Pindar the Emergence of Literature places Pindar in the context of the evolution of Archaic Greek poetics. While presenting an in-depth introduction to diverse aspects of Pindar’s art (authorial metapoetics, imagery, genre hybridization, religion, social context, and dialect), it seeks to establish a middle ground between cultural contextualism and literary history, paying attention both to poetry’s historical milieu and its uncanny capacity to endure in time. With that methodological objective, the book marshals a new version of Historical Poetics, drawing both on theorists usually associated with this approach, such as Alexander Veselovsky, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Olga Freidenberg, and on T. S. Eliot, Hans Blumenberg, Fredric Jameson, and Stephen Greenblatt. The ultimate literary-historical problem posed by Pindar’s poetics, which this book sets out to solve, is the transformation of preliterary structures rooted in folk communal art into elements that still inform our notion of literature.
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Conventions

I follow the practice of using single quotation marks for meanings of particular words, reserving double quotation marks for quotes from other authors. Pindar’s text is quoted from sources identified below under SM, except for paian, for which Rutherford’s 2001 text is used. For the text of Bacchylides I use the Teubner edition: Snell, B. (ed.) Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis. Leipzig, 1961. By default, the text and fragment numbering for Sappho and Alcaeus, other melic poets, and elegiac poets follow the standard editions: LP, PMG and S, and W, respectively. Other texts are cited from Oxford Classical Text editions, unless noted otherwise. Translations from all languages are my own, except when cited from sources for which a translator is identified in the Bibliography. In citing scholarly works translated from other languages, I provide the date of the original publication in brackets next to all citations.
Abbreviations

The abbreviations of the names and works of Greek and Roman authors and works referred to in footnotes are those adopted in *OCD*. When spelling Greek names and toponyms, I keep the traditional Latinate versions for generally familiar figures and places (Andromache, Athens), but use a Hellenized spelling for less familiar ones (Khromios, Orkhome-nos) as well as in cases where the Latin equivalent might introduce anachronistic assumptions (Kharites, not Graces), unless that would contradict accepted scholarly practice (hence Muses, not Mousai).

The following abbreviations are used to refer to the texts of Pindar and Bacchylides:

- O.: Olympian
- P.: Pythian
- N.: Nemean
- I.: Isthmian
- Pai.: Paian
- Ep.: Epinikion

The abbreviations used for secondary sources are as follows:

- **AJP** American Journal of Philology
- **BICS** Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
- **CA** Classical Antiquity
- **CJ** Classical Journal
- **CP** Classical Philology
- **CQ** Classical Quarterly
List of abbreviations

GRBS Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies
HSCP Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
JHS Journal of Hellenic Studies
MH Museum Helveticum
QUCC Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica
Rhm Rheinisches Museum für Philologie
SO Symbolae Osloenses
TAPA Transactions of the American Philological Association