

A PINDARIC CHARIOTEER: AELIUS ARISTIDES AND HIS DIVINE LITERARY EDITOR (ORATION 50.45)

In his fourth *Hieros Logos* (*Or.* 50), Aelius Aristides reports that Asclepius instructed him in a dream to dedicate a victory tripod commemorating his recent choral performances. Aristides composes an epigram to be inscribed on the monument, detailing his efforts as poet, president of the contests, and *chorégos*: Ποιητῆς ἀέθλων τε βραβεὺς αὐτός τε χορηγός, / σοὶ τόδ’ ἔθηκεν, ἄναξ, μνήμα χοροστασίας (*Or.* 50.45).¹ But the god rejects this poetic attempt, dictating to his patient instead verses that celebrate Aristides as an ‘illustrious charioteer of ever-flowing tales’: Οὐκ ἀφανῆς Ἑλλήσιν Ἀριστείδης ἀνέθηκεν / μύθων ἀενάων κύδιμος ἡνίοχος (*Or.* 50.45). Although no archaeological trace of the memorial has come to light at the Asclepieum in Pergamum, the story has attracted some interest as indirect evidence for dedicatory practices of the sanctuary’s elite visitors, and scholars have added the revised epigram to the repertoire of inscriptions that illustrate how orators of the imperial era publicized their status.² Little attention has been paid, however, to the nature of Aristides’ self-commemoration in its narrative context.³ The first dedicatory epigram is Aristides’ own composition; the revised version, on the other hand, is the result of divine intervention, and it incorporates a striking metaphor of the poet as charioteer. I shall argue that Aristides borrows this epinician motif from one of the classical authors he most admired – Pindar – in order to make a statement about his own relationship to his patron god, Asclepius.⁴

¹ Citations from B. Keil (ed.), *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei Quae Supersunt Omnia*, Vol. 2 (Berlin, 1898, repr. 1958).

² Aristides says he dedicated a tripod adorned with representations of Asclepius, Hygieia and Telesphorus in the Roman-era Temple of Zeus Asclepius (*Or.* 50.46), which appears to have housed offerings made primarily by elite visitors, C. Habicht, *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin, 1969), 13–14. Excavations of the Asclepieum have not, however, yielded any epigraphic material related to Aristides, B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’époque impériale* (Paris, 2002) at 144; dedicatory inscriptions left by other orators of this period have been recovered, Habicht, loc. cit. at 16 and 71–80. There are parallels for the offering reported at 50.45–6. The dedication in Athens (*IG* 2² 4531) of an altar to the same three divinities (a common grouping) has been attributed to Aristides; see C.P. Jones, ‘Three foreigners in Attica’, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 222–34. For an example of a tripod dedicated to Asclepius commemorating artistic performances, see *IG* 2², no. 3120b (Athens, c.E. 190–200): ἄρχων Διονυσόδωρος Εὐκάρπου τέχνης / πάσης με κύδος κομικῆς τραγικῆς χορῶν / τὸν δεῖθ’ ἱεράμβον τρίποδα θῆκ’ Ἀσκληπιῶ. L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), 216–17 and Puech, loc. cit., 138–45 consider Aristides’ epigram in relation to contemporary orators’ self-commemorative inscriptions.

³ Aside from brief remarks on epigraphic parallels or dedicatory practices, the passage receives little comment in the annotated translations published by C.A. Behr, *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, 2 vols (Leiden, 1981), A.-J. Festugière and H.-D. Saffrey, *Discours sacrés: Rêve, religion, médecine au II^e siècle ap. J.-C.* (Paris, 1986), S. Nicosia, *Discorsi Sacri* (Milan, 1984), O. Schröder, *Heilige Berichte* (Heidelberg, 1986).

⁴ Aristides’ relatively high rate of Pindaric quotation is noted by C.A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam, 1968), 11 and n. 28, and by A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d’Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère* (Paris, 1923), 441. T.K. Gkourogianis, *Pindaric Quotations in Aelius Aristides* (Diss., University of London, 1999) provides a compre-

In the fourth *Logos*, Aristides describes the resumption of his literary training and rhetorical performances after a year of illness.⁵ In spite of continuing physical weakness, Aristides is required not just to practise a little vocal exercise, light conversation, or recitation from memory, but in fact to take up declamation in the full sense: in the stoa near the theatre he is to perform an improvised and ‘agonistic’ speech (*Or.* 50.15). This, he says, was the first of many such performances, for ‘this new strength was as if the god was providing it, and the year seemed to be one not of silence but of training’.⁶ In this story of professional revival, poetic composition constitutes a distinct narrative sub-section (*Or.* 50.31–47) in which Aristides taps the traditional springs of literary inspiration.⁷ From his first tentative lines, written after falling ill on the journey to Rome (*Or.* 50.31), to the public (*δημοσία*, *Or.* 50.43) choral performances he presents in Pergamum, Aristides enjoys continual divine guidance, and he begins and ends with Pindar as his model. In his initial paean to Apollo, inspired in a dream by the god of poetry himself, the opening line – *Φορμύγγων ἄνακτα Παιᾶνα κληίσω* (*Or.* 50.31) – echoes the beginning of Pindar’s second *Olympian*: *Ἀναξίφορμυγες ὕμνοι*.⁸ His account closes on a similarly Pindaric note: the narrative sequence culminates in dream-instructions to set up a choregic monument, ‘partly as a mark of gratitude to the god, and partly as a memorial to the choral performances I had given’.⁹ The inscription for this memorial tripod crowns the excursus on his poetic career (*Or.* 50.45):

καὶ ἐμοὶ μὲν παρεσκεύαστο ἐλεγείον τοιονδί·
 Ποιητῆς ἀέθλων τε βραβεύς αὐτός τε χορηγός,
 σοὶ τόδ’ ἔθηκεν, ἄναξ, μνήμα χοροστασίης.
 ἔπειτα δύο τινὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔτερ’ ἦν ἔπη, ὧν τὸ μὲν τοῦνομα εἶχε τοῦμόν, τὸ δ’ ὅτι
 προστασία τοῦ θεοῦ ταῦτα ἐγίνετο. ἐνίκησεν δὲ ὁ θεός. ἥ γὰρ ἡμέρα ἔδει
 γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀνάθεσιν, ταύτῃ μοι δοκεῖν ἢ μικρόν τι πρὸ αὐτῆς περὶ τὴν ἔω ἢ καὶ
 ἔτι θάττον ἀφικνείται θεῖον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον οὕτως·
 Οὐκ ἀφανὴς Ἑλληνισμὸν Ἀριστείδης ἀνέθηκεν

hensive study of the citations in context. Pindar is by no means an exclusively epinician poet, particularly for Aristides who, as Gkourogianis shows, was thoroughly familiar with the entire Pindaric corpus, much of which is lost to modern readers. Themes of crucial interest to Aristides – including Pindar’s self-definition as a poet and his relationship to the divine – appear across the corpus.

⁵ *Or.* 50.14. Behr (n. 4), 26, n. 19 dates the beginning of Aristides’ sojourn at the Pergamene Asclepieum – and hence his return to rhetorical practice – to the summer of C.E. 145, approximately a year after his return from Rome in poor health (cf. *Or.* 48.7, 46–49, 70); cf. C.A. Behr, ‘Studies on the biography of Aelius Aristides’, *ANRW* 2.34.2 (1994), 1140–1233, at 1155, n. 58.

⁶ καὶ τὰ τε δὴ τῆς ἄλλης δυνάμειος ἦν οἷα θεοῦ παρασκευάζοντος, καὶ ἔδοξεν ὁ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ χρόνος οὐ σιωπῆς, ἀλλ’ ἀσκήσεως εἶναι (*Or.* 50.18). Asclepius imposes a regimen of literary training, alongside prescriptions for physical health, and rhetorical feats themselves may bring about cures: e.g. *Or.* 50.14–18, 22, 29–30. On contemporary notions about how vocal exercise could affect health, see M. Gleason, *Making Men* (Princeton, 1995), Ch. 4, and A. Rousselle, ‘Parole et inspiration: le travail de la voix dans le monde romain’, *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 5 (1983), 129–57.

⁷ The account of Aristides’ poetic training is part of the overarching narrative of his return to professional practice (see also n. 25, below). For accounts of the place of poetry in oratorical education of this period see Boulanger (n. 4), 42–7 and E. Bowie, ‘Greek sophists and Greek poetry in the Second Sophistic’, *ANRW* 2.33.1 (1989), 209–58.

⁸ *O.* 2.1. Cf. Bowie (n. 7), 214–15.

⁹ περανθέντων δὲ τούτων ἔδοκει χρῆναι ἀναθεῖναι τρίποδα ἀργυροῦν, ἅμα μὲν τῷ θεῷ χαριστήριον, ἅμα δὲ μνημεῖον τῶν χορῶν οὓς ἐστήσαμεν. (*Or.* 50.45) On the kind of performances that might have led up to the dedication of the tripod, see Bowie (n. 7) at 216.

μύθων ἀενάων κύδμιος ἡνίοχος.
τοῦτό τε ἐπυγράψειν ἐδόκουν καὶ τὸ ἀνάθημα ἀναθήσειν ὥς δὴ Διί.

And the following elegy had been prepared by me:

‘The poet, president of the contests, and *chorégos* himself,
has dedicated to you, lord, this memorial of choral performance’.

Then there were two other verses in addition to these, one of which contained my name, and the other the fact that all this took place with the god’s guidance. But the god carried off the victory. For on the day when the dedication was supposed to take place, on this day, so it seemed, or a little before then, around dawn or even earlier, a divine epigram came to me that went like this:

‘Not unknown among the Greeks, Aristides dedicated [this],

Illustrious charioteer of ever-flowing tales (*muthoi*)’.

I dreamed that I was inscribing this and also that I was going to dedicate it as a votive offering precisely as if to Zeus.¹⁰

Scholars have drawn attention to the fact that Aristides’ name is highlighted in the god’s revised dedication.¹¹ The inscription can then be adduced as another example of the sense of self-importance that led certain rhetoricians of this period to identify themselves by personal name only, without demotic or patronymic.¹² However, Aristides tells us that his name would have appeared in the first dedication as well, in lines he does not quote here. There is no way of knowing what form this signature would have taken, but if Aristides’ aim was to highlight the appearance of his name in the god’s version of the inscription, he need not have mentioned that it was included in the original dedication as well. More striking is the shift from a simple delineation of his responsibilities in mounting choral productions, to an impressive metaphorical evocation of his excellence. The first epigram follows the commemorative conventions of choregic monuments, which enumerate the names and roles of the individuals responsible for various aspects of the choral production.¹³ In the second, inspired version, the claim to official functions is replaced by a bold statement of Aristides’ exceptional brilliance and fame (οὐκ ἀφανῆς Ἑλλήσιν) reinforced by Homeric language (κύδμιος) and a description of his compositions as everlasting (ἀενάων). All this is animated by the metaphor – emphatically late in the second line – of Aristides as a charioteer, ἡνίοχος.

Chariot racing as shorthand for excellence was current in epigraphic monuments to literary and artistic accomplishment. From among a number of examples ranging considerably in both date and subject matter,¹⁴ a choregic epigram of the Hadrianic period from Athens provides perhaps the closest parallel:

¹⁰ In order to be sure that he has completely fulfilled this part of the dream-prescription (... τὸ ἀνάθημα ἀναθήσειν ὥς δὴ Διί) Aristides eventually makes a second dedication to ‘Olympian Zeus’ (Or. 50.46), probably at a temple of Olympian Zeus on his ancestral lands in Mysia. For this temple, see Or. 49.41, 50.48, 50.1, 51.10; Robert (n. 2), 207–22 locates it at the modern day town of Alibey, north of Omerköy. In the narrative context of a victory memorial, the reference also recalls the games held in Zeus’ honour at Olympia, whose athletic victors Pindar celebrated.

¹¹ Puech (n. 2), 144–5 and 399–400; Robert (n. 2), 216–17; Habicht (n. 2) at 75.

¹² A choice example is cited and interpreted by Puech (n. 2) at 399: dedicating a statue of Demosthenes in the Pergamene Asclepieum (after dream-instructions from the god), the orator Polemon identifies himself by personal name only, but specifies the patronymic and *deme* name of the (presumably more famous) fourth-century dedicatee.

¹³ In this case, Aristides fulfills all the roles: poet, *chorégos* and *agonothete* (βραβεύς).

¹⁴ G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Berlin, 1878), no. 39. 3 (Athens, Dipylon, fourth century B.C.E.): ἡνίοχος τέχνης τραγικῆς; no. 498. 2 (Boeotian Thebes, c. third century B.C.E.): ἡνίοχος παντοίης ἀρετῆς. T. Preger, *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae* (Leipzig, 1891; Chicago, 1977), no. 10 (Athens, fourth century B.C.E.): ἡνίοχος κιθάρας.

[Καλὸν μὲν γάρ Πραξαγόρας (?) χορὸν ἡνιόχευε[ν]] ...

[For Praxag]oras charioteered (ἡνιόχευε[ν]) an [excellent] chorus. (IG 2² 3117)¹⁵

Aristides' revised dedication fits well within this metaphorical and commemorative tradition; Asclepius' eloquent 'charioteer of ever-flowing *muthoi*' gives poetic éclat to the responsibilities for composition and performance that Aristides had already enumerated in more pedestrian fashion.¹⁶ The god's victory – ἐνίκησεν δὲ ὁ θεός (*Or.* 50.45) – is partly a stylistic one that illustrates the practical aid Aristides says was bestowed upon him so abundantly in dreams.¹⁷ But as this climax of poetic commemoration and choral performance brings us full circle from Aristides' beginnings as a Pindaric poet at Rome (*Or.* 50.31), we should also consider the charioteering metaphor from a Pindaric perspective, asking what it tells us about Aristides' relationship with his divine literary editor.¹⁸

Chariot imagery is prominent in the epinician odes, particularly in places where Pindar reflects upon his own craft.¹⁹ He uses it to evoke two broad themes: (1) an association with gods and the divine realm; (2) craftsmanship or technical skill. In *Olympian* 1, written to celebrate the victory of Hieron of Syracuse in the single horse race of 476 B.C.E., the emphasis is on divine favour. When Pindar forecasts the possibility of racing victories in Hieron's future he also anticipates his own role in celebrating them – by alluding to his poetry in terms of a chariot metaphor:

θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἔων τεαῖσι μῆδεται
 ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος, 'Ιέρων,
 μερίμναισιν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι,
 ἔτι γλυκυτέραν κεν ἔλπομαι
 σὺν ἄρματι θοῶ κλείζειν ἐπικούρον εὐρὼν δόδον λόγων ...

A tutelary god keeps watch over your endeavours, Hieron, making this his concern. And as long as he does not suddenly desert you I hope to celebrate an even sweeter victory with the swift chariot, having found a helpful road of words ... (*O.* 1:109–110).

The 'swift chariot' is both the literal vehicle of Hieron as victor, and the metaphoric vehicle of Pindar's poetic excellence. In both cases, divine favour opens the path of victory clear and unobstructed. Human craft also contributes to excellence, however.

¹⁵ Text from *SEG* 51.209; cf. S. Follet and D. Peppas-Delmouzou, *The Greek East in the Roman Context* (Helsinki, 2001), 95–117. The individual named here is probably the *chorégos*.

¹⁶ Cf. Bowie (n. 7) at 217.

¹⁷ See *Or.* 50.25–6.

¹⁸ Because the narrative context of the chariot image in the fourth *Logos* points towards Pindar, I set aside another obvious precedent: the charioteer of the soul in Plato's *Phaedrus*. In his *Or.* 2 Aristides turns Plato's discussion of madness and inspiration in the *Phaedrus* towards a defence of oratory as a divinely inspired art, and in *Or.* 28 he evokes the image of a winged chariot to describe his own performances (*Or.* 28.114–15); cf. 28.143 for direct reference to the *Phaedrus*. On the centrality of the *Phaedrus* in contemporary literary culture, see M.B. Trapp, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in the Second Century', in D.A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford, 1990), 141–73, at 141, 152–3 and 166–7 for details on Aristides. Platonic chariot imagery speaks to the theme of divine influence, but it does not engage questions of the close relationship between inspiration and technical skill, in the way that the Pindaric chariot does. Furthermore, as epinician poet *par excellence* and one of Aristides' preferred literary models (see n. 4 above), Pindar's example is directly relevant to the contexts of choral performance, competition and poetic commemoration that are at issue in the passage under consideration here.

¹⁹ D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song* (London, 1986). M. Simpson, 'The chariot and the bow as metaphors for poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPA* 100 (1969), 438–49.

So at *Olympian* 9.80–1 Pindar hopes that his own skill makes him worthy of the chariot of the Muses: εἴην ἐύρησιεπῆς ἀναγεῖσθαι / πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρῳ ('Skilful with words may I be fit to be carried up in the chariot of the Muses').²⁰ The potential of the chariot metaphor as an expression of craftsmanship comes most insistently to the fore in cases where Pindar shifts attention away from the vehicle and towards the charioteer who drives it. In a context quite separate from poetry, a boxing trainer responsible for moulding the innate strength and gifts of a young competitor is presented in these terms:

δελφῖνι καὶ τάχος δι' ἄλμας
ἴσον <κ'> εἵποιμι Μελησίαν
χειρῶν τε καὶ ἰσχύος ἀνίοχον.

... and I would call Melesias equal in swiftness to a dolphin through the sea, charioteer of hands and strength. (*N.* 6:64–6)

Described as a charioteer, and likened to a dolphin in speed, the trainer Melesias embodies the conjunction of learned skill and natural physical strength that he nurtured in the victorious young Alcimidas.²¹ This potent combination of innate gift and acquired skill returns in a remarkable image – of poetic excellence – from *Isthmian* 7:

... ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί,
ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον
κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκεται ζυγέν·

... and mortals forget what does not reach the glorious pinnacle of wisdom, yoked to renowned streams of verses. (*I.* 7.17–19)

In the economy of the metaphor, attaining wisdom through poetry requires bringing together the discipline of the yoked chariot and the spontaneous, natural inspiration of flowing waters.

Inspiration and craft are the twin requirements of excellent performance in Pindar's world – whether athletic or poetic – and the image of the chariot can, as we have seen, illuminate both. However, in the two places where he names his subordinates in the process of poetic production, Pindar uses the analogy of the hierarchical relationship between the victor and his charioteer to figure his own superior position as poet with respect to the chorus leader who presents his works.²² In *Olympian* 6, Pindar describes himself as drawing inspiration for his song from the spring of the nymph Metope (*O.* 6.82–4) but then urges the chorus-leader Aeneas to 'spur on' (ὄτρυνον) his companions in performance (*O.* 6.87–8). Aeneas is thus given the enabling role of Phintis, Hegesias' charioteer, who was in fact conscripted (metaphorically) into poetic service earlier in the poem, when Pindar exhorted him:

²⁰ For the chariot of the Muses, cf. *I.* 8.61 and *Paeon* 7 (fr. 52h) 13–14, which Aristides quotes when he produces an example of poetic locution at *Or.* 45.13: ἄρμα μουσαῖον. I thank Professor Ewen Bowie for this reference.

²¹ The same two metaphors (dolphin and charioteer) appear in fr. 140 B, where they seem to describe Pindar's poetry and the poetry of one of his predecessors respectively. W.J. Henderson, 'Pindar *Fr.* 140B Snell–Maehler: the chariot and the dolphin', *Hermes* 120 (1992), 148–58 reads the metaphors here in terms of an opposition between inspiration and craft.

²² For discussion of the parallel Pindar constructs between his own chorus leader and the charioteer who drove for the victor see N.J. Nicholson, *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge, 2005), Chs 3 and 4.

ὦ Φίντις, ἀλλὰ ζεύξον ἤδη μοι σθένος ἡμιόνων,
 ἄ τάχος, ὅφρα κελεύθῳ τ' ἐν καθαράῃ
 βάσομεν ὄκχον, ἵκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν καὶ γένος.

'O Phintis, yoke at once the strong mules for me, as quickly as possible, so that we may drive our chariot on a clear path and I may come to his family's very lineage' (*O.* 6.22–5).

Likewise in *Isthmian* 2, when Pindar instructs his chorus-leader Nicasippus to 'impart these words' (ἀπόνειμον) to his guest-friend Thrasybulus (*I.* 2.47–8),²³ he echoes the language (νειμ- 'dispense; direct') he used earlier in the poem to describe the role of Xenocrates' driver, Nicomachus, in the racing victory (*I.* 2.20–2).²⁴ In these examples, then, the metaphor of the charioteer creates distance – if not precisely opposition – between inspiration and craft.

When Aristides borrows the metaphor of the Pindaric charioteer for the culminating episode of his poetic itinerary in the *Hieroi Logoi*, he invokes a complex web of associations: divine inspiration, skilled craft, and also a suggestion of hierarchical distance between the two. In the epigraphic tradition, as we have seen, the image of the charioteer is a motif of honour and status. Indeed, Aristides is not carried up passively by the Muses' chariot to a divine realm; rather he is himself the glorious charioteer (κύδιμος ἡνίοχος). At the same time, the motif of divine sponsorship is as closely entwined in his self-representation as a poet as it is in his Pindaric model. For whose words are these that Aristides composes, publishes and performs? The gift of the revised epigram recapitulates the crucial role of Asclepius and other divinities in Aristides' poetic development – a reminder that the 'ever-flowing tales' (μύθων ἀενάων) that Aristides 'charioteers' come from the god. When Aristides declares that the god 'carried off the victory' – ἐνίκησεν δὲ ὁ θεός – the statement applies not to this particular interaction only; it sums up the story of his progress as a poet (*Or.* 50.31–47) and, by extension, his whole professional revival.²⁵ Without relinquishing the claims to personal literary glory that the chariot image suggests, Aristides points at the same time to his own subordination to the god.²⁶ This refinement need not ultimately detract from Aristides' prestige: here, as so often in the *Hieroi Logoi*, we see Aristides astutely negotiating the boundary between self-aggrandizement and glorification of Asclepius. The Pindaric image of the charioteer allows him to achieve both purposes.

In his *Hymn to Asclepius* (*Or.* 42) Aristides is explicit about his pointed interest in Pindar as a model for the relationship between writer and god.²⁷ Here Aristides

²³ Son of the now-deceased Xenocrates.

²⁴ ... οὐκ ἐμέμθη / ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός, / τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν νεῖμι, ἀπάσαις ἀνίαις.

²⁵ At the end of the excursus of *Or.* 50.31–47, Aristides makes a transition back to the subject of oratory proper by rephrasing the compliment the god paid to him as a poet – μύθων ἀενάων κύδιμος ἡνίοχος (*Or.* 50.45) – in more general terms: ἐδόκει παντὶ τρόπῳ χρήναι ἀντέχεσθαι τῶν λόγων ... ἐπεὶ δὲ γε ἀενάους τοὺς λόγους ὁ θεὸς ἔτυχεν προσειρηκώς. '... it seemed in every way necessary to cling to oratory (*logoi*) ... since the god had called my words (*logoi*) "everlasting"' (*Or.* 50.47).

²⁶ Compare the metaphor at *Or.* 43.26, 'To Zeus', where Zeus in his role as the universal directing power is compared to the παραβάτης, while other beings (humans and other gods) assume the enabling role of the ἡνίοχος: καὶ πάντα δὲ πανταχοῦ Διὸς μεστὰ καὶ πάσιν ἐφ' ἐκάστης πράξεως παρίδρυται, ὥσπερ οἱ διδάσκαλοι τοῖς παισὶ καὶ <οἱ> παραβάται τοῖς ἡνίοχοις, 'And everything everywhere is full of Zeus, and for all he presides over every deed, as teachers do with pupils and *parabateis* with charioteers'.

²⁷ *Or.* 42 postdates the *Hieroi Logoi*, to which it contains a reference at *Or.* 42.10.

describes his speeches as divine gifts, and he contrasts his understanding of his own oratorical accomplishments with a story told about Pindar – that the god Pan himself performed one of Pindar's paeans. The reverse is true in Aristides' case, he says:

τὸ γὰρ τοῦ Πινδάρου μετέβαλες· ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πᾶν τὸν παιᾶνα ὠρχήσατο, ὡς λόγος, ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, ὦν <σὺ ἐδίδαξας λόγων, ἡξιούμην τούτων>²⁸ ὑποκριτῆς εἶναι· προὔτρεφάς τε γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ τῆς ἀσκήσεως κατέστης ἡγεμών.

In fact you [Asclepius] reversed Pindar's situation. For in his case, Pan danced his *paeon*, so the story goes. Whereas I, if I may say so, <thought it right> to be the interpreter (ὑποκριτῆς) of the <speeches you taught>. Since you yourself [Asclepius] directed me towards them [i.e. rhetorical studies, λόγους] and established yourself as the commander of my training. (*Or.* 42.12)²⁹

Although the syntax is disturbed,³⁰ Aristides seems to describe himself as the 'interpreter', the 'actor' (ὑποκριτῆς) of Asclepius, who directs his training and performance in public speaking.³¹ In both images – one from the theatre and one from the race-track – the god is the power behind Aristides' accomplishments and thus the true victor.

In conclusion, I have tried to show that the story of the revised commemorative epigram in the fourth *Hieros Logos* is a more finely calibrated piece of self-promotion than scholars have previously recognized. When the description of Aristides is changed from 'poet, judge and *chorēgos*' to 'charioteer', what is highlighted if we read through a Pindaric lens, is Aristides' relationship with Asclepius. Figuring both divine inspiration and skilled craftsmanship, the Pindaric language of chariot racing illuminates the dynamic connection between god and human that defines Aristides' self-presentation as a writer of poetry, as it does his conception of his wider rhetorical vocation.³²

Princeton University

JANET DOWNIE
jdownie@princeton.edu

²⁸ Keil (n. 1), 338 follows previous editors in positing a lacuna and offers this conjecture in his apparatus. For other conjectures, see Keil ad loc. and G. Dindorf, *Aristides*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1829) 1.68, n. 3 (*Or.* 6 = *Or.* 12 K). Behr (n. 3) at 249 and 463 translates Reiske's emendation: ὦν <σὺ ἐποίησας, φημι> ὑποκριτῆς εἶναι, 'I say that I am the actor of your compositions'.

²⁹ The *Vita Ambrosiana* of Pindar records the tradition that Pan was seen between Cithaeron and Helicon singing (ᾄδων) one of Pindar's paeans, A.B. Drachman, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1903), 1.2.2. For Pindar's song of gratitude cf. fr. 95 and Gkourogiannis (n. 4), 110. Aristides refers again to this incident in his oration 'In Defence of the Four', F.W. Lenz and C.A. Behr (edd.), *P. Aelii Aristidis Opera Quae Exstant Omnia Volumen Primum* (Leiden, 1976), at *Or.* 3.191, where it contributes to an argument about *philotimia*, a topic of ongoing concern to Aristides; cf. *Or.* 28.55, where Aristides refers to *O.* 2.86–8 and invokes Pindar as a model for poetic pride. On this oration, see I. Rutherford, 'The poetics of the *paraphthema*: Aelius Aristides and the decorum of self-praise', in D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Oxford, 1995). On Aristides' use of the Pindaric biographical tradition see Gkourogiannis (n. 4), 114–16 and 119–25.

³⁰ See n. 28, above.

³¹ Cf. *Or.* 50.18, *Or.* 50.26.

³² I would like to express my gratitude to Professors Christopher Faraone, Shadi Bartsch and Elizabeth Asmis for their encouragement, and for their advice on drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank William Bubelis for enthusiastically fielding questions on epigraphic matters. I am grateful to Professors Mark Payne and Ewen Bowie for responses to earlier presentations of this material, and I have benefited from the comments of *CQ*'s anonymous referee.