmation, not a revelation.

The complex functioning of the self-representation of the agonist-tyrant can be observed in the best way by comparing victory odes for tyrants and for non-tyrannical victors. If it is correct to regard victory odes as, among other things, the script of a social ritual that reintegrated the victor into the community of the polis, renegotiating their reciprocal relationship in light of the new situation created by his agonistic success<sup>10</sup>, we should expect a priori odes for tyrants to show peculiarities, since the position of the tyrant vis-à-vis the citizen body could not be equated to that of even the most successful among its members. Indeed, peculiarities of various sorts have often been pointed out by scholars. In his book on athletes and the polis, Christian Mann shows that the connection between the laudandus and heroic models evoked in the odes is much more direct, closer, and personal when the victor was a tyrant. In other words, victory odes for tyrants were much more explicit in claiming heroic status for their patrons<sup>11</sup>. In a similar vein, Andrew Morrison, in an investigation of the audiences and performance contexts of Pindar's Sicilian odes, has pointed to the very high frequency, in odes for Hieron and Theron or in praise for Hieron and Theron in odes for related people, of the kind of praise that he, following William Race, calls 'superlative vaunts,' that is, praise that extols the laudandus by suggesting matchless excellence, thereby implic-

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of the legitimation of archaic tyranny from the point of view of Max Weber's sociology of rule, see MANN 2001, 284-288 (more briefly already MANN 2000, 38). Even from this perspective, the boundary between tyrant and aristocrat remained ambiguous, considering that the ideology of elite excellence was itself marked by a strong charismatic element; see SLATER 2001.

<sup>9</sup> On the sociology of athletic victory in archaic and early classical Greece, see MANN 2001. On the *kleos* of the victorious athlete, KURKE 1991 is a classic.

<sup>10</sup> On this function of epinician poetry, see especially KURKE 1991 and the recent discussion of the underlying social dynamics by THOMAS 2007.

<sup>11</sup> See MANN 2001, 253-281. Notice the very similar conclusions reached by STENGER 2004, 275-288 in his analysis of the use of *gnômai* in Bacchylides.

itly elevating him above the whole of his fellow-citizens<sup>12</sup>.

However, in victory odes the exceptional political position of the tyrant was not addressed only on this implicit way. Right on the surface of the text, the poets in some cases referred explicitly to the position of political supremacy of the tyrannical *laudandus*. Here, however, we are confronted with a dichotomy we would not necessarily have expected a priori. Victory odes for tyrants show two diverging options: the *laudandus* can be depicted according to the traditional aristocratic values, as brave, wise, and of course generous, as the most *aristos* of all *aristoi* in his city, as it were, with generous recourse to superlative vaunt, or he can be addressed as a ruler, who to be sure is provided in the highest degree of all the virtues just mentioned, but on top of that wields personal power within the political community. The first option appears in the odes for the tyrant Theron of Akragas and for members of his family, the Emmenidai, the second in the odes for Hieron of Syracuse and for people of his court. The consistency between Pindar and Bacchylides, when they write for the same patron, shows, in case we had doubts, that what is being reflected is the patron's will, not the poet's choice<sup>13</sup>.

The Emmenidai of Akragas<sup>14</sup> are celebrated in four victory odes, all by Pindar. Olympians II and III refer to Theron's victory at the Olympics of 476, while the earlier Pythian VI celebrated the victory of Xenokrates, Theron's brother, at the Pythian games of 490. Finally, Isthmian II, commissioned by Xenokrates' son Thrasyboulos, appears to celebrate retrospectively Xenokrates' victory at the Isthmian games sometime between 490 and 476. The original ode for this victory had apparently been composed by Simonides. All the victories were won in the chariot race. Furthermore, Pindar also composed two *encomia*, probably meant for performance in a sympotic context, for Theron and for his nephew Thrasyboulos, the former possibly in 476, the latter around 490<sup>15</sup>.

The most explicit statement of Theron's role in Akragas, the words that most strongly suggest the suspicion that he was not just an excellent citizen among citizens, come at the beginning of the most grandiose of the odes Pindar wrote for him, Olympian II (5-8):

<sup>12</sup> See MORRISON 2007, 33-34; 52; 84-87; building on Bundy's terminology, RACE 1987, 137-139 calls a vaunt 'a summary evaluation by which an author attests to the superlative quality of his subject.' Similar observations in CATENACCI 2006, 184.

<sup>13</sup> On this point, in general, see MANN 2000 and, among the most recent scholarship, FEARN 2007, 21; VAN DEN GROENENDAL 2010.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed discussion, see LURAGHI 1994, 231-272.

<sup>15</sup> For a catalogue of Pindar's Akragantine odes and for the possible chronology of the two *encomia*, see CATENACCI 2006, 181.

Θήρωνα δὲ τετρα<αο>ρίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου  
 γεγωνητέον, ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων,  
 ἔρεισμ' Ἀκράγαντος,  
 εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολι·

But (*scil.* among men) Theron must be celebrated because of his victorious four-horse chariot, a man just with guest-friends, a bulwark for Akragas, the best city-securing offspring of glorious fathers.

The keyword of the praise, ὀρθόπολις, appears only here in Greek literature, and otherwise only in inscriptions. A honorary epigram from Termessos in Pisidia (*TAM* III 127), dating to the second or third century CE, includes it in a series of highly literary epithets, many of which are quite rare and may well derive from Pindar, too. More interestingly, ὀρθόπολις appears as the name of an Athenian battleship from the age of Alexander the Great (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1631 line 646). Surely Theron's role of 'keeping upright' or 'keeping straight' the polis does suggest his political supremacy, but in a rather benign way. For the rest, the excellence of the Emmenidai is articulated in conventional, if occasionally superlative<sup>16</sup>, terms. In the same Olympian II Pindar assures his audience that in a hundred years, that is, ever since being founded, Akragas had not given birth to a man more benevolent in his mind or more generous with his hand than Theron (101-104). In Olympian III, written for the same victory and possibly destined for performance in a ritual worshipping the Dioskouroi<sup>17</sup>, we learn that Theron and the Emmenidai have been granted *kudos* precisely by the Dioskouroi in reward for the worship they paid to them (38-41). Then the praise of Theron appears embedded in a typical Pindaric priamel: if water is best and gold is the most honored of all possessions, now Theron reaches the farthest point by virtue of his own native excellence and touches the pillars of Heracles, beyond which nobody can go (*Ol.* 3,42-44).

Pindar's two odes for Xenokrates' victories fall before the beginning and possibly after the end of Theron's tyranny at Akragas, and yet, they are hardly different from Olympians II and III. All four odes celebrate the members of the family of the Emmenidai, among whom Theron clearly occupies the most prominent position, as witnessed by the fact that he appears in Pythian VI, for his brother Xenokrates, and indirectly also in Isthmian II<sup>18</sup>. This is in itself a very noteworthy fact, to be sure: appearances in odes dedicated to others are confined to relatives who have themselves won in stephanite games, which

<sup>16</sup> See Pind. *Ol.* 2,93-95 with MORRISON 2007, 52.

<sup>17</sup> According to the theory of KRUMMEN 1990, 217-241; see now MORRISON 2007, 53-57.

<sup>18</sup> LURAGHI 1994, 166.

was not the case for Theron at the time of Pythian VI<sup>19</sup>. Otherwise, the wisdom and excellence of Xenokrates is praised, it is made clear that he was held in high esteem by his fellow-citizens, but on the whole, nothing is said of him that could not be said about any other victor.

As anticipated, the situation is completely different in the odes for Hieron<sup>20</sup>. Needless to say, references to the code of values of late-archaic social elites are no less frequent than in the Akragantine odes, and Hieron's excellence and generosity are praised extensively, but the terminology applied to Hieron makes it clear that he is not just your usual excellent citizen. Right at the beginning of the first datable ode for Hieron, Bacchylides' Epinician V<sup>21</sup>, celebrating the victory of the horse Pherenikos at Olympia in 476, Hieron is invoked as Εὖμοιρε Συρακοσίων ἵπποδιήτων στραταγέ, that is, something like 'fortunate in your fate, general of the Syracusans, riders of whirling horses'<sup>22</sup>, while for Pindar, who celebrated the same victory in his Olympian I, Hieron is the Συρακόσιος ἵπποχάρμας βασιλεύς, the 'Syracusan horse-loving<sup>23</sup> *basileus*' (23), the man who θεμιστεῖον ἀμφέπει σκᾶπτρον ἐν πολυμήλῳ Σικελίᾳ, that is, 'who wields the scepter of justice in flock-rich Sicily' (12-13). Let us remind ourselves that the scepter is a straightforward attribute of divine or heroic monarchy: it belonged to Homeric *basileis*, and Pindar and Bacchylides attribute it to Zeus, Hestia, Tlepolemos, and Pelias (the latter actually wields in Iolkos the scepter that should have gone to Jason by right of inheritance)<sup>24</sup>. Together with the insistent use of *basileus* referred to Hieron, it forms part of a terminological complex that suggests an assimilation of the Syracusan ruler to Homeric kings<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Exceptions to this rule include Hieron, on whom see below, and two cases of people who are thought to have sponsored odes for someone else, the Aleuadai of Larissa (Pythian X, celebrating Hippokles of Pelinna) and Damophilos of Cyrene (Pythian IV, for king Arkesilas of Cyrene). On the Aleuadai, see below n. 43.

<sup>20</sup> On all aspects of Hieron's life and afterlife, see now BONANNO 2010, with full references to evidence and scholarship.

<sup>21</sup> For an introduction to this ode, its chronology and occasion, see now CAIRNS 2010, 75-92.

<sup>22</sup> Notice the vocative: Epinician V opens with lines that read like a hymn to Hieron, a rare feature on which see the comments of CAIRNS 2010, 82.

<sup>23</sup> More likely than 'fighting with horses,' the other possible translation of ἵπποχάρμας; see GERBER 1982, 49.

<sup>24</sup> Since according to Homer the *themistes* were given by Zeus to the kings, Pindar's statement essentially represents Hieron's power as divinely ordained; see GERBER 1982, 32-33. For a discussion of the symbolical meaning of the scepter in Homer, see VAN WEES 1992, 274-280. On the possible implications of the reference to Sicily in this passage, see below, p. 42 and n. 56.

<sup>25</sup> On kingship in Homer, see especially the comprehensive discussion of the evidence in CARLIER 1984, 137-230; on Pindar casting Hieron as a Homeric *basileus* with the references to the scepter and the *themistes*, see HARRELL 2002, 441-442.

All the odes for Hieron repeat this concept with variations in the terminology. In Pythian II, not earlier than 477/6 and celebrating a victory with the chariot in an unidentified competition,<sup>26</sup> Hieron is called indirectly βασιλεύς (13-14), and directly πρύταις κύριος πολλῶν εὐστεφάνων ἀγυιῶν καὶ στρατοῦ, that is, 'lord and master of many streets crowned by fine battlements and of a host of men' (58). *Prytanis*, a word of Anatolian origin, indicated the supreme magistrate in various Greek cities, and appears as an attribute of gods in poetry: of Poseidon in Stesichoros (PMG 235), of Zeus in Pindar (*Pyth.* 6,24) and in tragedy<sup>27</sup>. In Bacchylides (19,43), Epaphos is the *prytanis* of the Egyptians. In other words, even more unambiguously than *basileus*, the term carries associations of heroic or divine rulership<sup>28</sup>. In mysterious Pythian III, an ode written for an unknown occasion whose very presence among the epinicia is puzzling<sup>29</sup>, the only clear-cut thing is the depiction of Hieron as a ruler: he is the one who Συρακόσσαισι νέμει βασιλεύς, πραῦς ἀστοῖς, οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖς, ξείνοις δὲ θαυμαστός πατήρ (70-71), 'who rules as a *basileus* over Syracuse, gentle to the citizens, not begrudging to the *agathoi*<sup>30</sup>, and a venerable father for *xenoi*.' Further variations appear in the two odes that celebrated Hieron's victory with the chariot at the Pythian games of 470, Pindar's grandiose Pythian I<sup>31</sup> and Bacchylides' short Epinician IV. At the beginning of the latter, Hieron is called ἀστύθεμις (2), something like 'just ruler of the city,' while Pythian I, after some complicated allusions to Spartan kingship which will be discussed more in detail below, calls Hieron ἀγητῆρ ἀνήρ (69), a leader, whose task it is δᾶμον γεραίρων τρέπειν σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν (70-71), i.e., honoring the people, or more precisely, granting the people the *geras* that is due to it, to turn it to harmonious peace. A few lines later, in a reference to the battle of Kyme of 474, Hieron is called Συρακοσίων ἀρχός (73), with a rare word of transparent etymology, used in the *Iliad* as synonymous with *basileus* (1,144) and by Pindar himself as an epithet of heroes<sup>32</sup>. Finally, in

<sup>26</sup> Both the chronology of Pythian II and the event it celebrated are controversial. For an early date, which I find more persuasive, and a connection with games in Thebes, see MOST 1985, 61-68 and CURRIE 2005, 258-259, who proposes an interesting textual emendation that would solve the problem of the location of the event in favor of Thebes. For a late date, around 470, see CINGANO 1995, 43-47.

<sup>27</sup> See Chantraine s.v.

<sup>28</sup> See CATENACCI 2006, 187.

<sup>29</sup> See CURRIE 2005, 344-345 and MORRISON 2007, 97-98 with further references.

<sup>30</sup> Here Pindar is reversing a topos of anti-tyrannical discourse, the envy of the tyrant for the 'best' among the citizens; see e.g. Hdt. 3,80,4.

<sup>31</sup> In general, on Pythian I as a manifesto of Hieron's propaganda see PFEIFFER 2005.

<sup>32</sup> On the meaning of the word, see M. Schmidt, *LfgRE* s.v. In this passage, Pindar strikingly depicted Hieron as if the latter had single-handedly defeated the Etruscan fleet (note especially line 74). In the famous comparison of Western and Mainland Greek victories over the barbarian (lines 73-80), Salamis is attributed to the Athenians and Plataia to the Spartans, while Himera is attributed to the Deinomenidai and Kyme to Hieron alone. On the battle of Kyme, see BONANNO 2010, 159-172.

Bacchylides' Epinician III, that celebrates the most prestigious of Hieron's agonistic victories, with the chariot at the Olympic games of 468, the ruler of Syracuse is the man *παρὰ Ζηνὸς λαχὼν πλείσταρχον Ἑλλάνων γέρας* (11-12), i.e., the man who has received from Zeus as his due the greatest rule among the Greeks<sup>33</sup>, and further on Hieron's attribute is the *σκᾶπτρ[ο]ν Διό[ς]* (70), the scepter of Zeus, no less. Noteworthy is also the fact that the same terminology accompanies Hieron in an ode written for a member of his court. In Olympian VI, for the victory of the Iamid Agesias of Syracuse in the mule cart race at Olympia, between 476 and 468, Hieron is described as the man who in Syracuse *καθαρῶ σκάπτω διέπει* (94), that is, rules with a pure scepter<sup>34</sup>.

In one case, in Pythian III (84-86), Hieron is qualified with the epithet we are most used to attach to him:

τὴν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἔπεται.  
λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρκεται,  
εἴ τιν' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγας πότμος.

Your share of happiness attends you, for truly if great destiny looks with favor upon any man, it is upon a tyrant leader of warriors.

Reading these lines, scholars have often concluded that Pindar called Hieron indifferently *basileus* and *tyrannos*, or even that he used the two words interchangeably and did not perceive any negative meaning attached to the word *tyrannos*. Surely this would be a rather hasty conclusion: after all, Hieron is called *basileus*, by both Pindar and Bacchylides, many times, and *tyrannos* only once. Furthermore, it is not irrelevant that in these lines *tyrannos* is modified by the rare term *lagetas*. *Lagetas* is Dorian word, with Mycenaean resonances: the *ra-wa-ke-ta* seems to have been the military commander, second in line after the *wa-na-ka*, in Mycenaean kingdoms<sup>35</sup>. Closer in time, *lagetai* appears in Ibykos as an attribute of the Dioskouroi (S 166,16), and in

<sup>33</sup> Bacchylides' words resonate in the apostrophe of the Greek ambassadors to Gelon in Hdt. 7,157,2.

<sup>34</sup> Nemeans I and IX, written for Chromios, a Geloan who had come to Syracuse with the Deinomenidai and went on to become one of Hieron's lieutenants (see LURAGHI 1994, 338-340), are packed with unmistakable resonances of the odes for Hieron (see MORRISON 2007, 24-39; 102-104), but the tyrant never appears directly. MORRISON 2007, 32; 76-78; 106 notices striking resemblances between Olympian VI and the odes for Chronios.

<sup>35</sup> On Mycenaean terms for rulers, see PALAIMA 2006 with further references. In a Phrygian rock inscription from the seventh or sixth century, *lawaktas* is an attribute of Midas; see BRIXHE - LEJEUNE 1984, text M-01.

Pindar characterizes Aiolos (*Pyth.* 4,107), Perseus (*Pyth.* 10,31), and the sons of Pelops (*Ol.* 1,89). *Laetas* is clearly a name for heroic leaders, an equivalent of sorts for choral lyric of epic formulaic epithets like *poimên laôn*, which in Homer indicate the *basileis*: yet another word of the sort of *prytanis* and *archos*. Therefore, rather than conclude that Pindar was indifferent to the negative undertones of the word *tyrannos*, we should probably see in these lines an isolated attempt at whitewashing the word transplanting it into the semantic sphere of epic heroes.

If we look for comparisons among Pindar's odes, only Pythians IV and V, celebrating the victory of Arkesilas, king of Cyrene, in the chariot race at Delphi in 466 show a somewhat similar vocabulary<sup>36</sup>. The analogy has led some scholars to the conclusion that the Deinomenidai of Syracuse, Hieron and his brother Gelon before him, had transformed their autocracy in a real monarchy<sup>37</sup>. In this theory, Hieron's propaganda has won its last victory. The fact of the matter is that archaic tyranny was rule de facto, without a constitutional framework. The tyrant suffered under a permanent deficit of legitimacy, and for this reason he constantly tried to depict his power in more appealing ways. However, to turn his unlimited but chronically unstable rule into some constitutional form was not a real option, especially because of the endemic refusal of monarchy that characterizes the political culture of the *polis*. As a matter of fact, the diverse and creative terminology, rich in connotations but denotatively unclear, that Bacchylides and Pindar apply to Hieron does not suggest a well-defined institutional position, and the very comparison with the odes for Arkesilas shows this, suggesting one further observation of some interest. In his case, Pindar uses none of the rich vocabulary of power that we find associated with Hieron. Arkesilas is invariably a *basileus* of Cyrene, as are his ancestors all the way back to Battos Aristoteles, the founder of the city (*Pyth.* 4,2; 5,15; on Battos, *Pyth.* 4,62; on the ancestors, 5,96-97). On the other hand, in odes for Hieron there is not a hint of the dynastic legitimacy that is showcased in those for Arkesilas. Whatever Pindar's Hieron was supposed to be, he was not the successor of another ruler of the same sort. Genealogical memory in the odes never goes beyond the name of his father, who however is nothing more than a name. This is a point that we will need to return to later.

From the passages discussed so far, two uncontroversial conclusions can be derived. First, victory odes do indeed reflect the specific political position of the laudandus. Second, it was clearly the tyrant himself who decided whether

<sup>36</sup> For a comparison between odes for Arkesilas and odes for Hieron, see HARRELL 2002, 448.

<sup>37</sup> Formulated most explicitly by OOST 1976.

and how his power was to be addressed in the ode. This second point may seem obvious to some, but it is worth stressing, considering a persistent tendency in research on epinicia to underestimate the input of the patron. Based on these conclusions, attention will now turn to selected passages from the odes for Hieron that seem to offer further evidence on the representation of tyrannical power. In these passages, tyranny is defined indirectly, by suggesting analogies with other forms of power that function as implicit interpretive models for it: the masks of the title of this contribution. Such models have one interesting point in common: they are all drawn not from the world of myth, but from a historical and institutional reality that was clearly familiar to the audience of the odes. The analogies are suggested, more or less explicitly, but never worked out in detail, not only because victory odes were not political treatises, but also because a sharper comparison would have defeated the goal of the enterprise, which was to conjure up a legitimate framework for the power of the tyrant.

The first passage has been partially referred to earlier. It deserves to be looked at in its entirety (*Pyth.* 1,58-70):

Μοῖσα, καὶ πᾶρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι  
πίθεό μοι ποιῶν τεθρίππων· χάσμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος.  
ἄγ' ἔπειτ' Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον·  
τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἐλευθερίᾳ  
'Υλλίδος στάθμας 'Ιέρων ἐν νόμοις ἔκτισσε θέλοντι δὲ Παμφύλου  
καὶ μὲν 'Ηρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι  
ᾄχθαις ὑπο Ταυγέτου ναίοντες αἰεὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγίμιου  
Δωριεῖς. ἔσχον δ' 'Αμύκλας ὄλβιοι  
Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι, λευκοπῶλων Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι γείτονες, ὧν κλέος  
ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς.  
Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν 'Αμένα παρ' ὕδωρ  
αἶσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων.  
σὺν τοι τίν κεν ἀγῆτηρ ἀνήρ,  
οὐκ ἔπιτελλόμενος, δᾶμον γεραίρων τράποι σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν.

Muse, at the side of Deinomenes too, I bid you sing the reward for the four-horse chariot, for a father's victory is no alien joy. Come then, let us compose a loving hymn for Aitna's king, for whom Hieron founded that city with divinely fashioned freedom under the laws of Hyllus' rule, because the descendants of Pamphylos and indeed of Herakles' 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, much acclaimed neighbors of the Tyndaridai with white horses, and the fame of their spears flourished. Zeus Accomplisher, de-

termine such good fortune as this always for the citizens and their kings by Amenas' water<sup>38</sup> to be the true report of men. For with your help a leader, instructing his son, honoring his people, can turn them to harmonious peace.

Pindar is here alluding to the foundation of Aitna by Hieron, in the second half of 476/5, in place of the old Chalkidian colony of Katane. The population of the new city came from Syracuse and was composed of former mercenaries of Gelon, of former citizens of Megara and Gela whom Gelon himself had moved to Syracuse after 485, and possibly also of more recently enrolled mercenaries, coming from the Peloponnese. At the beginning, an old Gelonian comrade and brother-in-law of Gelon and Hieron, Chromios, had been put in charge of the city, possibly acting as a tutor of Hieron's young son Deinomenes, whom these verses celebrate as *basileus* of Aitna<sup>39</sup>.

Modern readers of Pythian I often seem to be tempted to take Pindar at face value and conclude that the constitution, or better, the *nomoi* of the new city were modeled on Sparta's. Even though this is precisely what Pindar tries to suggest, we need to resist taking his allusions literally. Against such a temptation, one may point to the opening lines of Isthmian IX (1-4), where Pindar evokes with similar terminology the foundation of Aigina by the Dorian army of Hyllos and Aigimios and the fact that the Aiginetans ever since obey the *στάθμα* of the two heroes. The parallel with the *στάθμαι* of Hyllos and the *τεθμοί* of Aigimios is obvious. But of course, apart from the fact that the Aiginetans were Dorian, nobody ever thought that Aigina had the same constitution as Sparta. There is no reason to think otherwise in the case of Aitna<sup>40</sup>.

The invocation of the laws of Hyllos and Aigimios, which for Pindar represent the foundation on which Hieron has put the new city, has certainly something to do with the high prestige enjoyed by Sparta in the aftermath of the Persian Wars. Furthermore, we have good reasons to think that Dorianism was a component of Deinomenid ideology, possibly already in Gelon's times and certainly in the case of the foundation of Aitna. In the case of the refoundation of Syracuse by Gelon, Polyaeus speaks of an invitation to new colonists of Dorian stock (1,7,23). As for Aitna, the summary of Aischylos' tragedy *Aitnaiai*, written for Hieron and more or less contemporary of Pythian I, suggests, with its changes of scene, from Aitna to Xouthia, then back to Aitna, Leontinoi and finally Syracuse, a juxtaposition of Aitna and Xouthia-

<sup>38</sup> DOUGHERTY 1993, 94-95 astutely points out a pun on the name of the river, meant to confirm the durability of the new foundation.

<sup>39</sup> On the foundation of Aitna, see LURAGHI 1994, 335-346; BONANNO 2010, 127-139. On its celebration in various literary genres, DOUGHERTY 1993, 83-102.

<sup>40</sup> See CINGANO 1995, 349; BONANNO 2010, 150-152.

Leontinoi as mother-cities respectively of the Dorians and Ionians of Sicily<sup>41</sup>. This is clearly the ideological context of Pindar's praise of Dorianism.

But there is more here, and it is not only the jolly brashness with which Pindar celebrates the freedom of the new tyrannical foundation. The Dorian laws of Aigimios and Hyllos are framed by two references to *basileia*: first, Deinomenes appears as the *basileus* of Aitna, and then Pindar wishes good luck to the citizens and their *basileis*. After that, Hieron dominates the stage, the ἀγῆτις ἀνήρ, in his double role as a leader for the citizens of Aitna and a mentor for his son. At which point, one starts suspecting that the theme of the Spartan laws may not be there only in order to praise the Dorianism of newly-founded Aitna, but also to cast a special light on the role of the two tyrants, father and son. Interpreters from Böckh to Köhnken have seen in the reference to *basileis* of Aitna, in the plural, an allusion to Sparta's famous double monarchy,<sup>42</sup> and even though we could just as well think that the plural refers to the sequence of all future kings, the association between the plural and the two *basileis* mentioned directly would remain somehow in the air. And in any case, the reference to Sparta allows Pindar to depict *basileia* as a lawful component of the political form of the new city. Now, it is clear beyond reasonable doubt that Hieron and/or Deinomenes did not occupy in Aitna a position comparable to that of kings Pleistarchos or Leotychidas in Sparta. However, it is also clear that Pindar, with his subtle and less than subtle allusions, is here exploiting Spartan *basileia* in order to make it possible for Hieron's autocratic power to appear on the stage of this ode with an air of legitimacy. Interestingly, this is not the first time Pindar tried this trick. In the opening lines of his Pythian X, Spartan kingship is exploited in a very similar way to dress in a respectable cloak the aspiration of the Aleuadai of Larissa, famous Medizers, to be recognized as the lords of Thessaly<sup>43</sup>.

And now, to the second mask, and to Pythian II. As noted earlier, date and occasion for this ode are unknown to us, and were unknown already to ancient commentators, the only uncontroversial fact being that the victory celebrated had been won with the chariot. After the introductory praise of Syracuse and Hieron, the first antistrophe and the epode run as follows (13-20):

<sup>41</sup> Dorianism of the Deinomenidai: VALLET 1985, 308-310. On Aischylos' *Aitnaiai*, see now POLI-PALLADINI 2001; for their relation to Hieron's political agenda, see LURAGHI 1994, 343-344; BONANNO 2010, 139-147.

<sup>42</sup> See KÖHNKEN 1970, 4 n. 2.

<sup>43</sup> See *Pyth.* 10,1-3: both Sparta and Thessaly are ruled by Herakles' offspring (the Aleuadai are indirectly called *basileis*, like Arkesilas of Cyrene and Hieron). On the actual position of the Aleuadai in Thessaly, see HELLY 1995. On Thessalian society at the times of Pindar, see STAMATOPOULOU 2007.

ἄλλοις δέ τις ἐτέλεσεν ἄλλος ἀνὴρ  
 εὐαχέα βασιλεῦσιν ἕμνον ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς.  
 κελადέοντι μὲν ἀμφὶ Κινύραν πολλάκις  
 φᾶμαι Κυπρίων, τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα προφρόνως ἐφίλησ' Ἄπολλων,  
 ἱερέα κτίλον Ἀφροδίτας· ἄγει δὲ χάρις φίλων ποί τινος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζόμενα·  
 σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων  
 Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει, πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων  
 διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές.

Various men pay the tribute of a resounding hymn to various kings as a recompense for their excellence. The voices of the Cyprians often celebrate Kinyras, whom the golden-haired Apollo heartily befriended, the priestly favorite of Aphrodite, for reverent gratitude goes forth in one way or another in return for someone's friendly deeds. But you, O son of Deinomenes, the maiden of Epizephyrian Lokroi invokes in front of her house, for after desperate toils of war she has a look of security in her eyes thanks to your power.

The scholia offer information on the historical events that form the background of these lines. The tyrant of Rhegion Anaxilas, founder of Messene in Sicily and a prominent member of the coalition that had been defeated at the battle of Himera, had probably attacked the Epizephyrian Lokrians once before, shortly before 480, defeating them and sending to Olympia a dedication from the war booty<sup>44</sup>. Now, in 477, possibly hoping to take advantage of Gelon's death, Anaxilas was preparing a new offensive, together with his son Leophron, to whom he had entrusted Rhegion when he founded Messene. Hieron replied sending his brother-in-law Chromios to Anaxilas with an ultimatum. Anaxilas backed off and Hieron gained the gratitude of the Lokrians<sup>45</sup>.

We do not need to decide whether the song of the Epizephyrian maidens was motivated by the fact that the Lokrians had vowed to prostitute their daughters in the temple of Aphrodite in case of victory over Anaxilas<sup>46</sup>. More interesting for us is the person that Pindar compares to Hieron as a king recipient of songs of gratitude. Kinyras appears as king of Cyprus already in the *Iliad* (11,20 ff), where he gives to Agamemnon a breastplate as a *xenion*. Tyrtaeus associates him with Midas because of his wealth (12,7 W<sup>2</sup>), to

<sup>44</sup> Two couples of inscribed dedications for a victory over the Lokrians of the Rhegians and Messenians, *SEG* 24,304-305 and 311-312 respectively, are the only surviving trace of this episode; for their date, based on their archaeological context, see LURAGHI 1994, 216.

<sup>45</sup> The evidence, provided by *scholia* to Pythians I and II, is quoted and commented upon by BONANNO 2010, 75-77.

<sup>46</sup> For a discussion of this long-debated issue, with full references to earlier scholarship, see now CURRIE 2005, 261-275.

which Pindar refers elsewhere, too (*Nem.* 8,18), while Anakreon mentioned his longevity (Plin. *NH* 7,154)<sup>47</sup>. All this would be enough to make of Kinyras a flattering comparison for Hieron, but the link between the two suggested by Pindar is more specific: as the initial lines make clear, Kinyras is brought in not only because he was an illustrious hero, but more precisely, because he, like Hieron, was a king. At first sight, this is just a particular case of your usual Pindaric association of heroes and victors, but the association between Hieron and Kinyras may not be confined to the world of myth.

A borderland between Greece and the Near East, from the early seventh century Cyprus had been divided in city-states ruled by kings, as shown by the prism of Esarhaddon, dated 673/2, when the island was under Assyrian supremacy<sup>48</sup>. It is unclear whether we should regard these monarchies as a survival of the Mycenaean past or as a product of Near Eastern, Syro-Phoenician influence<sup>49</sup>. In any case, at the time of Pindar and Hieron the kings of Cyprus were legitimate rulers, who ruled their cities in a constitutional framework. As an example, it suffices to look at the famous Idalion bronze, an inscription in Cypriot syllabary dating to the first half of the fifth century, in which *pa-si-le-u-se ka-se a-po-to-li-se*, that is, the *basileus* and the *polis* appear repeatedly side by side as subjects of political deliberation (*ICS* 217 = *Nomoi* 31). The extensive involvement of Cypriot poleis in Greek politics, from the Ionian revolt to the Delian League, assures us that any reasonably well-informed Greek would be familiar, at least in general terms, with the island and its kings.

On top of their political and military prerogatives, Cypriot kings had also a religious role. We cannot tell specifically what such role looked like in every city, but luckily, the case that matters most for us is also the clearest. In Paphos, one of the main centers of the revolt against Persia in 498, inscriptions from the fourth century show regularly the title 'king of Paphos and priest of the Wanassa,' i.e., Aphrodite<sup>50</sup>. The aetiology of Paphian priestly monarchy is narrated in a page of Tacitus' *Historiae* (2,2-4). Its founder, first priest of Paphian Aphrodites, is none other than king Kinyras, whose double role of priest and king is referred to by Pindar himself.

It is precisely this double role, one may suggest, that made of Kinyras an attractive pendant for Hieron<sup>51</sup>, and the connection was supported not only by

<sup>47</sup> On the mythic character of Kinyras and its development over time, see now ROSCALLA 1998, 6-9 with further references.

<sup>48</sup> On the prism of Esarhaddon, with a list of Cypriot vassal kings and respective cities, see LIPINŃSKI 2003, 62-76. Cypriot kings subject to the Assyrian king are already mentioned some years earlier, in the stele of Sargon II from Larnaca, dated to 707; on the Larnaca stele and parallel evidence from Khorsabad, *ibid.* 51-55.

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion, see RUPP 1987 with further references.

<sup>50</sup> See MAIER 1989, 377; TUPLIN 1996, 62-63.

<sup>51</sup> As noticed by BELL 1984, 6-7.

the mythic identity of Kinyras, but at least as much by the fact that in Kinyras, whom Pindar is the first Greek author to describe as both king and priest, his audience recognized the priest-kings of Paphos of the present day. In other words, this time it is the historical institution, whose founder Kinyras was supposed to have been, more than the hero, that functions as an alter ego for Hieron. As the ancient commentators saw (*Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2,27b*), Pindar is here alluding to the fact that Hieron came from a priestly family, and may have been himself a priest. As Herodotus informs us (7,153,2-3), the Deinomenidai were hierophants of the Chthonian Goddesses at Gela, and Philistos (*FGrHist 556 F 49*) and Timaios (*FGrHist 566 F 96*) apparently said that Hieron had inherited the priesthood<sup>52</sup>. A fragment of Pindar's lost *hyporchema* for Hieron, quoted for parodic purposes in Aristophanes' *Birds* (926-927) and then mentioned by many other ancient authors, calls Hieron 'the man who is named after sacred rituals' (fr. 105a M.<sup>2</sup>): the pun on the name of the tyrant refers probably to the priesthood.

Above and beyond the analogies, more or less contrived, between Hieron and the priest-kings of Paphos, evoked by the reference to their archegetes Kinyras, the differences that Pindar tries to elide should not be forgotten. Apart from the fact that he was not a king of Syracuse, it is not even clear that Hieron was a priest at Syracuse: the cult of which the Deinomenidai were hierophants was located in Gela, their hometown. Even if one were to venture the hypothesis that Hieron might have transferred the cult to his new home – and there is no reason to think that this was the case – the fact remains that the priesthood had nothing to do with Hieron's political power. The priest-kings of Paphos, no less than the Spartan *basileis*, are just another mask that disguises his tyrannical power.

The last mask worn by Hieron the tyrannical agonistes is the best known. It brings us back to Pythian I, and at the same time, it gives us a chance to bring in Pindar's rival Bacchylides. It is the mask of the last Mermnad, Kroisos king of Lydia.

At the end of Pythian I, Pindar invites Hieron to keep up his generosity, a long-term investment guaranteed by the word of the poet. A double example validates this general statement: Kroisos' *philophrôn areta* is immortal, and so is the hated memory of Phalaris, the savage roaster of men<sup>53</sup>. It cannot be accidental if Pindar, in order to point out to Hieron a positive and a negative model, has chosen not two heroes of myth but rather two characters from

<sup>52</sup> See VAN COMPENOLLE 1957.

<sup>53</sup> On the figure of Phalaris and its development through the ages, see MURRAY 1992.

the relatively recent past. On one level, they define implicitly Hieron's status, the status of an autocrat. Addressing an audience for which any sole ruler is suspect in principle, Pindar contrasts a positive model of autocracy, which tellingly has to be looked for outside of the Greek world, and a negative one, one more familiar to the Greeks. In the aftermath of the Persian Wars, and considering the importance of the theme in Pythian I, it may be relevant that Kroisos had lost his throne, and possibly his life, fighting against the Persians.

Obviously, the comparison with Kroisos was pleasing to Hieron, as shown by the fact that Bacchylides' Epinician III, the victory ode for the last and most prestigious of his victories obtained with the chariot at the Olympic games of 468, picks up this comparison and turns it into the main theme of the ode<sup>54</sup>. At the beginning of the second strophe, after a teeming image of the feasts and celebrations unleashed by Hieron's victory, the scene shifts to Delphi and the dazzle of the golden tripods dedicated in front of the temple by the Deionemenidai brothers. Apollo constitutes the link to another famous worshipper of Loxias, who had been saved by the god in a moment of extreme danger: Kroisos. The fall of Sardis is described with highly dramatic tones, until Kroisos' attempted suicide. At the climax of tension, when Kroisos complains against the ingratitude of the gods, Zeus sends rain to quench the fire on which the old king had climbed with his wife and daughters, and Apollo transports them all safely to the land of the Hyperboreans, rewarding Kroisos' *eusebeia*, which had found expression in his offerings to Delphi, the most lavish that a mortal had ever dedicated in the sanctuary. And this way we come full circle to Hieron, Kroisos' successor in the role of main benefactor of the shrine<sup>55</sup>.

Bacchylides expands and sharpens the comparison between Kroisos and Hieron that Pindar had but sketched. At the beginning of the ode, the praise of Sicily takes the place normally occupied in victory odes by the *polis* of the laudandus. The rigidity of the convention of epinician poetry suggests that here Bacchylides may be giving voice to Hieron's aspiration to be recognized as the lord of Sicily as a whole<sup>56</sup>. Then, as we saw earlier, Hieron is introduced as the man who has received from Zeus the largest dominion among Greeks (11-12). Next comes the indefinite image of the cheerful crowds, and finally, the dazzling gold of the tripods evokes Kroisos. The splendor of the dedications to Apollo, material expression of piety, constitutes the link between Hi-

<sup>54</sup> For an introduction to the ode, see CAIRNS 2010, 63-74. Cairns suggests (*ibid.* 71) that Kroisos 'is undeniably a symbol of the vulnerability of despotic power.' Contrast however KURKE 1999, 131-132, who calls Kroisos 'every aristocrat's wish-fulfillment fantasy: fabulous wealth and power unconstrained by civic order.' In any case, the decisive fact is that, after Pindar, Bacchylides repeated the comparison, which would hardly have happened if Kroisos had really been seen as such an ominous character.

<sup>55</sup> On the ode going from Hieron to Kroisos and back, see CAIRNS 2010, 64; KURKE 1999, 141-142.

<sup>56</sup> See the comments of MORRISON 2007, 59 on the analogous reference to Sicily in Pind. *Ol.* 1,12-13.

eron and Kroisos on the surface of the text, but at the same time, the image of Kroisos king of Lydia is in the air, and overlaps with Hieron, the lord of Sicily. Just as the audience would have taken as a matter of course the now extinct Mermnad monarchy of Lydia, Bacchylides invites it to take for granted in the same way Hieron's alleged monarchy over Sicily.

It is time to conclude. Victory odes for tyrants show interesting aspects of the power of the patrons and of the genre itself. Praising a tyrant was no simple matter. If the patron chose to stick with the aristocratic values, he missed the chance to showcase his power. Let us not forget that silence is not a friend of charismatic forms of rule. However, also the opposite choice, consisting in addressing explicitly the power of the victorious tyrant, created a number of problems. Being a tyrant was not like being a *basileus* of Sparta or Cyrene, and the value system of Greek social elites had no place for tyranny. Encomiastic rhetoric could depict tyranny only as a bundle of connotations, while on the level of denotation the poet was compelled to evasiveness, in the attempt at navigating a safe path across the minefield of negative associations of tyranny.

In order to address an audience that considered tyranny negative as such, the poet disguised his laudandus, dressing him in respectable clothes<sup>57</sup>. The very diversity of the masks worn by Hieron in the victory odes confirms, if it were necessary, that we are dealing with rhetorical strategies. The question is, why did the choral poets engage in this tour de force for him and for him only. As becomes a tyrant, the answer may turn out to be paradoxical. The comparison between Hieron and Arkesilas brought out a surprising absence of dynastic rhetoric or of any sustained reference to the lineage of the tyrant – all the more surprising, since references of this kind are found in odes for Theron. On the other hand, in Pythian I, where Hieron's son Deinomenes does appear clearly as his father's intended successor, it seems that the succession was supposed to take place at Aitna: nothing points to the possibility that Deinomenes

<sup>57</sup> At this point, it will not be out of place to recall that our knowledge of the modes and contexts for the performance of victory odes is rather sketchy; for a recent summary, with references to earlier scholarship, see CAREY 2007. In the present contribution, the audience of the odes is taken to be the contemporaries of Hieron, especially in Sicily but also in Mainland Greece – at least some of the odes were very likely performed in the very place where the victory had taken place. But the evidence is not conclusive enough to recommend the attempt at differentiating, e.g., between the rhetoric of praise of odes meant for performance in Sicily on the one hand and in Delphi and Olympia on the other. For a perceptive attempt at individuating the place of performance of Sicilian odes, see MORRISON 2007. In any case, recent scholarship has insisted that the very text of the odes provides hints of the fact that they were meant to remain meaningful beyond the immediate occasion of the performance; see again MORRISON 2007; HUBBARD 2004.

might one day succeed to his father in Syracuse<sup>58</sup>. All this acquires a precise meaning in the light of other sources that suggest strongly that Hieron held power in Syracuse as a regent of sorts for Gelon's son, who was under age at the time of his father's death<sup>59</sup>. This had to be an internal arrangement within the family and the supporters of the Deinomenidai, of course: 'tyrant' was itself not an official title, much less 'regent for a tyrant.' But this latent precariousness might explain both the absence of dynastic claims in the odes and, more interestingly, the very showcasing of Hieron's autocratic power, by way of suggestive epithets and implicit parallels. The impressive discourse of legitimacy mobilized by Pindar and Bacchylides in their praise of Hieron may turn out to have been addressed to the very entourage of the tyrant as much as to the Sicilian and Panhellenic audiences. In many ways, their loyalty was even more important than the acquiescence of his subjects or Panhellenic acceptancy of his glorious power. This is, after all, the logic of tyranny<sup>60</sup>.

### *Bibliography*

- ADKINS, A.W.H. 1972, *Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century*, London.
- ANTONACCIO, C. 2007, *Elite Mobility in the West*, in S. HORNBLOWER - C. MORGAN (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 265-285.
- BELL, J.M. 1984, *God, Man, and Animal in Pindar's Second Pythian*, in D. GERBER (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honor of Leonard Woodbury*, Chico, Calif., 1-31.
- BOIX, C. - SVOLIK, M. 2008, *The Foundations of Limited Authoritarian Government: Institutions and Power-sharing in Dictatorships*, published on-line, <http://www.princeton.edu/~cboix/Papers.html>
- BONANNO, D. 2010, *Ierone il Dinomenide: storia e rappresentazione*, Roma.
- BRIXHE, C. - LEJEUNE, M. 1984, *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*, Paris.
- CAIRNS, D.L. 2010, *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, 13)*, Leeds.

<sup>58</sup> This would be all the more striking if the ode was indeed performed in Syracuse, as suggested by MORRISON 2007, 66-67.

<sup>59</sup> On this, see LURAGHI 1994, 325-328. The most explicit piece of evidence is Aristot. *Pol.* 5,10,1312b11 ff.

<sup>60</sup> See BOIX - SVOLIK 2008. Notice the remarks of PRIVITERA 2003 on Hieron's attempt at posing as the true heir of Gelon by dedicating a golden tripod to Apollo in Delphi, precisely the golden tripod evoked by Bacchylides, and connecting it to the one dedicated by his brother after the battle of Himera.

- CAREY, C. 2007, *Pindar, Place and Performance*, in S. HORNBLOWER - C. MORGAN (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 199-210.
- CARLIER, P. 1984, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg.
- CATENACCI, C. 1992, *Il tiranno alle Colonne d'Eracle. L'agonistica e le tirannidi arcaiche*, "Nikephoros" 5, 11-36.
- CATENACCI, C. 2006, *Pindaro e le corti dei tiranni sicelioti*, in C. CATENACCI - M. VETTA (edd.), *I luoghi e la poesia della Grecia antica*, Alessandria, 177-197.
- CINGANO, E. 1995, in B. GENTILI - P. ANGELI BERNARDINI - E. CINGANO - P. GIANNINI, *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*, Milano.
- CURRIE, B. 2005, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
- DE LIBERO, L. 1996, *Die archaische Tyrannis*, Stuttgart.
- DOUGHERTY, C. 1993, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*, Oxford.
- DUPOUY, A. 2006, *Le Prestige des élites: recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les Xe et Ve siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- FEARN, D. 2007, *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford.
- FRÄNKEL, H. 1969, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts*, München [third revised edition].
- GERBER, D.E. 1982, *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, Toronto.
- HARRELL, S.E. 2002, *King or Private Citizen: Fifth-Century Sicilian Tyrants at Olympia and Delphi*, "Mnemosyne" 55, 439-464.
- HELLY, B. 1995, *L'État thessalien: Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*, Lyon.
- HEUSS, A. 1946, *Die archaische Zeit Griechenlands als geschichtliche Epoche*, "A&A" 2, 26-62.
- HUBBARD, T.K. 2004, *The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts*, in C.J. MACKIE (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Contexts*, Leiden - Boston, 71-93.
- KÖHNKEN, A. 1970, *Hieron und Deinomenes in Pindars erstem Pythischen Gedicht*, "Hermes" 98, 1-13.
- KRUMMEN, E. 1990, *Pyrros Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*, Berlin.
- KURKE, L. 1991, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca.
- KURKE, L. 1999, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*, Princeton.

- LIPÍŃSKI, E. 2003, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven.
- LURAGHI, N. 1994, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*, Firenze.
- MAIER, F.G. 1989, *Priest Kings in Cyprus*, in E. PELTENBURG (ed.), *Early Society in Cyprus*, Edinburgh, 376-391.
- MANN, C. 2000, *Der Dichter und sein Auftraggeber: Die Epinikien Bakchylides und Pindars als Träger von Ideologien*, in A. BAGORDO - B. ZIMMERMANN (edd.), *Bacchylides 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, München, 29-46.
- MANN, C. 2001, *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland*, Göttingen.
- MORRISON, A.D. 2007, *Performance and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*, London.
- MOST, G. 1985, *The Measures of Praise. Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, Göttingen.
- MURRAY, O. 1992, *Falaride tra mito e storia*, in L. BRACCESI - E. DE MIRO (edd.), *Agrigento e la Sicilia greca*, Roma, 47-60.
- OOST, S.I. 1976, *The Tyrant Kings of Syracuse*, "CPh" 71, 224-236.
- PALAIMA, T.G. 2006, *Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek*, in S. DEGER-JALKOTZY - I.S. LEMOS (edd.), *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh, 53-71.
- PFEIJFFER, I.L. 2005, *Propaganda in Pindar's First Pythian Ode*, in K.A.E. ENENKEL - I.L. PFEIJFFER (edd.), *The Manipulative Mode: Political Propaganda in Antiquity*, Leiden - Boston, 13-42.
- POLI-PALLADINI, L. 2001, *Some Reflections on Aeschylus' Aetnae(ae)*, "RhM" 144, 287-325.
- PRIVITERA, S. 2003, *I tripodi dei Dinomenidi e la decima dei Siracusani*, "ASAA" 81, 391-424.
- RACE, W.H. 1987, *Pindaric Encomium and Isokrates' Evagoras*, "TAPhA" 117, 131-155.
- ROSCALLA, F. 1998, *Mida e Cinira: per un confronto storico-religioso*, "PP" 53, 5-29.
- RUPP, D.W. 1987, *Vive le roi: The Emergence of the State in Iron Age Cyprus*, in D.W. RUPP (ed.), *Western Cyprus: Connections*, Göteborg, 147-161.
- SLATER, W.J. 2001, *Aristo-Talk*, in D. PAPPENFUSS - V.-M. STROCKA (edd.), *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Mainz, 39-49.
- SMITH, R.R.R. 2007, *Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit*, in S. HORN-BLOWER - C. MORGAN (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 83-139.

- STAHL, M. 1987, *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates*, Stuttgart.
- STAMATOPOULOU, M. 2007, *Thessalian Aristocracy and Society in the Age of Epinikian*, in S. HORNBLOWER - C. MORGAN (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 309-341.
- STEIN-HÖLKESKAMP, H. 2009, *The Tyrants*, in K.A. RAAFLAUB - H. VAN WEES (edd.), *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, Chichester - Malden, MA, 100-116.
- STENGER, J. 2004, *Poetische Argumentation. Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides*, Berlin.
- THOMAS, R. 2007, *Fame, Memorial, and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinikian Poetry – an Historical Study*, in S. HORNBLOWER - C. MORGAN (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 141-166.
- TUPLIN, C. 1996, *Achaemenid Studies*, Stuttgart.
- VALLET, G. 1985, *Pindare et la Sicile*, in *Pindare. Huit exposés suivis de discussions. Vandœuvre - Genève 21-26 août 1984*, Genève, 285-320.
- VAN COMPERNOLLE, R. 1957, *Les Deinoméniades et le culte de Déméter et Korè à Géla*, in *Hommages à Waldemar Deonna*, Bruxelles, 474-479.
- VAN DEN GROENENDAL, W.E. 2010, *Whose Line is it Anyway? Rhetoric Aimed at Short-term Benefits in Some of Pindar's Epinician Odes Composed for Sicilian laudandi (Pi. O. 4, 5, 6 and 12, P. 12, N. 1 and 9)*, "Mnemosyne" 63, 381-405.
- VAN WEES, H. 1992, *Status Warriors: War, Violence, and Society in Homer and History*, Amsterdam.
- WEBER, G. 1992, *Poesie und Poeten an den Höfen vorhellenistischer Monarchen*, "Klio" 74, 25-77.

