Introduction: Aegina in Contexts

David Fearn

As for you, golden-charioted Aiakidai, I proclaim that my clearest obligation as I come to this island is to rain down praises upon it. Countless paths one hundred feet wide have been laid out by your noble deeds, one after the other: both beyond the streams of the Nile and further than the Hyperborians. There is no city so barbarous or so backward in its speech that it does not hear the glory of the hero Peleus, blessed son-in-law of the gods; or of Ajax Telamon’s son, and of his father...

(Pindar, Isthmian 6.19–27)

The island of Aegina was the homeland of the mythical Aiakidai celebrated here in magnificent style. Situated in the Saronic Gulf 15 miles south of Athens, it is well known as the original home of the magnificent Doric architecture and sculpture of the Temple of Aphaia, and as the home of many of the patrons of Pindar and
Bacchylides. The island and its inhabitants feature prominently in the narratives of Herodotus’ *Histories*, especially in the relation of the island to the nearby states of Athens and Sparta. Indeed, Aegina is the third most frequently mentioned Greek state in all of Herodotus, after her two prominent fifth-century rivals, yet this fact frequently goes unnoticed. Throughout the fifth century, as both Herodotus and Thucydides reveal, the island was a constant challenge to Athens, and consequently was eventually transformed into an Athenian kleruchy at the start of the Peloponnesian War, with the indigenous Aeginetan population deported to the Peloponnese and subsequently almost totally wiped out by the Athenians at Thyrea in 424 BC.1 The island also has a rich and complex archaeological heritage, with material finds dating back to the third millennium BC and sites that have revealed an extremely rich history of continuous occupation, with significant wider links across Greece.2 Aegina is also familiar to scholars of archaic and classical economic history, as the ground for fertile debate on the nature of the relation between commerce, land-use, and social structure in the archaic and classical periods.3 The poetry associated with the island in the fifth century, by Pindar and Bacchylides, continues to impress with its glittering beauty, mythological inventiveness, complexity, and self-confidence.

It is unfortunate, then, that too many of these aspects have been studied in isolation. There is general need for joined-up thinking about the nature of Aeginetan society in the fifth-century BC, integrating a wide range of subject matter and approaches. Aeginetan poetry is rightly prominent in studies of Pindar, given that one-quarter of Pindar’s epinician output was composed for Aeginetan victors; Bacchylides, too, composed his longest epinician ode for an Aeginetan victor.4 Influential modern historicist approaches to
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1 Thuc. 2.27; 4.56.2–57.5.
2 On the prehistory of the main archaeological sites on the island, see in particular *Alt-Agina*, III.1; Felten and Hiller (1996); Pilafidis-Williams (1998); Felten and Hiller (2004); Gauss (2007); Felten (2007); Gauss and Smetana (2008).
Pindar have often underestimated the significance of the diversity of local contexts for epinician poetry, and, from a historical point of view, there is still scope for Greek historians to mine the non-traditionally historiographical sources for information. This is the first ever multi-contributor study of choral lyric poetry devoted to one particular context; the richness of the papers presented here aims to validate, and prove the need for, future studies of different contexts and their cultures, to add to the growing acknowledgement of political and cultural diversity that is the hallmark of fifth-century Greek culture, and of which Herodotus provided arguably the most sophisticated ancient overview.

Aeginetan studies have been dominated for many years by the researches of Thomas Figueira. His focus has been traditionally historical, a process of trying to determine the chronology and precise nature of the events affecting the island and its inhabitants in the fifth century and beyond. Among the many virtues of his work on Aegina, his study of Aegina’s strategic position in the Saronic Gulf is one of the few which grants the island a significant role in the causes of the Peloponnesian War, building on what little Thucydides has to say about the island. There is, however, significant scope for other studies such as the present one, studies which are obviously indebted to Figueira, but which look at the issues and evidence with different perspectives and expertise. Where this volume touches on historical questions, contributors are particularly interested in the ways in which the presentation of the distinctive point of view constituted by an ancient source can offer insights into broader truths about the nature of Aeginetan culture and society: for instance, the broader significance of representations of the Aiakidai throughout the wide range of different literary and non-literary sources, or the nature of subsequent articulations of Aeginetan history as carefully constructed narratives reliant upon a diversity
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5 See Fearn (2009) for a recent attempt to bring political and aesthetic/poetic considerations together through two individual case-studies.
7 Figueira (1990); cf. D. M. Lewis in CAH V².370–1: a significant part of Thucydides’ geopolitical take on causation is Corinth, not Aegina (or Megara).
of oral records with their own biases and points of view, rather than straightforward reconstructions of history as fact.

It was through a desire to bridge the gaps between different disciplinary approaches to fifth-century Greek contexts, and to face up to the challenges that contextualization presented, that I chose to organize a seminar series at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in autumn 2006, with the title ‘Aegina: Poetry and Culture in the Fifth Century bc.’ The aim was to invite papers from scholars who would be able to offer a diverse range of contributions on issues relating not only to Aeginetan epinician poetry, but to other subjects which might have a bearing on the poetry, and which the poetry might itself have influenced. In general, the hope was for an interdisciplinary series which would enable many aspects of Aeginetan fifth-century life to be taken into consideration, in ways that would open up the work of Pindarists to historians, art historians, and archaeologists as a serious and potentially fruitful avenue to explore, as well as inviting more literary-minded Pindarists to learn from contemporary research into fifth-century religion, art, historiography, and economics. The main intention was to bring together into one place work being done, often in isolation, by scholars with different research interests and research backgrounds, and by both those in the early stages of academic careers and those with established international reputations.

The success of the seminar series initiated the preparation of the current volume, which includes additional contributions from scholars who either attended the original series and expressed an interest in being involved in the project as it developed further, or who were approached subsequently to offer contributions designed to round off and fit neatly into the broader aims of the volume (Guy Hedreen and Elizabeth Irwin). The present volume bears the title Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century bc. ‘Contexts’ is intended here to reinforce the notion that the poetry, or indeed the art, archaeology, or historical source material, must be interpreted in ways that are sensitive to a diversity on the ground: the concentration on one particular polis in a given historical moment is designed to challenge disciplinary disconnectedness. The fact that this volume is devoted to one particular set of epichoric circumstances is hardly limiting. Indeed, the detailed studies offered here increase the level of scrutiny devoted to
individual issues that may have importance for other states, regions, and networks, and therefore impinge on broader ideas and questions about the nature of classical Greece in general. The most obvious point is that a focus on Aegina—an immensely powerful pre-classical state which was, through the course of the fifth century, progressively viewed as a threat, marginalized, and ultimately suppressed by the dominance of Athens (and Sparta) in inter-state relations, viewed as the ‘pus of the Piraeus’—resets the balance, showing that fifth-century Greek history is much more than the history of Athens and/or Sparta in relation to other relatively minor players. Also, this Aeginetan case-study invites thought about the nature of Greekness in the classical period, emphasizing local diversity as a key, highly productive theme. The ways localized individuals and groups interacted with and defined their identities in relation to others, and how they did so (through the whole raft of social and cultural possibilities available to them: military strategy, myth-making, networking, art, trade, cult, political identity and allegiances, religion, athletics), go together to create the very notion of Greekness in the fifth century BC. ‘Greekness’ is not a thing in itself with a status separate from that given it by those invoking it, and therefore the occasions upon which it is invoked are significant, requiring examination from multiple perspectives. In the case of Aeginetans, as we shall see, the strategies they adopted are often and importantly reflected, as well as enacted, in the lyric poetry they commissioned. And, at the same time, the poets the Aeginetans used to celebrate their achievements were Panhellenic artists with a broad (in both geographical and political terms) base of patrons; and the contexts in which Aeginetans often demonstrated their prowess, whether through religious expertise or athletic skill, were themselves often Panhellenic. The poetry therefore also articulates the tensions between epichoric individuality and inter-state competitiveness for pre-eminence and influence on broader Panhellenic stages that generate the very idea of Greekness in the early fifth century. And these are important factors which are clearly visible, for instance, throughout Herodotus’ Histories.

8 ‘Pus of the Piraeus’ (the view of Pericles): Arist. Rhet. 1411a, Plut. Per. 8.5. See Irwin, this volume, Ch. 11 for detailed discussion of this metaphor of ‘medical purging’, or what we might call ‘ethnic cleansing’.
‘Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry’ defines this collection in a number of complementary and overlapping senses. Some of the following chapters interpret the theme quite literally, offering interpretations of individual poems in direct and specific relation to a set of particular contexts understood to be cued to us by the poems themselves, or through connection with which the poems are seen to develop their meaning and significance. Others choose to look at a range of poetic material, whether it be Aeginetan lyric as a whole, or Aeginetan lyric in relation to other non-Aeginetan lyric, and the issues that contextualization within the poetic tradition and within Aeginetan culture raise. More broadly still, some contributions offer wider views of how the very medium of poetry as a traditional cultural product and purveyor of mythology played highly significant roles in forming Aeginetans’ views of themselves and their background, and in shaping the ways in which Aeginetans interacted with others, culturally, politically, and economically. Other contributions focus exclusively on key cultural institutions with which the poetry comes into contact, such as the Temple of Aphaia and other buildings with cultic significance, and offer new suggestions about how these should be interpreted. Finally, the volume itself generates a context for discussion of ways in which Aeginetan cultural monuments, along with the ideals they represented and articulated, were themselves recontextualized and interpreted by fifth-century historiography.

We have, of course, to recognize that ‘context’ provides no stable field against which to situate the poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides (and Simonides). Choral lyric poetry, in terms of both original performance and subsequent reception, was one important part, and one important mode, of cultural expression, that makes up and constitutes what we view as ‘context’. However, we also need to be on our guard to avoid prioritizing or essentializing the unstable field of ‘context’.9 And prolonged focus on what appears to be cultural uniformity at a distance (here ‘Aegina’) emerges as a series of deeper, and more telling, diversities, dynamics, and oppositions.10 Rather like with the fractals of mathematical programming, the
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9 See Feeney (1998), 141.
10 Excellent methodological discussion with direct relevance for Hellenists at Feeney (1998), esp. 60–3 on Greek myth and context.
further we zoom in, the more complex, and the more fascinating, the picture inevitably becomes.

INTERDISCIPLINARY CONTEXTUALIZATION

The ways in which scholarship has revealed its interpretations of Aeginetan choral lyric poetry have often been governed by modes of articulation and frameworks which have allowed too little regard for the specificity of Aegina. Despite the dominance of Aeginetan commissions in Pindar’s epinician oeuvre, there have been few attempts to interpret Aeginetan poetry in ways that understand the poetry and culture together, and without the literary perspective dominating. However, recent years have seen the appearance of useful broader studies of choral lyric poetry (of all genres: not only epinician poetry) as a cultural phenomenon that cannot be separated from contextually grounded issues pertaining to athletic competition, politics and society, and religion. Pindar’s epinician poetry clearly provides one of the most accessible signs of the assertive self-confidence of Aegina in the early fifth century. It therefore needs to be understood in relation to the contexts in which it was performed and received.

A long-standing aid is provided by the scholarly commentaries on Pindar and Bacchylides; these have tended to dominate the scholarly field on Aeginetan poetry, at least until recently. Commentaries have obvious uses, especially for the literary elucidation of a kind of poetry justifiably characterized by its frequent difficulty and obscurity of expression. However, limitations of space generally allow only for short contextual sketches; and primary focus on textual elucidation can result in the impression of social decontextualization, or biographical or historical over-interpretation, both of which are unfortunate.  

11 And this despite some excellent work done on, for instance, Sicilian epinician poetry and its contexts and significance: e.g. Kurke (1991a), esp. Part III; Luraghi (1994); Philipp (1994); Bell (1995); Antonaccio (2007); Morrison (2007b).

12 The older traditionally historicist commentaries are still useful, but the mode of contextualization is too narrowly limited to biography. For general coverage of Aeginetan poetry, see Bury (1890) and (1892); Jebb (1905); Farnell (1930–2); historical
In order to be able to do justice to the cultural richness that Aeginetan choral lyric poetry brings to our attention, a multi-contributor study of contextualization seemed a good idea, allowing for a rich diversity of both subject matter and approaches; this is also a useful way of dealing with a major challenge facing the whole project, namely that of how exactly such contextualization should be articulated, and what kinds of methodology such a project entails or allows. The formalist analyses by Elroy Bundy made readers sensitive to the gestures of the texts, but his insights became a rather unsatisfactory end in themselves, when they can really only be useful when instrumental for broader, more holistic readings.13 On the other hand, contextualization poses difficult methodological questions: what kind(s), or what degree, of historicism should be applicable; how ‘thick’ should we really expect our contextual surveys of choral lyric poetry to be, especially for places like Aegina where, in comparison to classical Athens, the supply of historical information is relatively meagre? One problem, then, is exactly how to determine such limits, and what to count as relevant contextual information. Answers emerge from the coherence of a given reading, but a certain circularity still threatens.

Perhaps the most influential study of Pindar (at least his epinician output) of the last twenty years has been offered by Leslie Kurke, because of the way she avoids the Bundyist impasse by offering a politicized reinterpretation of Pindaric rhetoric and metaphor in the light of a New Historicist methodology, and producing a reading of Pindaric poetry as deeply embedded within the politics of its own time.14 However, Kurke had surprisingly little to say about Aegina, especially by comparison with her attention to Sicilian odes, or about comment is often heavily reliant on the speculations of the ancient scholiasts. The principal more recent commentaries are Thummer (1968–9); Carey (1981); Kirkwood (1982); Privitera (1982); Maehler I; Wilcock (1995); Instone (1996); Ferrari (1998); Pfeijffer (1999); Maehler (2004); Henry (2005). Where these touch on externals, they have tended to be more interested in ethics and mythology than in politics or society. Henry (2005) is extreme, with decontextualization systematic: see Gerber (2005). Pfeijffer (1999) is the only one to focus solely on the Aeginetan material, but his treatment is vitiated by frequent and speculative attempts at historicist contextualization without sufficient grounding in other areas of study.

13 Cf. e.g. Hornblower (2004), 28, 38–9.
14 Kurke (1991a).
the specifics of oligarchic political conditions, thus leaving Aegina relatively under-explored.\footnote{See also my comments at Fearn (2009), 34 with n. 68; the studies of Morgan (2007) and Thomas (2007).}

Other recent historicizing studies of choral lyric have offered highly promising insights into context, but rather ironically contextualization can often lead to under-engagement with the poetry itself.\footnote{See the volume of Hornblower and Morgan (eds.) (2007), which although very useful relegates Pindar’s poetry largely to citations in footnotes.} Accordingly, we need somehow to preserve a delicate balance between appreciations of the literature as literature, and appreciations of the place of that literature in broader debates opened up by historians, archaeologists, and art historians. Offering a nuanced contextualization of the kind outlined is difficult to accomplish, and the present multi-contributor volume offers a range of contextualizing readings that are designed to open up, and open out, appreciation of the interpretative possibilities. The multi-contributor approach to Aegina enables the richness of Aeginetan culture, in all its many aspects, to take centre-stage, and the interdisciplinarity aims to uncover the diversity and specificity of Aeginetan culture and society in ways that single authorship would find difficult to manage.

The present study of course acknowledges its indebtedness to renewed interest in the importance of Aegina for a number of different areas of study which are relevant for open-minded discussion of Aeginetan culture and society. Aegina has been central to recent discussions of paens, sacred pilgrimage, and cult, and has played an important part in renewed scholarly interest in the broader cultural significance of mythological genealogies and classical texts, particularly the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue of Women}. Important work has been carried out here by scholars such as Ian Rutherford and Leslie Kurke, along with the wider explorations of scholars such as Jonathan Hall, as well as Barbara Kowalzig and Giovan Battista D’Alessio.\footnote{Rutherford (1992), (1997), and esp. (2001); Kurke (2005); Hall (1997) on Greek ethnicity, with the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue} as a key source-text; Kowalzig (2005) and (2007), esp. ch. 4 focusing on the relation between Aeginetan performance culture, ritual, and inter-state relations; D’Alessio (2005\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{b}) for more detailed focus on the \textit{Catalogue} and its importance as a source for Pindar and Bacchylides to draw from; Hirschberger (2004).} Sociological studies of the
significance of choral performances and *mousikē* in general across the classical Greek world are now flourishing.\(^{18}\) This is thanks in good part to the fundamental work by Peter Wilson on the Athenian *chorēgia*, which raises important questions about the nature of the provision of choruses not just for fifth-century Athens, but also beyond Athens.\(^{19}\) To single out other important recent work on choral lyric in its social context, D’Alessio has also produced an excellent and suggestive study of the significance of epichoric paean for community self-definition.\(^{20}\) As such, this is all part of an evolving trend in social and cultural history, to see beyond Athens and to fight the biases of reception which make her dominate attention: though of course Aeginetan fifth-century culture makes no sense without Athens.

All of these topics and approaches raise important questions, and without them an appreciation of Aeginetan culture in the round would be seriously incomplete. Simon Hornblower’s *Thucydides and Pindar* has made important advances in our understanding of the significance of a study of myth and of prosopography for Aeginetan epichoric history across both historiography and the choral lyric poets, thus making a compelling case for the relevance of Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides, as well as of Herodotus and Thucydides, for cultural historians of classical Greece.\(^{21}\) Pindar’s Aegina has been studied in further detail by Bruno Currie in *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*.\(^{22}\) Anne Burnett’s *Pindar’s Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* interestingly discusses the relation between athletics and aristocracy, though she lays emphasis on the significance of rituals of boys’ initiation to the exclusion of broader views of
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\(^{18}\) e.g. the papers in Hunter and Rutherford (eds.) (2009); Power (2010). We await contextual studies on dithyramb in Kowalzig and Wilson (eds.) (forthcoming) and on *mousikē* in Plato’s *Laws* in Peponi (ed.) (forthcoming).

\(^{19}\) Wilson (2000): see 279–302 for thoughts about the nature of choreic administration beyond Athens.

\(^{20}\) D’Alessio (2009).

\(^{21}\) Hornblower (2004). Kinship diplomacy and myth: 118 for Aegina and Thebes; Aeginetan prosopography: 262 and 23 on Krios, and the family of Lampon. See also Hornblower (2007a), though the conclusions he offers about Aeginetan *xenia* seem perhaps rather simplistic.

\(^{22}\) Currie (2005).
Aeginetan political issues or broader investigation of the Temple of Aphaia.\textsuperscript{23}

New investigations of classical archaeology and art history concerning Aegina also find their way into discussion here at a number of points. In particular, the volume as a whole has benefited greatly from the presentation of the archaeological evidence amassed by the Austrian excavations detailed in the series of \textit{Alt-Ågina} volumes. Particularly significant are their treatments of the complex of buildings on the archaeological site of the so-called ‘Kolonna Hill’ in Aegina town, associated with the local cult of Apollo.\textsuperscript{24} The Temple of Aphaia, of course, benefits from frequent discussion, not only in art-historical terms—thanks to the pedimental reconstructions in Munich and the studies by Dieter Ohly\textsuperscript{25}—but also through interdisciplinary investigations of the relations between the temple, its iconographic schemes, and its cults, and broader issues such as intertextualities with particular Pindaric works, its power as a symbol of Aeginetan pride and hostility to Athens, and the rituals associated with it. Recent work by Andrew Stewart has reopened questions about the dating of the temple;\textsuperscript{26} the issue of chronology remains live, and contributors to this volume give differing opinions on the new findings and their relevance to individual discussions. The publication of the discovery of the Athenian shrine of Aiakos by Ron Stroud has helped to reopen the issue of Athenian relations with Aegina from the perspective of hero-cult.\textsuperscript{27} This has been fruitful for work on Aeginetan choral lyric,\textsuperscript{28} and the possible relation between the Aeginetan and Athenian shrines to Aiakos, and connections between the various poetic, artistic, cultic, and historiographical manifestations of the Aeginetan Aiakidai and their significance.

\textsuperscript{23} Burnett (2005); review by Hubbard (2007–8). For an overview of historicist issues and reviews of Hornblower (2004), Currie (2005), and Burnett (2005), see the review article of Nicholson (2007).
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Alt-Ågina}, I.1–3.
\textsuperscript{25} Esp. Ohly (1976) and (2001).
\textsuperscript{26} Stewart (2008\textsuperscript{a} and \textsuperscript{b}).
\textsuperscript{27} Stroud (1998).
\textsuperscript{28} Fearn (2007), 88–95; Kowalzig (2007), 212–13, making a close connection with the supply of grain.
for relations between Aegina and Athens in the fifth century receive further detailed discussion.

AEGINA: CONTEXTS FOR CHORAL LYRIC POETRY

Three subjects in particular are highlighted in the present set of contributions. These are: (1) the socio-political significance of myth-making; (2) the importance of poetry as but one part of the broader cultural, especially artistic, means by which fifth-century Greeks expressed themselves; and (3) the importance of the relation between epinician poetry and historiography, especially in Herodotus. The first of these is flourishing well, thanks to a surge in contemporary scholarly interest in the wider significances of archaic and classical Greek *mousikē* and performance culture. The second is a developing area of interest, with literary scholars beginning to appreciate the significance of an understanding of the relevance of material culture to their own concerns and areas of traditional expertise, and classical art historians developing new responses to the nature of the evidence (especially for the development of classical art and the transition from archaic to classical), 29 and with art historians and literary scholars striving to find ways to deal with potential interconnections across media. 30 The third of these has always been seen as significant, but recent research by Simon Hornblower has revived interest in the relations between Pindar and Thucydides, and fresh takes on Herodotus’ approach to the writing of historical narrative have brought Herodotus’ own particular perspective back to prominence. He is now being recognized as a writer and intellectual keen to explore and expose the cross-cultural ironies, hypocrisies, and travesties thrown up by the multiplicitous complexity of rival and competing versions of history that were made available to him, rather more than simply a purveyor of historical

29 e.g. Neer (2002); Tanner (2006); Elsner (2006).
truth unadorned (let alone of wilful fictional confections); and with Aegina specifically, we now have a study that situates the Aeginetan narratives of Herodotus book 5 in broader concerns about the nature of Herodotus’ project and its status as history. The presence of Herodotus is felt throughout this volume, and it concludes with a final section offering new interpretations of the place and significance of Aegina and Aeginetan narratives in the historiography of both Herodotus and Thucydides, studies which build on these new approaches to Herodotus as a sophisticated and self-conscious story-teller and memorializer.

PART I. CONTEXTS FOR HEROIC MYTH-MAKING: ETHNICITY, INTER-STATE RELATIONS, CULT, AND COMMERCE

Part I of this volume investigates ways in which Aeginetan heroic myth-making relates to a wide variety of broader societal issues. As we have already seen in the passage from Pindar’s *Isthmian* 6 which opened this Introduction, mythology and genealogy must be considered as crucial elements for a full appreciation of classical Aeginetans. And one of the key questions which this volume seeks to address is what is particularly Aeginetan about their uses of the Aiakidai (offspring of Aiakos, son of the relationship between Zeus and Aegina, eponymous nymph and daughter of Asopos), and why and how did the offspring of Aiakos become so important that they dominate all aspects of fifth-century Aeginetan culture.

It is important to get away from thinking about mythology as either a decorative or an abstract phenomenon: we need to see the particular ways and occasions on which it was manipulated and shaped, with sensitivity to both the similarities and the differences between different media and different contexts of production and

31 See esp. Munson (2001), in addition to the studies in Irwin and Greenwood (eds.).
32 Haubold (2007); Irwin and Greenwood (eds.).
occasions of reception. Moreover, consideration must be given to the ways that both artistic and poetic traditions influenced and shaped the portrayals of myth in the classical period and for Aegina in particular. Scholarship on Greek myth has had a tendency to think of myth as functionally significant for groups rather than individuals: see Buxton’s ‘collective significance to a particular social group or groups’. In the case of Aegina, the mythological story-patterns provided by the Aiakidai, offspring of the eponymous nymph, do perhaps provide one kind of systematic, maybe even structural, consistency to the media which express those myths: note in particular Pindar’s unusual, quasi-institutional, use of τεktion to express the obligation to sing of the Aiakidai when coming to Aegina, in line 20 of Isthmian 6. Moreover, it is plausible that the unique attestation of the word βάρβαρος in all of Pindar here at line 22, in the highly assertive statement, ‘there is no city so barbarous or so backward in its speech that it does not hear the glory of [the Aiakidai]’, is a sign that the poem is, at least in part, looking outwards beyond Aegina’s shores to engage with broader debates—or indeed accusations—about Aeginetan Medism and Aeginetans’ devotion to the Greek cause during the Persian Wars, an issue that hangs over Aegina throughout the century; concomitantly, it may also be seen as one of the first signs of a growing fifth-century struggle to articulate ‘Greekness’ as a difficult and at times problematic negotiation between ethnic and cultural definitions. The usage may also be thought to be expressive of uniformity in the Aeginetan outlook. Yet this is only one articulation among many of the significance of the Aiakidai. The very diversity of media—and even the diverse mythological articulations across different Aeginetan epinician poems—through which the Aiakid myths are expressed may also question the usefulness of a strongly collectivist theory of myth, the inadequacy of which may already be revealed by the indeterminacy in Buxton’s expression (‘a particular social group or groups’; my italics). In the

33 Buxton (1994), 15, following e.g. Burkert (1979), 1–5.
34 See Kirkwood (1982), 293 ad loc.; Thummer (1968–9), ii.103 ad loc.; Slater (1969), s.v.
35 See the contributions to this volume by Elizabeth Irwin (Chs. 10–11).
36 See in general Hall (1997) and (2002), though this passage is not discussed.
case of Aegina, a lack of sensitivity to diversity would risk underestimating the problems and issues surrounding intra-aristocratic conflict to which ancient oligarchies were prone, and thus missing out on a key aspect of Aeginetan society.\textsuperscript{37}

In his contribution, Gregory Nagy focuses on the myths associated with the patron heroine of the island, the nymph Aegina, daughter of the river-god Asopos. He shows how important continuities of mythological tradition from the archaic past in poetry such as the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue of Women} were for Pindar in his own take on the mythical history and foundation of the island. Of particular importance is the way in which the fifth-century lyric poetry for Aegina furthers the aims and ambitions of archaic Aeginetan myth-making. The identity, and specific geographical situatedness, of the nymph Aegina as a daughter of Asopos on the island is seen to represent the culmination of a long and dynamic process of inter-regional partnerships, hostilities, affiliations, and tusslings for primacy and for authority, between Thessaly, Thebes, Athens, and Aegina, through claims to kinship with Asopos and claims to his significant descendants, most importantly Aiakos, Peleus, and Achilles.

James Watson explores the history of the Sanctuary of Aphaia and its sculptural schemes, discussing the evidence for the context of the temple’s erection within the wider history of Aeginetan–Athenian enmity in the early fifth century. From a range of possible reasons for the splendid reconstruction of the sanctuary after fire in the late archaic period, two stand out as particularly important. First, the site’s location on a hilltop overlooking the Saronic Gulf, from which it could clearly be seen, even from the Athenian acropolis, gave the Aeginetans the opportunity to present themselves to the wide audience of all those who sailed past their island. Secondly, the conflict between Aegina and Athens had reached a particularly intense level by the end of the sixth century. The Sanctuary of Aphaia embodied rivalry with Athens in several ways, in particular through the sculptures which adorned the new temple at the site, in response to Athenians repeatedly laying claim to divine figures important to

\textsuperscript{37} Excellent discussion of the limitations of sociological functionalism at Feeney (1998), 61–3. More discussion of the political ramifications of these questions in Fearn, this volume, Ch. 5.
Aegina—especially the Aiakidai. The Aeginetans changed the sculptural decoration of their new temple to reclaim their heroes; they even tried to claim Athena from Athens by placing that goddess on the temple’s pediments. By using and contextualizing the evidence available from the site, Watson demonstrates the role of monumental art in the articulation of rivalries between these two states, with broader implications for the issue outside Aegina. This contribution therefore provides an important case-study of the relevance of the Sanctuary of Aphaia for interdisciplinary scholarship on Aeginetan art, history, and politics, revealing the fluidity of boundaries between art, myth, ritual, and the inter-state politics of the period.

In his piece, Ian Rutherford provides a new reassessment of the evidence for a building identified on the archaeological site of Kolonna Hill in Aegina town, a significant subject of discussion in recent work on Aegina.38 This is the so-called Theàrion, or ‘Theàrion of the Pythian one’ (Πυθιὼ Θεάριον), referred to at line 70 of Pindar’s Nemean 3, part of the complex of buildings constituting the Sanctuary of Apollo. Using a range of comparative epigraphic evidence, Rutherford assesses a variety of theories for its role in the institutional infrastructure of theòria, or inter-state and inter-regional religious pilgrimage, and associated networks, and the nature of the officials who administered it. This rich and sensitive survey will impact on other issues concerning the relation between aristocratic networking, choral lyric poetry, and religious administration.

Barbara Kowalzig takes the image of song as cargo travelling across the sea from the opening of Pindar’s Nemean 5 as the point of departure for a sophisticated discussion of the relation between Aeginetan myth-making and Aeginetan economics. She focuses on the articulation of Aeginetan myth in performance culture and ritual to produce an alternative and ground-breaking perspective on the long-standing scholarly question about the nature of the relation between Aeginetan elites and Aeginetan trade. She argues that Aeginetan self-representation through myth is profoundly linked to the island’s commercial activities; in particular, a set of interconnected myths and cults embeds the island in patterns of local and regional economic activity in the Saronic Gulf; and Aeginetans also form part of a wider elite-born

38 Currie (2005), 333–40; see also Fearn, this volume, Ch. 5.
network of commercial and maritime enterprise in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean. Stereotypical Aeginetan characteristics such as ‘strength at sea’ and ‘justice’ or ‘hospitality’ towards strangers are reflections of the island’s role as a cosmopolitan hub in the Saronic Gulf. Commercial activity, she argues, belongs to public Aeginetan self-representation on Aegina, as well as in a Panhellenic context, and as such adds to our understanding of economic rivalry in the Saronic Gulf, and aristocratic and democratic perspectives.

**PART II. POETRY, PERFORMANCE, POLITICS**

The tension between first performance and future reperformances and reception is at the heart of choral lyric poetry; the *kleos*-driven nature of epinician praise invites broader receptions beyond the relatively limited occasions of first performance: the aspiration of the poet and the wish of the patron is for these future performances (however imagined).\(^{39}\) Epinician poetry is likely to have been performed in a variety of different ways, sometimes chorally and sometimes not, according to the circumstances of given patrons or states; epinician, and choral lyric poetry in general, understood as a performance or set of performances, can helpfully be regarded as one part of a dynamic set of cultural modes of self-expression which can help us to gain insight into even broader aspects of a given society; and Aeginetan epinician poetry, as the largest surviving epichoric subset of the fifth-century epinician poets’ output, is capable of offering broader cultural and political insights.\(^{40}\) We also need to keep an eye on the questions of what makes choral lyric poetry, even when it has a ritual orientation, distinctive as poetry. And we need to bear in mind that the performance cultures of fifth-century Greece do not

\(^{39}\) Recent discussion of Pindaric reperformance contexts, and consequences, in Currie (2004); Morrison (2007b), with an excellent general summary of performance studies of Pindar.

\(^{40}\) Other general discussions in Carey (2007); Hornblower (2004), 33–6; Currie (2005). Cole (1992) discusses Aeginetan performances, but his strong historicist interpretations of poetry and context are generally too restrictive and allegorical to be compelling.
necessarily lead us directly into organic unity of relations between poetry and ritual or religion, which put at risk the overlaps, differences, and diversities offered up by competing ‘texts’ and competing media.\textsuperscript{41} Even paeans, however performed or received, cannot be transformed into an anthropological phenomenon, if that risks jettisoning the literary qualities of a piece of poetry that form the very fabric of its being, and against which other discourses engage.\textsuperscript{42} 

The publication of large-scale projects such as the Copenhagen Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis (\textit{CPCInv}) provide a breadth and depth of coverage that should facilitate future studies into particular features and circumstances of individual Greek states. Latest thinking on Greek political history again represents a plea for broad appreciation of diversity, to supersede overly rigid applications of democratically skewed political or cultural theory, thus moving away from the Athenocentric bias of some of our sources.\textsuperscript{43} Indeed, the ways in which the contributions to this volume are fighting methodologically against Athenian dominance are comparable with (though in many ways obviously different from) the ways the fifth-century Aeginetans had to fight, in action and through the cultural articulation of their ideals. And the contributions to this volume offer a striking validation of the historians’ quests for ever-more detailed, ‘thicker’, descriptions of epichoric contexts.

My own contribution to the volume explores Aeginetan performance culture and politics, providing insights into three broad issues: first, the nature of the relation between Aeginetan epinician poetry and other Aeginetan choral work; second, ways in which Aeginetan epinician poems might relate to both epichoric and Panhellenic cult; and third, the broader socio-political ramifications of such connections. The

\textsuperscript{41} Fundamental objections to ‘organic’ as part of a Hellenic model: Feeney (1998), 7, 22–5.
\textsuperscript{42} Feeney (1998), 23, critiquing Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel (1992), 228 within a broader discussion of polarized models for Greek versus Roman myth, literature, and religion. Cf. also Kurke (2005), 82, 84 for the prime importance of the relation between text and context, though I am not sure that ‘ritualization’ provides the obvious way forward, whether or not it allows us to deconstruct the text-context opposition. Some further discussion of this in Fearn, this volume, Ch. 5.
\textsuperscript{43} See in particular Brock and Hodkinson (2002), and the importance of Aristotle’s \textit{Politics} as a key text for fresh studies of political diversity.
startlingly prominent naming in this epinician poetry of victories by other family members, beyond anything we see elsewhere in non-Aeginetan material, marks out the Aeginetan material as special, and has particular socio-political ramifications when considered in relation to the frequency of references to cult, cult-practice, and the polis. It is argued that the control of, and support for, non-epinician choral song was itself also in the hands of the same aristocratic group of Aeginetan individuals and clans that commissioned these poets to write epinician poems in celebration of athletic victories by members of their families. The Aeginetan epinician material, when taken together as a discrete body of work, reveals itself as a highly aggressive and competitive oligarchic form with the potential to destabilize the very fabric of Aeginetan society even as it confirms the existence of a group for whom the poetry had special currency, especially during a dangerous period for Aegina marked by external threats, and internal threats posed by factional unrest\textsuperscript{44} which intra-oligarchic rivalries instantiated by the epinician poetry itself are likely to have produced.

Andrew Morrison focuses on the possibility of overlapping audiences for performances of some or all of the Aeginetan epinician poetry, using his previous study of Sicilian victory odes as his point of departure.\textsuperscript{45} He argues in detail for cross-references between the four odes for the sons of Lampon (\textit{Nemean} 5, Bacchylides 13, \textit{Isthmian} 6, \textit{Isthmian} 5), and suggests that \textit{Nemean} 5 and Bacchylides 13, both composed for the same victory of Pytheas, were designed by their respective poets with some awareness of the other’s ode. His analysis has consequences for the way we should read intertextual echoes between the odes, and for our view of ‘conventional’ material in the odes. His conclusion considers the intertextuality of \textit{Isthmian} 6 and \textit{Olympian} 5, which appears different from the links developed within the odes for Lampon’s sons. \textit{Olympian} 5 seems to use earlier Pindaric odes as a storehouse for Pindaric words and phrases, rather than for significant allusion.

Both of these approaches use the specific geographical grouping of Aeginetan poems as their point of departure to offer something new to studies of epinician poetry. Moving beyond narrowly literary genre-based definitions of epinikion enables us to gain insights into

\textsuperscript{44} As witnessed by the Nikodromos affair reported by Hdt. at 6.88–91.
\textsuperscript{45} Morrison (2007b).
the implication of encomiastic poetry in discrete environments and for particular kinds of audiences. Genre in this period was a creative and flexible negotiation between poetic authority and audience expectations, accommodating a good deal of creativity and flexibility, responding to the exigencies of poetic patronage and a live performance culture. 46 Both of these chapters invite further consideration of intertextuality, both in a literal application which investigates relations between different epinician poems, and as a wider discursive phenomenon according to which a much larger range of media—literary works, monuments, performances of all kinds—can be considered as part of a broad system of signification.

PART III. INTERFACES BETWEEN POETRY, MYTH, AND ART

Earlier sections of the volume explore the variety of ways in which poetry associated with Aegina engaged with myths associated with the offspring of Aiakos. This section continues to ask questions about Aeginetan uses of the Aiakidai, now bringing Aeginetan art into the equation for the unique opportunity it provides for integrated reading of art and text that has not yet been explored fully.

Interdisciplinarity of this kind presents a scholarly challenge, for it is difficult to master both sides of the equation. But what is at stake is a deeper understanding of significant aspects of classical Greek culture, with all its rich complexity. Study of Aegina—clearly μικρὰ πολίς, though sadly we may require reminding of this—serves to prove the importance of studying seemingly less significant states and regions, even in the face of—or indeed as a response to—the dominance in scholarship of Athens and Attica, where evidence is

47 As, of course, Herodotus and Xenophon, at least, among classical Greek historiographers knew well: Hdt. 1.5.3–4; Xen. Hell. 7.2.1 following suit: ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ, καὶ εἰ τὶς μικρὰ πολίς οἷσα πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἔργα διασπέρασθαι, ἔτι μάλλον ἄξιον εἶναι ἀποφαίνειν (a comment on Phleious—another πόλις with a stake in the Aiakidai, for which see Fearn (2003) and further Nagy, this volume, Ch. 1).
much richer and well documented and interdisciplinary studies have been successful,\footnote{For Athens, see e.g. Castriota (1992).} and the dominant constructs offered by Thucydides the Athenian historian.\footnote{This hierarchy of significance, with Athens and Sparta dominating, is largely the construct of Thucydides, who retrojects onto previous fifth-century decades the political realities of the end of the fifth century.} Yet in those cases where the material or literary record is less rich, the need for interdisciplinary accounts is surely all the more pressing. The chapters which discuss the interfaces between Aeginetan poetry, myth, and art here represent some first forays into this fascinating and significant area of study, opening up possibilities for future studies of the relation between poetry and art in this period.

Lucia Athanassaki aims to interpret the major poetic choices of Pindar’s \textit{Olympian} 8 in light of the historical background of the composition and performance. She provides an overall reading of the poem which links the prominent use of \textit{deixis} together with interpretations of the poem’s myth—Apollo’s prophecy of the double sack of Troy—and allusions to the pedimental sculptures on the Temple of Aphaia which also illustrate the myth. Pindar’s view of Apollo’s prophecy to Aiakos in the poem, with Apollo authorizing Aiakid destruction of Troy, is set against the Delphic oracle which, according to Herodotus 5.89, instructed the Athenians to mark out a precinct to Aiakos after the lapse of thirty years and before beginning a victorious war against the Aeginetans. As the mirror-image of the Athenian story, Apollo’s favour of Aiakos in \textit{Olympian} 8 foreshadows the god’s benign attitude to his descendants and aims to cancel out the message of the Athenian tradition; the poem’s deictic references to performances both on Aegina and at Olympia and the allusions to the sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia reveal the Panhellenic aspirations of these Pindaric and Aeginetan counter-claims.

Henrik Indergaard’s chapter focuses on Pindar’s \textit{Isthmian} 6, the second of the three poems written by Pindar for the Aeginetan Lampon to celebrate the athletic victories of his sons. Indergaard observes how the Aiakidai are portrayed as a mythical parallel to Lampon’s clan, the Psalychiadai, and the possibility that Herakles is presented as a mythical parallel to Pindar himself. The mythical
narrative alludes to the pediments of the Temple of Aphaia, which are likely to have just been completed when the poem was written. Indergaard argues that the legendary tradition of the common exploits of Herakles and Telamon must have been particularly important on Aegina, and that the mythical narrative of Isthmian 6 provides a connection between the two Aphaia pediments, at the point when Herakles, the first conqueror of Troy, names Ajax as his successor. By providing this etiology in a poem praising one Aeginetan family, Pindar celebrates the pedimental iconography and also appropriates its significance for Lampon and his family. The mythical narrative of the friendship between Herakles and the Aiakidai also mirrors the political relationship between Thebes and Aegina. He argues that Pindar’s inclusion of Thebes and his own presence as a Theban xenos of his patron in a poem praising the Psalychiadai and the Aiakidai together not only expresses the patron’s interests, but also articulates a Theban perspective of Aegina and the family of Lampon, grounded in shared mythological heritage and ongoing friendship.

Guy Hedreen’s contribution illuminates both the pedimental sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia and the mythological narrative of Pindar’s Paean 6 through a study of their myth-making strategies of invention and appropriation. Building on tradition, both Paean 6 and the Aphaia pediments create narratives that enhance the reputations of Aeginetan heroes without blatant fabrication: the designers of the Aphaia sculptures used the conventional pairing of pediments to raise the significance of the first Trojan War, portraying the Aeginetan Aiakidai in the best possible light while subtly transforming traditional artistic portrayals of the fall of Troy; in Paean 6, emphasis on Apollo’s interest in the physical integrity of Troy plays down negative aspects of the portrayals of Achilles and Neoptolemos in the mythological tradition; and Pindar also manages to tighten the connections between Aegina, the Trojan War, and the Delphic Theoxenia. And it is Aiakos, saviour of Greece, founder both of the cult of Zeus Hellânos and of Aegina and the heroic lineage that produced Achilles and Neoptolemos, the principle actors in the paean’s narrative, who is the mythological figure who provides the connections. Interdisciplinary comparison across contemporary artistic media helps to isolate the particularities of Aeginetan
myth-making, thus adding to our understanding of Aeginetan negotiations within the Panhellenic canon of Greek myth.

PART IV. THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL AFTERMATH

Historical analysis of Aegina has focused on Herodotus, but at times such work has offered interpretations lacking sufficient sensitivity to the questions his text invites about historical change over the course of the fifth century, or about how individual episodes (logoi) might interrelate with their narrative surroundings within the Histories as a text to be read as a whole and debated and discussed as such.\(^{50}\) Herodotus has almost exclusively been treated as a source for the chronology of the conflict with Athens in the early fifth century, or for the political nature of Aeginetan society,\(^{51}\) with relatively little broader questioning of Herodotus’ motives as a contemporary writer composing against the backdrop of the destructions that Aegina suffered in the later stages of the fifth century.

Herodotus is, of course, yet one more ‘context’ in which to think about Aegina. The portrayals of Aegina that his narratives provide differ from, yet also importantly complement and revivify, the visions of Aegina offered by the epinician poets. As part of the multi-layered complexity of historical time that Herodotus provides, his Aeginetan focus is on the time before the heyday of their epinician poetry, and his time of writing is, for the most part, beyond it. Yet the epinician poetry, and the mythological paradigms that the poetry presents, systematically inform Herodotus’ themes. His narratives also implicitly tell audiences about processes of historical change, that take Aegina from a world vividly populated by helpful heroes (the Aiakidai) and cult statues that move (Dâmiê and Auxësiê) to a contemporary world of human agency characterized by Athenian dominance and Aeginetan destruction: a process of change which the chronology provided by the dates of the

\(^{50}\) For detailed discussion of approaches to Herodotus’ logoi, see Irwin and Greenwood (2007).

\(^{51}\) Notably in the work of Thomas Figueira.
peak period of Aeginetan epinician poetry we possess, from the 480s to the 440s, maps. So this part of the book focuses on the tensions in Herodotus’ account arising from the respective dates of his subject matter and the time of composition, and also recognizes the sense in which Aegina was an island with enormous significance throughout the entire century and before, and not just by virtue of, say, her prowess at the Battle of Salamis. And it also implicitly raises questions about the use to which Herodotus is put by scholars who see him as a historically transparent source for the history of archaic Greece and the Persian Wars. We, just like Herodotus himself, that most self-conscious of ancient historians, are readers and audiences, presented with information and accounts that we need to assess and weigh up. We can acknowledge the historicity of certain events, especially through corroboration with other material evidence. And we can also investigate the mechanisms by which Herodotus brings subjects and issues not only to our attention, but also to the attention of readers and audiences contemporary with him, including to groups and individuals—Athenians, for instance—who might not have been too willing to agree with or approve of his own slant on the reports and pieces of evidence that came his way.52

In her first contribution to this volume, Elizabeth Irwin builds on her previous work on fifth-century historiography to develop new ways of reading Herodotus’ Aeginetan *logoi*. Irwin situates Herodotus’ Aeginetan *logoi* in a multi-temporal framework of both history and history-writing, according to which narrations highlight discrepancies between a variety of different historical perspectives on Aegina and the island’s significance over the course of the entire century. The events that befall Aegina in the narrative may thus be seen to provide explanations or aetiologies for ways in which the major players in fifth-century Greek history, Sparta and Athens, behaved, therefore providing important lessons for contemporary audiences later in the century, in the wake of the growth of Athenian imperialism and during the Peloponnesian War. Herodotus is open and inquisitive, eager to listen to the stories of other important historical players such as Aegina and invite scrutiny of her

52 Relevant here is the issue of the ‘floating gap’ and the question of the extent to which Herodotus’ narratives are interested in providing chronological accuracy. For good discussion see Thomas (2001), esp. 203–4 on Aegina in Herodotus book 5.
deeds, and carefully to contextualize others’ accounts of those deeds; his explanations, and invitations to ask questions about the nature of the evidence presented, often counter competing and prevailing accounts, including importantly those of Athens, and those offered by Thucydides. This marks an attempt by the historian to restore Aegina for present and future audiences to a position of great importance for the course of fifth-century Greek history, and a warning to others not to rely, for example, on overly Athenocentric, negative, or dominating perspectives of Aegina, or grand narratives that celebrate the birth of Athenian naval imperialism to the historical detriment of Aeginetan achievements, both in the Persian Wars and subsequently. Herodotus is, like the epinician poets before him, involved in preserving κλέος, and he is following closely in their footsteps, since powerful external (as well as internal) political and strategic pressures were significant factors which also influenced Aeginetans’ prolonged patronage of Pindar and Bacchylides through ever-more threatening times. Irwin’s focus on the narrative contexts of the Aeginetan logoi in Herodotus reveals the sensitivity of his investigation of the nature of Aeginetan identity in heroic, military, strategic, political, economic, and ethnic terms, inviting renewed interest in such questions as: how Dorian was fifth-century Aegina? How did Aegina contribute to the Persian Wars, and how and why might her contribution have been challenged by the claims of others, notably Athens? What was the reaction of Sparta to Aegina both during the Persian Wars and subsequently? How was Aeginetan military/naval heroism to be constructed, and how might such constructions have helped to offer insights into questions about Aeginetan identity in relation to Sparta and Athens, and indeed about the heroic military visions offered by those rival states throughout the fifth century? The Aeginetan take on a number of these questions was manifested in the poetry and material culture associated with the island in the earlier fifth century, as discussed in previous contributions in this volume. Irwin provides some solutions to the significance of Herodotus’ interest in these narratives, in his intertwining of the stories available to him concerning the relations Aeginetans had with other states and powerful individuals from the archaic period to the aftermath of the Persian Wars, and in the ways he made them available to later fifth-century audiences for retrospective views of the nature of strategic power throughout the century, and for the ways Aegina had been treated.
In her second contribution, Irwin scrutinizes the relation between Herodotus’ Aeginetan logoi and the historian’s rationale, professed in the proem, that great deeds should not be without fame and should not fade from memory through the passage of time; moreover, she makes a significant point of contrasting this treatment of Aegina with that in Thucydides’ History, where not only are the destructive events that befell Aegina at Athenian hands during the Peloponnesian War passed over quickly with little comment—the forced deportations of 431 (Thuc. 2.27); the slaughter and enslavement of Aeginetans at Thyrea in 424 (Thuc. 4.57.4)—but the island’s earlier history is passed up as not worthy of the historian’s attention, being of little consequence (Thuc. 1.14.3). The ways in which Herodotus’ narratives present Athenians staking cultural and political claims to Aegina and vying with Aeginetans are matched by a historiographical contestation of the significance of Aegina which is fought out between Herodotus and Thucydides in the later century, a contestation which reveals that later fifth-century audiences’ own views of Aeginetan historical significance were similarly divided and opposed. Particular attention is paid to the seafaring prowess of Aeginetans referred to in books 1–4, the thalassocratic significance of the story of the statues of the epichoric Aeginetan deities Dâmiê and Auxêsiê and the general nature of the narration of the conflict between Aegina and Athens at 5.79–89, Herodotus’ comment upon the conflict between the two states at 7.144–5, and his final views of Aegina in Aeginetan involvement in the aftermath of the Battle of Plataea at 9.80 and 9.85. Herodotus’ self-conscious attention to the nature of his evidence reveals his sensitivity to the existence of rival accounts of Aegina which were circulating, and to the political and strategic rivalries that were spawning them; his reflection of accounts from the Pentakontaetia helps to provide an interpretative backdrop for what Pindar and Bacchylides were writing about Aegina. Herodotus gives his audience and readers every chance of working out for themselves the nature and significance of Aeginetan glory, and whether it should be allowed to endure, surviving the factors (imperial Athens; the frailties and biases of oral history; the narratorial strategies of Thucydides) which threatened to eradicate her memory.
Fortunately, however, the fame of Aegina lives on, in the poetry, sculpture, and archaeological sites of the island, and in those accounts offered up for scrutiny by Herodotus; and this volume itself aims to help to perpetuate that fame. Moreover, we also now know that, despite the depredations of the Peloponnesian War, Aeginetans regained a foothold on their island in the fourth century after that war had come to an end. In 1999 an inscribed marble slab was discovered set into the threshold of a church on the northern coast not far from Aegina town, with an unusual pyramidal top and a niche which may originally have housed a stone vessel or small statue. The monument is best thought to have been funerary in function, and its inscription, datable to the fourth century, names one Aristouchos son of Aristomenes, who is presumably the deceased honorand. By a remarkable coincidence, and one which seems likely given the prosopography and the dating, this Aristouchos may be the son of the same Aristomenes (of the Meidylidai) who was the victor in the boys’ wrestling at the Pythian Games of 446 and the honorand of Pindar’s *Pythian* 8, probably the last epinician ode that the great poet ever composed. The poetic impetus of Pindar’s *Pythian* 8 is a recognition of the significance of uncertainty in human existence, and the importance of home and the sense of belonging, which Apollo and Aegina together provide: expressions which an epinician ode by Pindar had the best chance of articulating and preserving for posterity, even in—and perhaps because of—the depths of political and societal insecurity in the years following 457–456 BC, when the island became a tribute-paying subject of the Athenian empire, presaging the dark days ahead for the island’s citizens later in the fifth century.

*Pythian* 8 ends with the following famous lines, the last we hear from Pindar of the Aiakidai and their importance for Aegina:

---

53 Polinskaya (2002).
55 See *CPCInv* 621 for a summary: listed ten times in the tribute lists, and assessed at 30 talents in all years except 450/49 and 432/1, the latter just prior to the forced evacuation of the entire indigenous population.
56 Superb articulation of the poetic rationale of *Pyth.* 8 and its focus on journeys—especially journeys home—by Richard Martin: Martin (2004); Silk (2001) for an important close reading of the connection between the egregious syntax of the closing lines and the values expressed therein; historical outline in Burnett (2005), 225–7; historicist reading overdone by Pfeijffer (1995a).
Creatures of a day! What is someone? What is no one? A shadow’s dream: mankind. But when god-given splendour comes, a shining light is upon men and life is sweet. Aegina, dear mother, bring this city safely home on a voyage that sails freely, with the aid of Zeus and lord Aiakos, and Peleus and noble Telamon, and especially Achilles.

(Pindar, Pythian 8.95–100)

Given the prominence of homecoming here when connected with the fragility of human existence (and of Aeginetan political identity), it seems extraordinary that it is Aristomenes’ family (or indeed clan) that provides us with our only material evidence for a continuity of Aeginetan selfhood after the ravages and tragedies of the Peloponnesian War years; the few remnants of Aegina’s original fifth-century population who were able to return home from exile were, it seems, able to regroup and re-engage with their pasts; the very oddity of this solitary funerary monument may articulate a sense both of cultural dislocation and displacement and of proud nostalgia. We might even say that the rediscovered funerary monument of Aristouchos represents, for us, the reality of the vision offered up by the end of Pythian 8 and its prayer for future well-being. For us as scholars of choral lyric poetry and fifth-century history, Aegina, her citizens, and her Aiakidai should continue to shine brightly, proven to be capable of enduring the vicissitudes of historical contingency, and thus able to live on, in our own and others’ readings of the choral lyric poetry and the island.

57 See the important discussion of Martin (2004), 357–8 with nn. 43–5 for the interpretation and translation of ἔλευθερῳ στόλῳ...κόμιζε.

58 Atypicality of the form of this monument within broader contexts of fourth-century funereal practice, and on Aegina in general: Polinskaya (2002), 405–6; we should strongly challenge, however, the notion (Hornblower (2007a) 305) that the relatively modest proportions of this fourth-century monument have any bearing on original fifth-century Aeginetans’ expenditure prior to the forced deportations of the Peloponnesian War (‘not an island of showy spenders’, Hornblower thinks).