

PINDAR'S TWELFTH *OLYMPIAN* AND THE FALL OF THE DEINOMENIDAI

I. THE ODE

THE ode celebrates a number of victories (all of them, as we shall see, in the *δολιχος*, the 'long' race) won by a certain Ergoteles, of Himera in Sicily. It is not in any proper sense an *Olympian* at all: the first victory mentioned was at Olympia, which is why the ode was classified by Aristophanes of Byzantium among the *Olympians*; but the most recent of the victories, the immediate occasion of the ode, was won not at Olympia but at Pytho.¹

The ode begins with an invocation of Fortune, and a prayer that she should protect the victor's city. From this it proceeds, in the regular fashion of the Greek hymn, to a statement of Fortune's power; and this statement then merges into a gnomic passage on the instability and unpredictability of human affairs, from which in turn we emerge to the victor and to *his* changing fortune and final success.

'I pray you, daughter of Zeus of Freedom, keep in your care Himera in her widespread might, o saviour Fortune. Yours is the piloting of swift ships on the sea, and on land of rapid warfare and gatherings where men give counsel; while men have their hopes tossed often up, and now down, as they cleave a sea of vain illusion,

'and none yet on earth has found a sure token from the gods about an issue that is to be, and their perception of what is to come is blind. Men have found many a thing fall out contrary to their judgement, to the reverse of delight; while others have met with grievous squalls and then in a moment got abundant good in place of hurt.

'Son of Philanor, so it is with you: by the hearth of your kin, like a cock that fights at home, the glory of your feet would have shed its leaves without renown, if civil strife that sets man against man had not bereft you of your native Knossos. But now, instead, you have taken a garland at Olympia, and twice from Pytho, and at the Isthmos, Ergoteles; and you take in your hands the hot waters of the nymphs and consort with fields that are your own.'

II. THE VICTOR

Ergoteles son of Philanor was a citizen of Himera in Sicily—a citizen, but not a native: as Pindar tells us (16), he was born a Cretan, in Knossos, but had to leave Knossos as a result of *στάσις*. When he came to live in Himera, no-one tells us; but we can make a very probable guess.

At some time in the late 480's Himera was in the power of a tyrant, Terillos; and this Terillos was then expelled by Theron tyrant of Akragas. It was Terillos's appeal to Carthage that provided the occasion of the Carthaginian invasion of Sicily in 480, defeated by Gelon tyrant of Syracuse and Theron at the battle of Himera; the expulsion of Terillos is therefore earlier, but presumably no long time earlier, than 480.²

We next hear of Himera in Diodoros's narrative (xi 48. 6–8) under the year 476/5. Theron had installed his son Thrasydaios as ruler of Himera; Thrasydaios governed harshly, and the Himeraians, seeing no hope in an appeal to Theron, looked for help elsewhere.

¹ Similarly *Olympian* ix is classified as an *Olympian* because it begins with the Olympic victory (of 468) and comes only thereafter to the Pythian victory (of 466).

² The facts in Herodotos, vii 165. No other evidence for the date: when Diodoros (xi 1. 5) says

that the Carthaginians spent three years in preparation for the invasion, the three years is measured not from Terillos's expulsion (of which no word) but from an alleged agreement between Persia and Carthage to synchronize their invasions, and need be no more historical than the agreement.

Now at Syracuse the second of the Deinomenid tyrants, Gelon's brother and successor Hieron, was at this time on the brink of war with Theron, who was supporting a third brother Polyzalos in disaffection against him; and the Himeraians made overtures to Hieron, offering, if he would attack their city, to revolt and engineer a surrender. But Hieron, rather than go to war with Theron, preferred to negotiate a settlement; and as an earnest of his goodwill he revealed to Theron the proposals that the Himeraians had made. The gesture succeeded: Theron investigated, found the information true, and settled his differences with Hieron. But Himera paid the price: Theron arrested his opponents there and put them to death. There were, says Diodoros, 'many of them' (πολλοὺς ὄντας). Then, still under the same year in Diodoros (xi 49. 3), Theron, seeing that after his executions in Himera the city was short of inhabitants, settled there 'Dorians and others who wished' and enrolled them as citizens.³

Diodoros recounts all this under the year 476/5; and though Diodoros's dates are not completely reliable, the margin of error is unlikely to be very great.⁴ Now it will appear in a moment that Ergoteles's victories were won in or about the years 472-464; it is an obviously attractive supposition that he was one of the Dorians admitted to citizenship at Himera in 476 or shortly afterwards. The δόλιχος seems to have been of about 4,000 metres;⁵ if Ergoteles came to Himera when of undergraduate age, he would be ripe three or four years later for his career as δολιχοδρόμος. Proof of course is out of the question; but the dates fit so well that I suppose the probability to be very strong.

III. THE VICTORIES AND THEIR DATES

Pausanias, in his description of Olympia, gives the essential facts about Ergoteles (vi 4. 11): 'Εργοτέλης δὲ ὁ Φιλάνορος δολίχου δύο ἐν Ὀλυμπίαι νίκας, τοσαύτας δὲ ἄλλας Πυθοῖ καὶ ἐν Ἴσθμῶι τε καὶ Νεμείῳ ἀνηρημένος, οὐχ Ἴμεραῖος εἶναι τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καθάπερ γε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶι φησι, Κρής δὲ εἶναι λέγεται Κνωσσιος· ἐκπεσὼν δὲ ὑπὸ στασιωτῶν ἐκ Κνωσσοῦ καὶ ἐς Ἴμέραν ἀφικόμενος πολιτείας τ' ἔτυχε καὶ πολλὰ εὖρετο ἄλλα ἐς τιμῆν.

This account is evidently based on two sources: the inscription on his statue, for his victories; and Pindar, for his Cretan origins. One source, Pindar, is here before us; and since 1953 we have possessed a good part of the other source, the inscription. This (*S.E.G.* xi 1223a) is the left half of a thin bronze plate inscribed stoichedon in the Ionic alphabet, with letter-forms appropriate to a date before the middle of the fifth century:⁶

Ἐργοτέλης μ' ἀνέθηκ[ε --- --- --- ---
 Ἕλληνας νικῶν Πύθι[α δις δολίχον
 καὶ δύο Ὀλυμπιάδας, δ[ις δ' ἐν Νεμέαι τε καὶ Ἴσθμῶι,
 Ἴμέραι ἀθάνατον μν[ᾶμ' ἀρετᾶς ἔμειναι.

³ Θήρων δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἴμεραίων σφαγὴν ὄρων τὴν πόλιν οἰκητόρων δεομένην συνώικισεν εἰς ταύτην τοὺς τε Δωριεῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς βουλομένους ἐπολιτογράφησεν. I can neither construe the sentence (with its two unconnected verbs) nor understand the article in τοὺς Δωριεῖς; but whatever the corruption I do not think that the sense can be in any doubt.

⁴ There are two controls. (a) Diodoros, after recording Theron's importation of new citizens, continues (xi 49. 4) οὗτοι . . . μετ' ἀλλήλων καλῶς πολιτευόμενοι διετέλεσαν ἔτη πενήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ, until the destruction of Himera by the Carthaginians. He records this destruction (xiii 62) under 409/8; his 'fifty-eight' is most likely a miscalculation for 'sixty-eight', and that gives 477/6 or (by inclusive reckoning) 476/5. (b) An ancient commentator supposed *O.* ii

95-8, in an ode for Theron's Olympic chariot-victory of 476, to allude to the revolt of his cousins Kapys and Hippokrates (sch. 173 f, g), and that revolt seems likely to have been linked with the disaffection at Himera (sch. 173g: Theron defeated them *περὶ τὴν Ἴμέραν*); what matters here is not whether the commentator was right or wrong in scenting the allusion (I think it likely that he was wrong; though I believe that there is an allusion in *O.* ii 15-20, after a prayer for the continuance of the dynasty), but that he presumably knew it to be chronologically possible.

⁵ For the evidence (which shows some discrepancy) see Jüthner, *Die athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen* i 1. 108-9, n. 232.

⁶ Jeffery, *The local scripts of archaic Greece* 246: 'unlikely to be much, if at all, later than 450.'

There is room for doubt about the detail of the supplements,⁷ but there can be no doubt about the general sense. Pausanias's account is confirmed: Ergoteles won two victories at each of the four great games.⁸

But when Pindar wrote his ode the tally was not yet complete: two Pythian victories, but only one Olympian, one Isthmian,⁹ and no Nemeian. We may ignore the Isthmian and Nemeian victories (which we have no means of dating), and confine ourselves to the Olympian and Pythian: when the ode was written, Ergoteles had two Pythian victories and one Olympian; at some time after the ode he won a second victory at Olympia. If we can date the four victories, we shall know within what limits the ode must fall.

Our most valuable evidence for the dates is of course the Oxyrhynchos victor-list (*P. Oxy.* 222 = *F. Gr. Hist.* 415). This gives us the δόλιχος-victors at Olympia for 476, 472, and 468; there is then a gap until 452. The victor of 472 is Ergoteles. The victors of 476 and 468 are not Ergoteles; his other Olympic victory was therefore either 480 (or earlier) or 464 (or later). Two considerations between them point to 464 as the most likely date: first, if Ergoteles came to Himera in c. 476, 480 or earlier is excluded; secondly, an interval of eight years between his two Olympic victories is on general grounds more probable than one of twelve or more, so that 464 is more probable than 460 or later. Neither consideration of course gives certainty: Ergoteles may have come to Himera at some other time, and an interval of twelve years cannot be firmly excluded. But 464 is certainly the most likely of the possible dates.

Our other direct evidence is in the Pindaric scholia, in their preliminary notice to the ode. This appears in two versions, which I shall call **A** (the 'Ambrosian' version, in A;

⁷ Those in 2 and 4 are due to Kunze, who first published the epigram (*Kretika Chronika* vii [1953] 138-45; *V. Olympia-Bericht* [1956] 153-6); in 3 I replace his δ[ύο δ' ἴσθμια καὶ Νεμέαι δις] by a supplement which avoids the bad Greek of δύο ἴσθμια and might perhaps account for a formal ambiguity in Pausanias (see n. 8 below). At the end of 1 I expect Φιλάνορος — — — rather than e.g. Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι, but do not know how to provide the last five syllables; in Kunze's Φιλάνορος ἀγλαὸς νῖός the epithet is at variance with the custom of these epigrams. It may be that one should consider a different approach, Φιλάνορος, ὅς ποτε διςάς] | Ἑλλανὰς νικῶν Πύθι[άδας δόλιχον], with the last line e.g. Ἰμέραι ἀθάνατον μν[ἄμα μ' ἔθηκ' ἀρετᾶς]; on this I observe (a) that the ἀνέθηκε . . . νικῶν which it abandons is characteristic: Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, nos. 3, 8, 14, 17, 18, and (aorist participle) 4, 5, 9, 16; (b) that ποτε should refer to what is securely in the past at the time of the dedication (Wade-Gery, *J.H.S.* liii [1933] 71-82), and so will have to construe only with νικῶν and not with the verb of 4; factually there is no difficulty, if Ergoteles dedicated the statue some years after his last victory, but I have no parallel for ποτε . . . νικῶν (ποτε νικήσας the epigram for Hieron's posthumous offering, Paus. viii 42. 9; there is of course no reason why if νικῶν be taken as representing the imperfect ἐνίκα it should not with a ποτε be antecedent to the leading verb).

[Only after my manuscript was with the printer did I become aware of the treatment of the epigram by J. Ebert, 'Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen', *Abh. Sachs.*

Akad., phil.-hist. Kl. lxiii 2 (1972), 79-82 (no. 20); Ἐργοτέλης μ' ἀνέθηκ[ε Φιλάνορος, ὅς ποτε ποσσίν] | Ἑλλανὰς νικῶν Πύθι[α δις δόλιχον] | καὶ δὴ Ὀλυμπιάδας, δ[ίς δ' ἴσθμια καὶ Νεμέαι δις,] | Ἰμέραι ἀθάνατον μν[ἄμα ἀρετᾶς ἔπορευ]. He anticipates two of my suggestions (1 ὅς ποτε, 3 δ[ίς]); he neither shares nor dispels my hesitation over ὅς ποτε . . . νικῶν. If ὅς ποτε is in fact right, I prefer my own treatment of the rest of the clause.]

⁸ Pausanias is formally ambiguous: two each at Nemea and the Isthmos, or two at the two together? I have supposed this to derive from a similar formal ambiguity in the inscription; but I have no doubt that the ambiguity is no more than formal, and that the writer meant to indicate two victories at each venue.

⁹ Another formal ambiguity in Pindar's καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοῖ τε: certainly two at Pytho, but one at the Isthmos, or two? I suppose only one: this seems the more natural interpretation; and if there had been two I should have expected Pindar to leave us in no doubt. (The notion that καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοῖ τε could be said of a single Pythian plus a single Isthmian victory, making two in all, is perverse; and no less perverse for Wilamowitz's tacit acceptance, *Pindaros* 305. The words might conceivably be so used by themselves, but not when they follow Ὀλυμπία: one might perhaps, if a man had won once at B and once at C, say 'you have won twice, at B and at C'; one could not, if he had also won once at A, say 'you have won at A and twice, at B and at C'. I say this because apparently it needs to be said; but the need passes my comprehension.)

inscr. a in Drachmann) and **V** (the 'Vatican' version, in BCDEQ; *inscr.* b in Drachmann):¹⁰

- A** Ὀλυμπιάδα μὲν ἐνίκησεν οὔζ' (77 = 472) καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οθ' (79 = 464), Πυθιάδα δὲ κε' (25 = 486) καὶ Ἰεθμία ὁμοίως.
- V** ἠγωνίσατο οὔζ' (77 = 472) Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κθ' (29 = 470).

I begin with the Olympic victories. Both versions place one of them in the 77th Olympiad, 472, which we know to be right. The other victory is ignored by **V** but dated by **A**: dated, however, as 'the next Olympiad, the 79th'. Since the next Olympiad was not the 79th but the 78th, one or other of these indications is corrupt. Before the Oxyrhynchos list was published (in 1899) the natural thing was to accept τὴν ἐξῆς and to reject '79th'.¹¹ But we now know from the Oxyrhynchos list that this was mistaken: τὴν ἐξῆς must be rejected, for the victor in the next Olympiad was not Ergoteles. '79th', on the other hand, is the very date, 464, that I have argued on other grounds to be the most likely; we have every reason, therefore, to accept it as genuine. The two Olympic victories belong to 472 and 464.

Now the Pythian victories. **A** gives the 25th Pythiad, 486, which is out of the question. **V** gives the 29th, 470; and this, falling between the two Olympic victories, is entirely suitable. ΚΘ (29th) and ΚΕ (25th) are very similar to the eye, and it is safe to assume that the κε' of **A** is a corruption of κθ' and that κθ' is genuine; one of the Pythian victories, therefore, falls in the 29th Pythiad, 470. For the other victory neither version gives a date. All we know for certain is that it comes before the second Olympic victory of 464; if Ergoteles came to Himera in 476 we can also assume (what is immaterial to the dating of the ode) that it is not as early as 478. We have therefore two alternatives: the 28th Pythiad, 474; or the 30th, 466.¹²

If 474 is right, the three victories mentioned by Pindar belong to 474 (Pythia), 472 (Olympia), and 470 (Pythia); there is then a gap of six years before the second Olympic victory of 464, and within that gap comes the ode. If 466 is right, the three victories belong to 472 (Olympia), 470 (Pythia), and 466 (Pythia); then a gap of two years before the second Olympic victory, and within this gap the ode. We may expect the ode to have been performed fairly soon after the last of the major victories it celebrates: either, that is, in 470 or in 466.

Between these alternatives, a performance in 470 and a performance in 466, we have so far seen no reason to make a choice. That scholars hitherto have preferred the earlier date is due in part at any rate to considerations of political circumstances alluded to in the ode.¹³ I shall come to these in a moment; but before I do so I shall proceed to the main point of my argument. It seems to me certain, from a reconsideration of the scholia, that

¹⁰ It appears from Drachmann that **A** uses alphabetic numerals and that BCDEQ have the numbers written out in full; for ease of comparison I have converted these latter to alphabetic numerals.

¹¹ So Tycho Mommsen in 1864, reading οὔζ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οη' (78 = 468) and in **V** οὔζ' Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς, Πυθιάδα <δὲ> κθ'; then Bergk (1878), Mezger, Gildersleeve, Schroeder (1900).

¹² I mention here two aberrant opinions of Boeckh's, both of them popular in the nineteenth century but forgotten in the twentieth; I mention them not for their own sakes but so that I can account below for other aberrations to which they led. First, he contrived to accept both κε' and κθ', so that the victory of the 29th Pythiad was the second at Pytho; secondly, he dated the Pythian era four years too early and

so put the 29th Pythiad (and its victory) in 474. The first aberration was killed by common sense; the second by the uncontested evidence of the Oxyrhynchos list and Bacchylides and the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία.

¹³ No-one indeed seems even to have considered 466. Before 1899 this was natural enough: those who thought that the second Olympic victory was in 468 had to put the ode before 468; those who acquiesced in one or both of Boeckh's aberrations (see above, n. 12) were at least encouraged to put it as soon as possible after the Olympic victory of 472. Since 1899 inertia will have played a part: accepted opinions are tenacious of life, even after the evidence on which they were founded has perished.

there are in fact good reasons for anchoring our floating Pythian victory; and that it should be anchored not in the traditional 474 but in 466, with the ode therefore in 466.

Of the two versions of the scholion, **A** is patently corrupt: of the three dates it gives, one certainly is guaranteed, but one is self-contradictory (τὴν ἐξῆς οἰθ') and the third is evidently impossible (the 25th Pythiad, 486). **V** is not patently corrupt: of the two dates it gives, one is guaranteed and the other inherently probable, and the way in which the two are related is internally consistent, 'the 77th Olympiad and the next Pythiad, the 29th'—the 29th Pythiad, 470, is the next after the Olympiad of 472. It has therefore become the custom, since the Oxyrhynchos list was published (and τὴν ἐξῆς shown to be corrupt), to disregard **A** altogether and to build solely on **V**; and Wilamowitz (*Pindaros* 305, n. 1) set the seal on this custom when he accounted for the text of the scholion in **A** as a corruption of the text preserved in **V**: καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κθ' was corrupted first by a miswriting κε' for κθ', then by the intrusion of an οθ' arising from a θ written in the margin in correction of κε',¹⁴ and finally (when all this had happened) by the deliberate insertion of a δέ to restore some kind of sense.

It seems to me that this explanation of the two versions of the scholion is manifestly false, and this for three separate reasons, each of them, in my judgement, cogent.

In the first place, the οθ' in **A** gives what does seem to be the true date of Ergoteles's second Olympic victory. I find it very unlikely (to say the least) that it should be the result of a corruption, however ingeniously explained, and should give the truth only by accident.

In the second place, the impossible καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οἰθ' of **A** is not to be mended by converting it into the καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κθ' of **V**; for τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κθ' is equally, if less obviously, impossible. The 29th Pythiad, of 470, is certainly the next after the 77th Olympiad, of 472; next, but not ἐξῆς: ἐξῆς should be used of an item which is next *in the same series*. An Olympiad is ἐξῆς after the previous Olympiad, a Pythiad after the previous Pythiad; but a Pythiad is not ἐξῆς after the previous Olympiad.

In the third place, nobody so far seems to have asked what the original form of the scholion is likely to have been. Ergoteles won two Olympic victories and two Pythian; the scholar who wrote the original note had the victor-lists before him, with all four victories recorded there. Our scholia are as a rule generous with their information about the Olympic and Pythian victories of Pindar's victors; and here, with three of the four victories mentioned in the text, there was especial reason to give the fullest information possible. I am confident that in the original note all four dates were given; and above all I find it inconceivable that when Pindar speaks of two victories at Pytho our Alexandrian scholar should have recorded the date of only one.

The solution, it seems to me, is obvious enough. Both versions of the scholion contain the words τὴν ἐξῆς in a position where they make no sense. The words must nevertheless have belonged to the original form of the note—they cannot have intruded themselves by accident; if they did so belong, they must have formed part of the enumeration of two consecutive victories in the same games. The Olympic victories were not consecutive; therefore the Pythian victories were, and the scholion recorded the fact. With that, we have the answer. The note ran originally

ἌΟλυμπιάδα . . . οζ' καὶ οθ', Πυθιάδα δὲ κθ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς.

Corruption to our present versions would not be difficult: first, καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς will have been transposed into the place of the preceding καί (one might guess that the words were omitted, perhaps through homoeocatacrton before καὶ Ἰσθμια, and then restored in the wrong place):

ἌΟλυμπιάδα . . . οζ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οθ', Πυθιάδα δὲ κθ'.

¹⁴ The notion that οθ' is the corrupt offspring (in already by Drachmann (*ad loc.*) in 1903 and by one way or another) of κθ' had been entertained Schroeder in 1923 (ed. mai., appendix, p. 507).

A preserves this unchanged, except for a further independent corruption of $\kappa\theta'$ to $\kappa\epsilon'$. But in **V** someone jibbed at the nonsense of $\omicron\zeta'$ *καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς οἰ'*, and so removed it by deleting *οἰ'*. The $\delta\epsilon$ may have been removed as part of the same deliberate change; or it may have been lost by accident in a secondary corruption. Deletion of *οἰ'*, loss (by deletion or accident) of $\delta\epsilon$, and we have what is essentially the scholion as it now is in **V**:¹⁵

Ὀλυμπιάδα . . . οἰ' καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς Πυθιάδα κῆ'.

If my arguments here be accepted, the four victories are 472 Olympia, 470 Pythia, 466 Pythia, 464 Olympia; and the ode will come between the Pythian victory of 466 and the Olympic victory of 464. Now I judge the arguments to be cogent of themselves; but they are clinched by a further statement in the scholia: on *ἱ παῖ Ζηγός Ἐλευθερίου* we have the comment (sch. 1a, in A) *καταλυθέντων τῶν περὶ Ἰέρωνα ἀθλήσας ἤδη ἐνίκησεν ὅθεν τὸν Ἐλευθέριον Δία <. . . >, ὡς τῶν Σικελιωτῶν κατελευθερωθέντων τῆς τυραννίδος.* Now Hieron died in or about 467, and the Deinomenid tyranny was finally overthrown less than a year later, in or about 466. I shall consider later, in the fourth part of this paper, the precise dating of these events and the precise sense to be sought from the scholion, but one thing is clear from the outset: the victory referred to cannot be earlier than the Pythiad of 466. Now the Alexandrian scholar who wrote the original note from which the scholion derives will either himself have been responsible for the list of Ergoteles's victories in the prefatory note or will have had that list before him as he wrote; and the victory he refers to will therefore have been included in that list. This victory cannot, as I say, be earlier than the Pythiad of 466; it cannot (assuming, as I think we may, that our man could count) have been the second Olympic victory of 464; therefore it was won *at* the Pythiad of 466, and my reconstruction of the list and my dating of the ode are thereby confirmed.

IV. THE ODE IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The ode begins with an invocation of the 'daughter of Zeus of Freedom, saviour Fortune', who is bidden to keep Himera in her care. Clearly this rather unusual invocation will have some especial point in the circumstances of the time.

We know of a number of cults of Zeus Eleutherios in various parts of the Greek world. Mostly we know merely of their existence, but in a few cases we know the occasion on which they were established: in Samos, after the fall of the tyrant Polykrates; at Plataia, after the defeat of the Persians in 479, and so perhaps at Athens too; at Syracuse, after the overthrow of the last of the Deinomenid tyrants, Hieron's brother and successor Thrasyboulos.¹⁶ Twice, that is, after deliverance from domination by a tyrant; once after deliverance from domination by an invading enemy.

I have said something already of the history of Himera: the tyrant Terillos was expelled in the late 480's by Theron of Akragas, and Himera was then ruled, with notable harshness, by Theron's son Thrasydaïos; an appeal to Hieron in *c.* 476 brought only betrayal and disaster. The next thing we know of is after Theron's death about four years later. Theron was succeeded at Akragas by Thrasydaïos; and Thrasydaïos mustered a large army, of mercenaries, Akragantines, and Himeraians, and prepared for war with Syracuse. Hieron took the field against him; and after a major battle, with heavy casualties on both sides, defeated him conclusively. Thrasydaïos was deposed; the Akragantines established a democracy, sued for peace, and were granted it.

Diodoros recounts all this, beginning with Theron's death, under the year 472/1

¹⁵ I say 'essentially': **V** has also shuffled the word-order at the beginning and has a different (and untypical) verb, *ἡγωνίσαστο οἰ' Ὀλυμπιάδα* in place of *Ὀλυμπιάδα μὲν ἐνίκησεν οἰ'*. One might guess that this happened at the same time as the deletion of

οἰ'; if so, the loss of $\delta\epsilon$ is perhaps most likely to be part of the same rewriting.

¹⁶ Samos, Hdt. iii 142. 2; Plataia, n. 39 below; Syracuse, n. 20 below. For other cults see Jessen, *R.E.* v 2348-50.

(xi 53. 1–5); but he has no Sicilian events again until five years later, and it is likely that he has compressed into the single year the events of a longer period. Now in *Pythian* i, composed for Hieron's chariot-victory of 470, there is a passage which has often been taken, and in my judgement must be taken, to refer to the defeat of Thrasydaios. After speaking of earlier battles in which Hieron had fought, 'when by the gods' devising they found them honour such as none in Hellas reaps, a lordly crown for their wealth' (the battles that is in in which the Deinomenidai established themselves as the leading power in Sicily), Pindar goes on: 'but now he has gone to war after the fashion of Philoktetes; and of necessity even one who was lordly has fawned on him as a friend.'¹⁷ In the context this battle, in which Hieron (ill though he was) took the field in person, must be one of major importance: inevitably, I think, the battle in which the Akragantines, the one power now remaining to dispute Hieron's dominance of the whole of Hellenic Sicily, were defeated and sued for peace. And the sentence begins *νῦν γε μάν*: I should suppose the battle to have been pretty recent at the time when *Pythian* i was composed. Hieron's Pythian victory was won in the late summer of 470, and the ode I suppose is likely to have been performed in the autumn of that year: I should judge the likeliest date for the battle to be earlier in 470—at the very earliest in 471, but preferably in 470 itself.

At this time, then, the Akragantines installed a democracy and sued for peace. What happened to Himera we are not told, but there can be no room for doubt: independence at last from Akragas (whom Hieron will inevitably have deprived of her principal dependency); a new constitution; and a treaty with Syracuse.

Now by the conventional dating *Olympian* xii comes at the same time as *Pythian* i, with Himera not long released from Akragantine domination. And to this occasion the opening words of the ode can obviously be thought peculiarly appropriate: Himera is free, Zeus Eleutherios has played his part; it is now up to Fortune—whom Pindar for the occasion makes his daughter—to play her part as well, and keep Himera secure in this new-found freedom. All this appears to fit admirably; and one can see why scholars have been glad to acquiesce in the date 470.¹⁸ But let us next consider the situation four years later, at the time when I have argued that we must suppose the ode to have been performed, after the Pythiad of 466.

Under the year 467/6 Diodoros narrates the death of Hieron and the succession of his brother Thrasyboulos (xi 66. 4); under the following year, 466/5, he narrates the revolution in Syracuse and the overthrow of Thrasyboulos (xi 67. 1–68. 7). I will come back in a moment to the question of Thrasyboulos's dates and their precise relation to the date of the ode; but first, in order to form a picture of the situation in Himera at the time, I will consider briefly both the circumstances of his fall and the situation in Sicily during the next few years. My account derives wholly from Diodoros.

When the revolution began, Thrasyboulos occupied Ortygia and Achradina with a strong force of mercenaries and allies; and there he was besieged by the revolutionaries. These sent a request for help 'to Gela, Akragas, and Selinous, and also to Himera and the Sikel cities inland'; and help was sent by all—help which comprised infantry, cavalry, and warships.¹⁹

¹⁷ *P.* i 47–52 ἢ κεν ἀνάσειεν οἴαις ἐν πολέμοιο μάχαις | τλάμοι ψυχᾷ παρέμειν', ἀνίχ' ἠρίσκοντο θεῶν παλάμαις τιμᾶν | οἴαν οἷτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει, | πλοῦτον στεφάνωμ' ἀγέρωχον· νῦν γε μάν τᾶν Φιλοκτή- ταιο δίκαν ἐφέπων | ἐστρατεύθη, σὺν δ' ἀνάγκαι νυ φίλον | καὶ τις ἐὼν μεγάλανωρ ἔσανεν.

¹⁸ Those who in the nineteenth century misdated the Pythiads (see above, n. 12) put the ode soon after the Olympiad of 472; but they supposed the defeat of Thrasydaios to have happened earlier in the same year, and so were operating with the same

historical situation as those who put the ode in 470.

¹⁹ *Diod.* xi 68. 1–2 πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλαν εἰς Γέλαν καὶ Ἀκράγαντα καὶ Σελινοῦντα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰς Ἰμέραν καὶ πρὸς τὰς τῶν Σικελῶν πόλεις τὰς ἐν τῇ μεσογειῶι κειμένας, ἀξιούντες κατὰ τάχος συνελθεῖν καὶ συνελυθηρῶσαι τὰς Συρακοῦσας. πάντων δὲ προθύμως ὑπακούοντων καὶ συντόμως ἀποστειλάντων τῶν μὲν πεζοὺς καὶ ἵππεῖς στρατιώτας, τῶν δὲ ναῦς μακρὰς κεκοσμημένας εἰς ναυμαχίαν, ταχὺ συνήχθη δύναμις ἀξίῳχρως τοῖς Συρακοσίοις.

There was a battle by sea and a battle by land; defeated in both, Thrasyboulos in the end capitulated. The Syracusans set up a democracy; voted to erect a colossal statue of Zeus Eleutherios and to establish an annual celebration;²⁰ and also 'freed the other cities that were ruled by tyrants or occupied by garrisons, and restored democracies in the cities'.²¹

But that was not the end of the troubles. Diodoros again (xi 72-3), under 463/2 (three years later): immediately after the fall of the tyranny, with freedom restored to all the cities in the island, Sicily was for a while at peace and prosperous. But then war and *στάσις* began again: and he proceeds to describe the situation in Syracuse. The *στάσις* there was between the original citizens and the mercenaries (*ξένοι*) who had been admitted to citizenship by Gelon; and these mercenaries repeated Thrasyboulos's behaviour and occupied Ortygia and Achradina. They were blockaded there, and were finally defeated in a battle which Diodoros does not describe until two years later, under 461/60 (xi 76. 1-2). And then, also under 461/60, he describes further action against the tyrants' protegés elsewhere (xi 76. 3-6): first the Syracusans, and also the Sikels, made an attack on Katane alias Aitna (which since *c.* 476 had been occupied by settlers installed by Hieron), expelled Hieron's settlers, and restored the original inhabitants; and then 'those who under Hieron had been expelled from their own cities were restored with Syracusan support, and ejected those who had wrongfully usurped possession of cities not their own; these included men from Gela, from Akragas, and from Himera'.²² Also Kamarina (whose population had been deported by Gelon) was refounded by the Geloans; and at the same time Rhegion and Messana threw out *their* tyrants, the sons of Anaxilas. The cities then concerted an agreement with the *ξένοι*: these were all settled in the territory of Messana, and other cities left to their original inhabitants.

We can put little trust in Diodoros for the chronology of these later troubles: the events he describes under 463/2 and 461/60 are his only Sicilian events between 466/5 and 459/8,²³ and one may guess that he has concentrated under these two years a series of events that were continuous over a period of several years from 466/5.²⁴ But the general picture seems fairly clear: first, immediately after the fall of Thrasyboulos, an abandonment of Syracusan domination of Sicily and a restoration (at least in the more directly dominated cities) of democracies; secondly, a period of some confusion which resulted ultimately in the

²⁰ Democracy and Zeus Eleutherios appear in Diodoros (xi 72. 2) under the year 463/2, but as antecedents of the events ascribed to that year; there can be no doubt that they belong immediately after the capitulation (for which time democracy is at least implicit in xi 68. 6, cited below, n. 30).

²¹ Diod. xi 68. 5 *τὰς δὲ ἄλλας πόλεις τὰς τυραννουμένας ἢ φρουράς ἐχούσας ἐλευθερώσαντες ἀποκατέστησαν ταῖς πόλεσι τὰς δημοκρατίας.* By *ταῖς πόλεσι* Diodoros ought to mean the Sicilian cities in general, and not merely the tyrannized or garrisoned ones (if these were meant, one would expect *αὐταῖς*); but I put no great trust in his linguistic precision.

²² Diod. xi 76. 4 *τούτων δὲ πραχθέντων οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἱέρωνος δυναστείαν ἐκπεπρωκότες ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων πόλεων ἔχοντες τοὺς (Συρακοσίους) συναγωνιζομένους κατήλθον εἰς τὰς πατρίδας, καὶ τοὺς ἀδίκως τὰς ἀλλοτρίας πόλεις ἀφηρημένους ἐξέβαλον ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τούτων ὅσων ἦσαν Γελῶιοι καὶ Ἀκραγαντινοὶ καὶ Ἱμεραῖοι.*

²³ Under 459/8 only a brief mention (xi 78. 5) of the capture by the Sikel leader Douketios of the small inland city of Morgantina; thereafter no Sicilian events until 454/3 (xi 86).

²⁴ The only event for whose date we have any control is the refounding of Kamarina, and the control is pretty vague. Psaumis of Kamarina, who won with the chariot at Olympia in 452, won at an earlier Olympiad a victory with the mule-car celebrated in *Olympians* iv [*sic*: 11 ὀχέων] and v, and the refounding was then still recent: iv 11-12 *κῦδος ὄρσαι σπεύδει Καμαρίναι*, v 8 *τὰν νέοικον ἔδραν*, 13-14 the building of permanent houses still in rapid progress. The scholia have no date for the mule-car victory (the event was not included in the victor-lists); they do in three places give the Olympiad in which Kamarina was refounded, but every time the figure is corrupt (sch. O. v 16 *π'* = 440/36, 19a omitted, 19b *μβ'* = 612/08). Another scholion (19d) affects to infer from certain premises that the mule-car victory was won at the 81st Olympiad, 456; as it stands the note is inconsequential, but it could be made at least partly consequential if one assumed the loss of a premise 'Kamarina was refounded in the 80th Olympiad' (*π'* = 460/56), and the assumption is encouraged by the fact that the note is part of the comment on 8 *τὰν νέοικον ἔδραν*.

elimination of the aliens imported into the various cities under Hieron and a restoration, as far as might be, of the status quo.²⁵

But I am concerned with events after the tyranny not for their own sake but for the light they throw on the situation under the tyranny; and there can be no doubt that in the years after 470 Himera, along with the rest of Greek Sicily, had been firmly under Syracusan domination. The form taken by this domination is likely to have varied from city to city. There were cities under more or less direct Syracusan control, ruled by tyrants (puppets, evidently, of the Syracusan tyranny) or held by Syracusan garrisons, and freed only after Thrasyboulos had fallen; they would include, presumably, Leontinoi (crowded by Hieron with the evicted populations of Katane and Naxos), and doubtless a number of the smaller cities such as Akrai and Kasmenai. For Himera, Gela, and Akragas we may assume a different situation: these three cities, along with Selinous,²⁶ could between them send to the Syracusan insurgents infantry and cavalry and warships, and cities which could send these against a tyrant were not, when they sent them, under that tyrant's direct control. On the other hand all three cities had had an obviously considerable number of their citizens exiled, and had aliens settled in them in their place: one might conjecture that Hieron had established in them some kind of less direct control—a government (democratic, apparently, at Akragas) that owed him its establishment and was ready to serve his purposes so long as he remained strong, but in the end proved ready to abandon him or his successor as soon as the régime showed signs of collapse.²⁷

Himera, then, will have been subject to Syracusan domination in the years following her release from Akragas in c. 470: a pro-Syracusan faction in power; exile for anyone suspected of anti-Syracusan leanings; aliens—one may suppose Hieron's veteran mercenaries—imported into the city in their stead.²⁸ And then finally, when Thrasyboulos was overthrown, freedom—real freedom this time—from Syracuse in turn. Thrasyboulos was overthrown, according to Diodoros, in 466/5; our ode was written, I have maintained, after the Pythiad (August or thereabouts) of 466. The supposition is irresistible that the freedom alluded to in the opening invocation is the freedom achieved by Thrasyboulos's overthrow. It is time now to seek to date that overthrow more accurately.

Actual dates for Hieron and Thrasyboulos are provided only by Diodoros: 478/7 (xi 38. 7), Gelon dies after seven years' rule, Hieron succeeds him and rules for eleven years and eight months; 467/6 (xi 66. 4), Hieron dies after eleven years' rule, Thrasyboulos succeeds him and rules for one year; 466/5 (xi 68. 4), Thrasyboulos is overthrown. We have also a statement of Aristotle (*Pol.* 1315 b 35–8) on the duration of the Deinomenid tyranny: ἔτη δ' οὐδ' αὐτῆ πολλὰ διέμεινεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ κύμματα δυοῖν δέοντα εἴκοσι. Γέλων μὲν γὰρ ἑπτὰ τυραννεύσας τῷ ὀγδόω τὸν βίον ἐτελεύτησεν, δέκα δ' Ἰέρων, Θρασύβουλος δὲ τῷ ἑνδεκάτῳ μηνὶ ἐξέπεσεν.

If we accept Diodoros's dates and the more exact of his two figures for Hieron's rule, namely eleven years and eight months, we must say that Hieron acceded in the first four months of 478/7 and died in the last four months of 467/6; if we then take for Thrasyboulos's rule Aristotle's precise ten months and a fraction, Thrasyboulos will have acceded in the last four months of 467/6 and been overthrown between one and two months earlier in 466/5.

²⁵ A papyrus fragment (*P. Oxy.* 665 = *F.Gr.Hist.* 577 F. 1) provides a tantalizing scrap of evidence for this period of confusion: part of a list of the contents of some historical work (Philistos?) which described various battles between Sicilian cities and the ξένοι (or in one case between the cities themselves).

²⁶ I do not know what control Hieron may have exercised over this far western city.

²⁷ I assume here that the emissaries of the Syracusan insurgents were dealing with established

governments: this is what Diodoros's language (n. 19 above) would naturally suggest. But I suppose we must reckon with the possibility that they were dealing with fellow revolutionaries, and that there was some sort of coup in these cities before help was sent.

²⁸ If we are to trust Diodoros (xi 49. 4, cited above, n. 4) there was no split between the original citizens and Theron's new citizens of c. 476.

Now Diodoros identifies his years by the Athenian archon; and if we suppose them therefore to be archon-years (and take 1 July as an approximation to their beginning), Thrasyboulos will have acceded between March and June 466 and been overthrown between January and May 465. In this case our Pythiad (*c.* August 466) will fall well within Thrasyboulos's period of rule; and unless the ode was not commissioned until several months after the victory, it can contain no allusion to his overthrow.

It is possible of course that the ode *was* written at some interval after the victory. Nevertheless the natural time for it to be commissioned would be at Delphi, immediately after the victory was won;²⁹ and if it was, we might expect it to reflect the political circumstances at Himera as they were when Ergoteles left home for Delphi, say in July or August 466. I think it does; and that Thrasyboulos had already fallen by midsummer 466.

I think it likely that Diodoros's years for the Deinomenidai are the right ones: dates and lengths of rule are at least consistent with one another,³⁰ and we have some sort of confirmation of one of the dates in the Parian Marble.³¹ But we have no good reason to equate these years with Athenian archon-years: the equation elsewhere is constantly breaking down (in favour of years beginning some months earlier) with events which are reliably dated from other sources;³² and what is likely to have happened here is that Diodoros (or perhaps his source) has loosely equated with Athenian archon-years the possibly very different years used by the original authority for his Sicilian dates. Nevertheless this supposition will not of itself get us entirely out of the wood: a year beginning after the vernal equinox will still put Thrasyboulos's fall only three months earlier, between October 466 and February 465; even a year beginning after the winter solstice would put it between July and November 466, and this (though just reconcilable with my suppositions) would be cutting things very fine.

It is conceivable, I suppose, that the revolution as Pindar writes is not yet successful but merely under way—Thrasyboulos pent up in Ortygia, and troops or ships from Himera already dispatched: freedom is not securely with us *yet*, but it is, or may be, on the way, and it depends now on *Τύχα* whether it does in the end arrive. Conceivable, but I think very unlikely: would Pindar really write thus with Himera still on the razor's edge? and would Ergoteles have departed for the games with his city's future thus at stake, or arranged to celebrate his victory with that future still obscure?³³ I think it far more probable that Thrasyboulos has fallen already; and the one obstacle to this supposition is Diodoros's figure of eleven years and eight months for Hieron's rule. Now this figure clashes irreconcilably with Aristotle's figure of ten years, and for that reason is already suspect: Aristotle's ten years is unemendable (being part of a total: Gelon seven plus, Hieron ten, Thrasyboulos one minus; total eighteen), and if the clash is to be resolved it is Diodoros's

²⁹ We have of course no evidence for the way in which odes were normally commissioned. But the difficulty of written communication (if nothing else) would make personal contact desirable, and the obvious occasion for this would be at the games themselves; I should be surprised if Pindar did not make a practice of attending the Olympic and Pythian festivals with this as one of his motives for attending. Our ode is one of two commissioned after a victory at the Pythiad of 466 (the other is *Olympian ix*, for Epharmostos of Opous).

³⁰ The consistency continues thereafter: after relating the fall of Thrasyboulos, Diodoros goes on (xi 68. 6, still under 466/5) <ἡ πόλις> . . . διεφύλαξε τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἕτη χθεδὸν ἐξήκοντα μέχρι τῆς Διονυσίου τυραννίδος; he records the beginning of Dionysios's tyranny under 406/5 (xiii 96. 4) and his death under 368/7 (xv 73. 5), and in each place gives the duration

of his tyranny as 38 years. All this tallies; except that I do not know why the *χθεδόν* (I suppose 'approximately' rather than 'nearly').

³¹ Γ[έ]λων ὁ Δειωμένος Σ[υρακο]υ[ccῶν] ἐτυράννευεν under 478/7 (*F.Gr.Hist.* 239, A 53): Gelon by error for Hieron? But then Ἴερον . . . ἐτυράννευεν under 472/1 (A 55), which was right in the middle of his tyranny: so much muddle here that the confirmation of 478/7 is at best very uncertain.

³² Constantly, but not consistently: Gomme, *A historical commentary on Thucydides* i pp. 4–5.

³³ There can be no doubt that the ode was performed at Himera, and not at the festival at Delphi: it is an ode not for a Pythian victory but for Himera and Ergoteles's whole career. Nor was this little masterpiece dashed off (and taught to the singers) in a day or two, in the intervals of a congested social and religious programme.

figure that must be changed. Changed I think it must be: ἔτη ἑνδεκα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ will be an error (whether of Diodoros himself or of a copyist³⁴) for ἔτη δέκα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ. Diodoros's other figure of eleven years will now be a rounding up (by four months) instead of a rounding down (by eight); Aristotle's ten years will be a rounding down.³⁵ This change made, Hieron's accession will come at some time in the last eight months of the year, his death and Thrasyboulos's accession at some time in the first eight months, and Thrasyboulos's overthrow at some time in the first seven months. With the Athenian archon-year we should still be cutting things fine, with Thrasyboulos's overthrow not before July; with a year beginning at any earlier point we shall have all the time we need.

This change was proposed eighty years ago by Beloch,³⁶ when the one reason for making it was the need to resolve the clash between Diodoros and Aristotle. I have added a second and I think stronger reason; and I will now proceed to add a third.

I have referred already, in the third part of this paper, to the scholion (1a, in A) on the opening invocation: καταλυθέντων τῶν περὶ Ἱέρωνα ἀθλήσας ἤδη ἐνίκησεν· ὅθεν τὸν Ἐλευθέριον Δία <. . .>, ὡς τῶν Σικελιωτῶν κατελευθερωθέντων τῆς τυραννίδος, 'the games at which he won his victory were subsequent to the overthrow of οἱ περὶ Ἱέρωνα; which is why (the poet speaks of) Zeus Eleutherios, in view of the Sicilians' release from tyranny'. When the ode was dated to 470, this comment was of course dismissed as pure muddle; but once one dates the ode to 466 it becomes important evidence. The victory is of course the Pythian victory of 466; and the man who made the comment may be assumed to have had evidence for the fall of the Syracusan tyranny which either indicated or at any rate was compatible with a date before the Pythiad of 466. As it stands, unfortunately, the language of the comment might create a suspicion of confusion (which might be either original, the fault of the Alexandrian scholar who first composed the note, or secondary, the fault of some intermediary who reworded it); and though I do not myself believe that there is confusion at all, I must at least expound the problem. The trouble lies in the expression οἱ περὶ Ἱέρωνα: this οἱ περὶ τὸν δεῖνα means originally, of course, 'X's associates', comes commonly to mean 'X and his associates', and ends up as a mere futile periphrasis for 'X'. And the suspicion would be that οἱ περὶ Ἱέρωνα here is intended to mean simply 'Hieron', and that the writer has confused the death of Hieron (which by any reckoning is earlier than the Pythiad of 466) with the fall of the tyranny in the following year. If so, there are two possibilities: first, that he dates the victory after Hieron's death and confuses this with the fall of the tyranny (in this case the confusion is original and gross); second, that he dates the victory after the fall of the tyranny but describes this mistakenly as the fall of Hieron (in this case the confusion might only be secondary). Now if either of these possibilities is true, it seems to me more likely to be the latter: the confusion is not only a slighter one but is paralleled in these same scholia in A on *Olympian* vi (165: the Syracusan Hagesias ἀνηρέθη Ἱέρωνος καταλυθέντος; he must of course have been killed when the *tyranny* was overthrown). But I incline myself to think that neither possibility is true, and that the writer is using οἱ περὶ Ἱέρωνα more meaningfully: that he is referring to the fall of the

³⁴ Most probably, I think, Diodoros: a man who is hesitating between an exact 'ten years and eight months' and an approximate 'eleven years' might easily confuse himself into writing 'eleven years and eight months'.

³⁵ I do not think one can infer from Aristotle's language (no 'died in the eleventh' for Hieron) that he intended Hieron's rule to have lasted an exact ten years. In full it would have been Γέλων μὲν γὰρ ἑπτὰ <ἔτη> τυραννεύσας τῷ ὀγδόῳ τὸν βίον ἐτελεύτησεν, δέκα δ' Ἱέρων <τυραννεύσας τῷ ἐνδεκάτῳ τὸν βίον ἐτελεύτησεν>, Θρασύβουλος δὲ <δέκα μῆνας τυραννεύσας>

τῷ ἐνδεκάτῳ μηνὶ ἐξέπεσεν; for brevity and variety he omitted 'died in the eleventh' for Hieron and 'after ruling for ten months' for Thrasyboulos. If Gelon died fairly early in his eighth year the total could be well under nineteen years: say Gelon 7 years 2 months, Hieron 10 years 8 months, Thrasyboulos 10 months; total 18 years 8 months, which Aristotle could then (neglecting the fraction) give as 'eighteen years'.

³⁶ *Griechische Geschichte*, 1st ed., i (1893) 445, n. 2. In his second edition he abandoned the suggestion.

tyranny in the year after Hieron's death, but instead of naming the relatively unimportant Thrasyboulos has preferred to comprise the whole dynasty, or rather the dynasty after Gelon, under a comprehensive 'Hieron's family'.³⁷

There are then, in all, three ways of explaining the note. On one of them, which presupposes a major muddle by the Alexandrian scholar who first composed it, the victory is dated after Hieron's death. On the others, which presuppose either a minor muddle, perhaps by an intermediary, or no muddle at all, it is dated after the fall of the tyranny; and this I believe to be what our Alexandrian scholar intended.³⁸

I consider finally the question of Zeus Eleutherios: that Fortune should be invoked as his daughter is proper enough in any city whose freedom is or has been at stake; it may be thought more proper still if in that city Zeus Eleutherios has an actual cult. We cannot infer a cult from the invocation; but we may legitimately investigate the possibility of its existence. There are three occasions on which its institution might be thought appropriate.

First, after the defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera in 480. This suggestion is based primarily on the analogy of Plataia, where after the defeat of the Persians in 479 the Greeks built an altar to Zeus Eleutherios (being so instructed by Delphi) and instituted quadrennial games.³⁹ It has been supported by the existence at Himera of the remains of a temple (of unknown dedication), imposing for a town of Himera's size, whose completion has been dated to 470-460;⁴⁰ and by the conjecture that this might be one of the two temples which the Carthaginians were required to build (we are not told where) as part of the peace terms of 480.⁴¹ This is all very flimsy indeed: the institution of a cult at this time is of course entirely possible; the evidence adduced does nothing to make it more than possible.

Second, after Himera's release from Akragas in *c.* 470. This I do not believe. That the freedom turned out not to be freedom at all is hardly an objection: as one escapes the frying-pan one may not be conscious yet of the temperature of the fire. But I doubt

³⁷ It may be that the same use is behind the mistake in sch. *O.* vi 165: that the original note had τῶν περὶ Ἱέρωνα in the sense of 'Hieron's dynasty', and that the Ἱέρωνος of the scholion is due to someone who misunderstood this τῶν περὶ Ἱέρωνα as meaning 'Hieron'.

³⁸ I suppose the same facts to be behind the note in sch. *inscr.* b (BCDEQ): Ergoteles, leaving Knossos as a result of στάσις, came to Himera, καὶ καταλαβὼν πάλιν τὰ ἐν Σικελίᾳ πράγματα στασιαζόμενα πρὸς Γέλωνος καὶ Ἱέρωνος ἐκδεξάμενος εἰρήνην ἐνίκησε. This is part of the same note in **V** that we have seen to have been arbitrarily rewritten where it deals with Ergoteles's dates (p. 28 with n.15), and I suppose there to have been similar arbitrary re-writing here (perhaps with subsequent corruption). I take the last words to derive from a statement of the same facts as in **A**'s (1a) καταλοθέντων τῶν περὶ Ἱέρωνα ἀθλήσας ἤδη ἐνίκησεν, with the 'victory' that of 466 and the 'peace' that which supervened on (ἐκδεξαμένης εἰρήνης Drachmann) the overthrow of the Deinomenidai. What I expect before this is a reference to the events which culminated in that overthrow; what we have is extraordinary stuff: if there was ever στάσις between Gelon and Hieron (sch. *P.* i 87 φασι δὲ τὸν Ἱέρωνα [καὶ] πρὸς Γέλωνα τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἑστασιακέναι τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔνεκα) it would be described here very oddly (with πρὸς), it will not have been pan-Sicilian (Himera in particular owed no allegiance yet to Syracuse), and it was never relevant to Ergoteles if he came to Himera in 476

with Gelon two years dead. It may be that our man has muddle-headedly thrown back (with καταλαβὼν) to the time of Ergoteles's arrival some reference to the revolution against the Deinomenidai, and in so doing has garbled it: πρὸς (whatever he means by it) out of sheer incomprehension of the facts, Gelon by what confusion I know not (perhaps by an over-confident expansion of 'the Deinomenidai').

³⁹ Plut. *Arist.* 20. 4, 21. 1; Str. ix 2. 31 = p. 412; Paus. ix 2. 5.

⁴⁰ P. Marconi, *Himera* 53. His date of 470-460 is based on the style of the lion-head rain-spouts; from what can be told of the structure of the temple itself he puts the beginning of the work in the first quarter of the fifth century, and his more precise suggestion of 'around 480' seems to be based only on guesswork ('presumably') about the length of time likely to have been taken over the building.

⁴¹ Marconi, *op. cit.* 164-5 (he makes no conjecture about the deity to whom the temple was dedicated; 'perhaps to Zeus Eleutherios' Dunbabin, *The western Greeks* 429). The peace terms are given by Diodoros (xi 26. 2) as follows (the subject is Gelon): ἐπράξατο δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν τὰς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον γεγενημένας δαπάνας, ἀργυρίου δισχίλια τάλαντα, καὶ δύο ναοὺς προσέταξεν οἰκοδομήσαι καθ' ὅς ἐδει τὰς ἐνθήκας ἀνατεθῆναι. I should have guessed myself that the temples were to be at Syracuse and Akragas: one text of the treaty for each of the two allied powers.

whether even at the time the deliverance would have seemed enough of a deliverance to call for the institution of such a cult. The opponents of Akragas had been massacred, six years or so before; the survivors of the original citizens would be either, one supposes, acquiescent in Akragantine domination or at any rate unlikely to welcome a switch to the Hieron who had proved so treacherous at the time of the massacre; and the new citizens of after the massacre were Theron's own importation. I cannot conceive that enthusiasm for the new order would be very marked.

Third, after the fall of Thrasyboulos in 466. Here we have at once the parallel of Syracuse: whose citizens at this very time voted for a colossal statue of Zeus Eleutherios and an annual and elaborate festival of the Eleutheria on the anniversary of Thrasyboulos's overthrow (Diod. xi 72. 2). The fall of the Deinomenidai was the beginning of a new era not only for Syracuse but for the whole of Sicily; at Himera too a new cult of Zeus Eleutherios would be easy to understand.

The invocation, as I have said, in no way presupposes a cult; but if there was a cult, it may well have been instituted in 466. Conceivably it was already in existence, instituted when the threat of servitude to the barbarian was averted in 480; but if it was, there can be no doubt that it took on new meaning now in 466, with the ending this time of no mere threat of servitude but of long years of servitude itself.

V. CONCLUSION

I will end by running briefly once more through the first two stanzas of the ode in this new context.

'I pray you, daughter of Zeus of Freedom, keep in your care Himera in her widespread might, o saviour Fortune.' The Himeraians are free at last, after long years of subjection to tyrants, domestic and foreign; whether or no they have signalled their gratitude by a cult, it is to Zeus Eleutherios and his aid that they owe their freedom, and the Fortune who is besought to guard it hereafter is named for that purpose as his daughter. And Himera is (or is to be: for this is a prayer) *εὐρυθενής*: no likely word at ordinary times for a city as undistinguished as this, but it will strike a chord in men who have just emerged from subjection into real *χθένος* (in whatever measure) of their own.

'Yours is the piloting of swift ships on the sea, and on land of rapid warfare and gatherings where men give counsel': the words come well when in the winning of freedom all these elements have successfully played their part.⁴²

'While men have their hopes tossed often up, and now down, as they cleave a sea of vain illusion, and none yet on earth has found a sure token from the gods about an issue that is to be, and their perception of what is to come is blind. Men have found many a thing fall out contrary to their judgement, to the reverse of delight; while others have met with grievous squalls and then in a moment got abundant good in place of hurt.' In part, of course, this is looking forward to Ergoteles's own case: his disaster in Knossos, turning, against all expectation, into security and distinction at Himera. But in part it is looking back to Himera herself and to all the unforeseen vicissitudes of recent years: the expulsion of Terillos turning into subjection to Akragas; then defeat by Hieron turning into release from Akragas, but this again into subjection to Hieron instead; and now at last real freedom once again.

W. S. BARRETT

Keble College, Oxford

⁴² Himera was one of the four cities who between (see above, n. 19); I like to think (but have no them sent ships and troops to the Syracusan insurgents means of proving) that she herself sent both.