



Neanalysis and the "Nestorbedrängnis": A Test Case

Author(s): Adrian Kelly

Source: *Hermes*, 134. Jahrg., H. 1 (2006), pp. 1-25

Published by: [Franz Steiner Verlag](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4477683>

Accessed: 07-07-2015 11:20 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hermes*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NEOANALYSIS AND THE *NESTORBEDRÄNGNIS*: A TEST CASE*

In the course of registering his opposition to the “small but expanding circle” of Homerists who have come to be known as the neoanalysts, DENYS PAGE turned his attention to what he called “the single strongest weapon in (their) whole armoury”, which he nonetheless dismissed as “clever and amusing” and “a guess, based on other guesses.”¹ The weapon was the so-called *Nestorbedrängnis* or ‘stranding of Nestor’ at *Iliad* 8.80 ff., where the old man finds himself stuck on the battlefield in the face of Hektor’s onslaught after one of his horses has been killed by Paris’ arrow. Diomedes notices his difficulty and, after unsuccessfully summoning Odysseus, moves to Nestor’s aid. The neoanalysts noted that this passage closely resembles the version of Antilokhos’ death as told first in Pindar’s sixth *Pythian* ode (28–42), where he advances to rescue Nestor, stranded once again because one of his team has been killed by Paris, but is then slain by Memnon. The

* This article has been long in the making, and I am indebted to the following colleagues for their help, criticism and advice: BILL ALLAN, ROBERT BOSTOCK, BRUNO CURRIE, SOPHIE GIBSON, BRYAN HAINSWORTH, ADOLF KÖHNKEN, MATTHEW LEIGH, OLIVER TAPLIN, ASTRID VOIGT, STEPHANIE WEST, MALCOLM WILLCOCK. None of them is responsible for the argument and its shortcomings. I have used M. WEST, *Homerus: Ilias* (2 vols.), Stuttgart / Leipzig 1998 – Leipzig / Munich 2000; B. SNELL & H. MAEHLER, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis: Pars I: Epinicia*, ⁸Leipzig 1987; A. BERNABÉ, *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta: Pars I*, Leipzig 1987.

¹ D. PAGE, rev. of G. SCHOECK, *Ilias und Aithiopis: Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung*, Zürich 1961, CR 13 (1963) 21–4, 23. ‘Neoanalysis’ is a term of convenience, there being many differences between the authors whose work it describes, and is applied here to those who believe that the *Iliad* poet employs as his source material specific epic poems (oral or written) which may be reconstructed principally from Homer and post-Homeric heroic myth. The chief works are: J. KAKRIDIS, *Homeric Researches*, Lund 1949; H. PESTALOZZI, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*, Zürich 1945; E. HOWALD, *Der Dichter der Ilias*, Zürich 1946; SCHOECK (above); W. KULLMANN, *Die Quellen der Ilias*, Wiesbaden 1960; W. SCHADEWALDT, *Einblick und Erfindung der Ilias: Ilias und Memnonis*, in: IDEM, *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, Stuttgart 1965; K. DOWDEN, *Homer’s sense of text*, JHS 116 (1996) 47–61; W. KULLMANN, *Ilias und Aithiopis*, *Hermes* 133 (2005) 9–28. For overviews, cf. esp. A. HEUBECK, *Homeric Studies Today: Results and Prospects*, in: B. FENIK (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, Leiden 1978, 1–17; M. CLARK, *Neoanalysis: a Bibliographical Review*, CW 79 (1986) 379–94; W. KULLMANN, *Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)*, in: J. LATACZ (ed.), *Zwei hundert Jahre der Homer-Forschung*, Stuttgart 1991, 425–55; M. WILLCOCK, *Neoanalysis*, in: I. MORRIS & B. POWELL (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 174–18; M. WEST, *Iliad and Aithiopis*, CQ 53 (2003) 1–14, 4–5.

correspondence led the adherents of this school to infer that both Pindar and Homer derived their scenes from an earlier poem, the *Aithiopsis*. Though PAGE remained unpersuaded, the methodology has flourished, and this passage in particular has been described by WILLCOCK as one of the “two most important scenes of the *Aithiopsis* which appear to be echoed in the *Iliad*” and “central to the beliefs of neoanalysts.”²

The present article aims to question the neoanalytical interpretation of the *Nestorbedrängnis*, proceeding on the basis that “if we can embrace neo-analysis as a ‘working hypothesis’ . . . we still need to scrutinize its proposals one by one, rejecting and accepting them as seems appropriate.”³ This is the practical extent of my purpose, but more general points about neoanalytical method will be made during the course of the discussion, hopefully opening the way for an engagement on a more even basis than that currently prevailing.⁴

The following discussion is separated into two parts. The first (‘Neoanalysis and the *Nestorbedrängnis*’) focuses on the difficulties in motivation and meaning which the neoanalysts have claimed to detect in the Θ passage, arguing that there are no such problems with the poet’s construction of the episode. The second section (‘Pindar and the *Nestorbedrängnis*’) will then analyse Pindar’s version of Antilokhos’ death in order to demonstrate that Pindar is actually heavily influenced by the *Iliad*, and principally the scene in Θ, for his narrative.

² WILLCOCK (n. 1) 176, 179. Neoanalysis has almost gained the status of orthodoxy; cf., e.g., R. JANKO, *The Iliad: A Commentary*; Vol. IV Books 13–16, Cambridge 1992, 312, 378–9; M. EDWARDS, *The Iliad: A Commentary*; Vol. V Books 17–20, Cambridge 1991, 15–19; D. CAIRNS, Introduction, in: IDEM (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer’s Iliad*, Oxford 2001, 1–56, esp. 35–52; K. DOWDEN, *The epic tradition in Greece*, in: R. FOWLER (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, Cambridge 2004, 188–205; WEST (n. 1) 14. Dissident voices may be heard; J. BURGESS, *The Non-Homeric Cypria*, TAPA 126 (1996) 77–99; IDEM, *Beyond Neoanalysis: Problems with the Vengeance theory*, AJP 118 (1997) 1–19; IDEM, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*, Baltimore 2001; IDEM, *Early Images of Achilles and Memnon?* QUCC 76 (2004) 33–51; W. ALLAN, *Arms and the man: Euphorbus, Hector and the death of Patroclus*, CQ 55 (2005) 1–16.

³ BURGESS, *Tradition of the Trojan War* (n. 2) 16.

⁴ Neoanalytical methods are increasingly used to exclude oralist perspectives; cf., e.g., DOWDEN (n. 1); WEST (n. 1) 14. This is hardly a new development; W. KULLMANN, *Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research*, GRBS 25 (1984) 307–323 (usually described as a reconciliation between the two) generally compares them to the constant disadvantage of the oralists, and DOWDEN (n. 1) 47, speaks of ‘interaction’ between Homeric and other early poetry as “an issue which has been obscured by scholarly discourse in terms of oral poetics”, before adopting (49) as “an attractive conceptual model . . . that Homer knew quite fixed texts”. Though he does pay some attention to the work of J. M. FOLEY (below, n. 44), it is unsurprising when (60–1) he reaches a conclusion exclusive of oralist techniques. When allied with these techniques and perspectives, however, neoanalysis is very useful; cf., e.g., L. SLATKIN, *The Wrath of Thetis*, Berkeley 1991; also WILLCOCK (n. 1) 189. Such an alliance is largely absent from the treatments with which this article is concerned.

1. *Neoanalysis and the Nestorbedrängnis*

Before encountering individual treatments of the *Nestorbedrängnis*, it must be conceded that a similar scene in the *Aithiopis* (assuming for the moment that Pindar did take it from that poem or a traditional narrative about the death of Antlokhos), would indeed have been very suitable and – given the death of the young son going to the rescue of his endangered father – much more poignant than the situation in the *Iliad*. However, priority or derivation cannot be determined solely on that ground;⁵ ‘besser motiviert’ is not the same thing as ‘älter’,⁶ as COMBELLACK notes:

[T]here is no reason whatever . . . why it is more likely that the author of the *Iliad* had a fine treatment of some motif before him and mangled it than that a poet inspired by the *Iliad* improved on his model.⁷

Even without making an oralist appeal to independent use of shared traditional material,⁸ it is very difficult to establish certain lines of influence from one early epic to another on this basis.⁹

It is also important at the outset to note that an extra-Iliadic source for the Θ passage was proposed well before the emergence of the ‘Neoanalytiker’. Principally on the basis of Proklos’ summary of the *Aithiopis* and Pindar’s narrative, BETHE and WILAMOWITZ supposed that the *Iliad* poet had drawn from a cyclic poem (whether the *Aithiopis* or the *Little Iliad*). Beyond pointing out the post-Homeric references to this story (or referring to WELCKER’s earlier source collection),¹⁰ neither scholar put forward detailed arguments for the connection.¹¹ They thought

⁵ I would therefore not follow H. ERBSE, *Nestor und Antilochos bei Homer und Arktinos*, *Hermes* 121 (1993) 385–403, 397, in his attribution of priority to Θ (similarly F. FOCKE, *Zum I der Ilias*, *Hermes* 82 (1954) 257–87, 268–9).

⁶ ERBSE (n. 5) 397 n. 20; cf., e.g., SCHADEWALDT (n. 1) 163; SCHOECK (n. 1) 21–2.

⁷ F. COMBELLACK, rev. of KULLMANN, *Die Quellen* (n. 1), *AJP* 83 (1962) 193–8, 194.

⁸ The classic statement is that of B. FENIK, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, Wiesbaden 1968, 231–40, though even he feels that the *Nestorbedrängnis* cannot be accounted for by an appeal to typicality, largely because he accepts that Pindar does reflect the *Aithiopis* episode in a more or less direct manner; cf. below, p. 13 ff.

⁹ cf. W. SCHADEWALDT, *Iliasstudien*, Darmstadt 3 1966, 97–8: “[i]ch sehe danach (a comparison of the situations and events in the *Aithiopis* and *Iliad*) nicht, was eine Abhängigkeit der Θ-szene von der *Aithiopis* erzwingt. Der Dichter der *Aithiopis*, der den Tod des Antilochos zu erzählen hatte, kann ebenso gut die vorübergehende Gefährdung Nestors im Θ aufgegriffen und pathetisch gesteigert haben. . . . Angenommen aber, Homer habe wirklich eine Nestor-Antilochos-Szene umgesetzt, so ist immer noch nicht die Möglichkeit ausgeschlossen, er wie die *Aithiopis* haben aus einer gemeinsamen älteren Quelle geschöpft.” He did, however, change his mind; cf. *IDEM* (n. 1).

¹⁰ F. WELCKER, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter II*, 2 Bonn 1882, 174–5 n. 5.

¹¹ U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1916, 45–6; E. BETHE, *Der troische Epenkreis*, Stuttgart 1966 (repr. of *IDEM*, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, II 2 iv, Leipzig 1929, 149–297), 99–100 (247–8).

of the relationship between Homer and early epic purely in stemmatic terms, and so a dependence on other texts was an obvious conclusion. It has, however, had an unfortunate consequence, in that neoanalysts initially assumed the derivation, and so did not feel the need to argue the case with any application until relatively recently.¹² When provided, substantive argument has taken the form of scrutinising the Θ episode for problems or features which can only or best be explained as imperfect manipulations or reconfigurations of pre-Iliadic material.

a. PESTALOZZI

PESTALOZZI was one of the first scholars of this group,¹³ and his objections to the *Nestorbedrängnis*, although he did not seek to place much weight on them, are typical of subsequent neoanalytical treatments, and so worth quoting in full:

[d]ie gekünstelte Situation mit dem überzähligen Beipferd, das – gleich dem des Patroklos Π 474 – bei Verletzung ohne Schaden vom Gespann abgetrennt werden kann, dem Pfeilschuß des Paris, der sonst in diesem Buch ausbleibt, dem achtlos vorbeilaufenden Odysseus, dem bedrohlich heranfahrenden Hektor, der tatenlos wieder verschwindet, nimmt man hin um des bewegten Schlachtbildes, der schönen Reden und der Haltung des Diomedes willen; solche unbedenkliche Verwendung von Motiven findet sich bei Homer häufig genug.¹⁴

He then stigmatised those who thought the episode derived from the *Iliad* as subject to a prejudice against the abilities of non-Homeric poets.¹⁵ Even though he was willing to accept the inferior nature of the Θ passage for the sake of some advantageous features, and noted that such unthinking construction is thoroughly Homeric, his individual criticisms are still insubstantial.

To begin with, the compressed nature¹⁶ of Θ (known, after all, as the κόλος μάχη) is surely enough to account for Paris's brief and fully typical¹⁷ appearance.

¹² Indeed, PESTALOZZI (n. 1) 11, in the absence of any detailed argument, explicitly invokes BETHE and WILAMOWITZ.

¹³ PESTALOZZI (n. 1) 9–11; KAKRIDIS (n. 1) 94 dealt with this episode only in passing. The major remaining neoanalytical treatments of this scene are KULLMANN, *Die Quellen* (n. 1) 31–2, 314–5 (& IDEM, *Ilias und Aithiopis* (n. 1) 22–4); SCHOECK (n. 1) 20–2 (and ff.); H. MÜHLESTEIN, *Homerische Namenstudien*, Frankfurt am Main 1987, 28–55, esp. 49 f.; E. HEITSCH, *Homerische Dreigespanne*, in: W. KULLMANN & M. REICHEL (eds.), *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, Tübingen 1990, 153–74. I shall not deal explicitly with SCHOECK, as he adds little to PESTALOZZI's arguments. For overviews, cf. DOWDEN (n. 1) 57; WILLCOCK (n. 1) 179–81; WEST (n. 1) 10 n. 45.

¹⁴ PESTALOZZI (n. 1) 10.

¹⁵ PESTALOZZI (n. 1) 11.

¹⁶ By 'compressed' I simply mean that an entire day's battle, which may span thousands of verses, is generated on a smaller scale in Θ than, for example, from Λ to Σ. The leisurely exposition of that central third day allows greater detail and elaboration than the poet felt necessary in Θ.

¹⁷ cf. 11.369–78, 11.505–7, 11.581–4.

Consider that Telamonian Aias also appears only once and briefly (330–1); in a passage generally devoted to Greek retreat, a greater focus on this warrior would have been apt. Furthermore, scale partially explains the nature of Hektor's victory in this portion of the fighting, but also allows the poet to detail the divine control over the battle. The scope for individual action is greatly diminished throughout Θ (particularly when compared with Ε), and is a prominent theme of this section of the poem.¹⁸ These are imaginary problems, and PESTALOZZI himself placed more emphasis on the fact that the motif would have been much more suitable in the *Aithiopis*, but two of his points have become central to the arguments of subsequent authors – the unsuccessful call to Odysseus, and the 'Beipferdmotiv'.

b. KULLMANN

The former particularly exercised KULLMANN, who felt that the call for aid was undermotivated in the *Iliad*, but would have added tremendously to the pathetic qualities of Antilokhos' decision to stand and fight in the *Aithiopis* scene.¹⁹ Hence, the *Iliad* poet took this element directly from the earlier scene. Neoanalysts are not alone in feeling disquiet about Diomedes' action and Odysseus' failure to respond, for scholars of every critical inclination have been troubled by it.

But what is the difficulty with the idea that Odysseus' temporary (or convenient) deafness²⁰ in Θ allows Diomedes centre stage in his own little drama?²¹ KULLMANN himself had lit upon this explanation (before rejecting it), proposing a juxtaposition between Diomedes and Odysseus in the circumstances of the *Nestorbedrängnis*. These two characters are closely linked in the *Iliad* and the broader epic tradition,²² and the retreat of Odysseus further serves to highlight the extraordinary valour of Diomedes, who acts in this passage against several clear

¹⁸ cf. generally M. WILLCOCK, The Importance of *Iliad* 8, in: Ø. ANDERSEN & M. DICKIE (eds.), *Homer's World*, Bergen 1995, 113–21.

¹⁹ KULLMANN, *Die Quellen* (n. 1) 31–2. This is still one of the most important works of neoanalysis; for KULLMANN's own modification of its arguments, cf. WILLCOCK (n. 1) 186–7 and, for a very recent restatement of his opinion on this scene, KULLMANN, *Ilias und Aithiopis* (n. 1).

²⁰ cf. G. KIRK, *The Iliad: A Commentary*; Vol. II Books 5–8, Cambridge 1990, ad 8.92–8, 306; *contra* K. STANLEY, *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*, Princeton 1993, 348 n. 7.

²¹ cf. ERBSE (n. 5) esp. p. 493 f.

²² Co-operation between the two is particularly strong during the *Doloneia*, and their joint efforts in the battle in Α; cf. M. REICHEL, *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias*, Tübingen 1994, 224–6. It is also reflected in the theft of the Palladion (*Ilias Parva* arg. 1.17–18; arg. 2.1–5; also F 25 I; cf., however, F 25 II & III), and the killing of Palamedes (*Kypria* F 30). It should be noted that Diomedes' call for aid to Odysseus in Θ is closely paralleled at 11.312 f., where Odysseus this time summons Diomedes to a joint venture against Hektor.

indications of Zeus' will. KULLMANN was surely wrong, then, to reject his own hypothesis on the grounds that such a consideration is not particularly important. For an audience attuned to the relationship between these two characters, the isolation of Diomedes is all the more apparent for the absence of someone with whom he often acts in concert. This is hardly the 'unbedenkliche Verwendung' of which PESTALOZZI had complained.

KULLMANN's other major argument for derivation centres around the 'trace-horse' (παρήγορος). Following LEUMANN, who deduced from the application of παρήγορος at 7.156 to a fallen warrior that the poet of H and Θ made use of the episode from P but misunderstood the word itself,²³ the existence or importance of the trace-horse has become somewhat of a crux. That this phenomenon arises only here and in Π during the combat between Sarpedon and Patroklos has been considered very significant. KULLMANN reasoned an association based around the link in the poet's mind between Antilokhos, Patroklos and Memnon; i.e., in Θ the poet is influenced by the stranding of Nestor and the death of Antilokhos, but in Π by the connection of Antilokhos and Patroklos. This parallelism, in which Patroklos is a doublet of the younger man, is of fundamental importance to neoanalysis,²⁴ but it has been powerfully challenged by BURGESS, who points out that the Iliadic scenes usually invoked as evidence are better explained as typical and meaningful features within the context of the *Iliad* itself.²⁵ A more pertinent problem is KULLMANN's definition of the motif itself:

[e]s wird zwar nicht berichtet, daß es ein Beipferd war (sc. in Pindar's narrative), aber die Situation der Aithiopisage ist die einzige, die das Beipferdmotiv geradezu fordert: Nur dort muß jemand ein Mißgeschick mit seinem Gespann haben und trotzdem noch daraus so befreit werden, daß er mit dem Gespann mühelos wieder zurückkehren kann.²⁶

This description does not, on the face of it, actually seem to fit the *Aithiopis* situation very well, where Nestor presumably cannot move. Moreover, on KULLMANN's criticism of the examples in Θ and Π, it does not really fit them either:

²³ M. LEUMANN, *Homerische Wörter*, Basel 1950, 222–31, esp. 228 f. At least as regards separate authorship (in part because Θ speaks only of παρηγορίας or the 'traces' themselves), his conclusion seems to me unlikely. If, as he believes, the poet of H and Θ knew Π, why would that poet use the term correctly in Θ, presumably on the basis of 16.152 (ἐν δὲ παρηγορήσιον ἀμύμονα Πήδασον ἴει), but then misunderstand it in H, when the concept of the trace-horse in Π, and its association with the earlier action at 16.152, was pretty clear both from the identity of the horse (ὁ δὲ Πήδασον οὐτάσεν ἵππον [467]) and the use of the term itself (κεῖτο παρήγορος ἐν κονίησιν [471]; παρήγορον [474])? H. ERBSE, *Zwei homerische Wörter*, Glotta 71 (1993) 130–6, 134, answers LEUMANN by referring to the word's connotation: "für den Dichter verbindet sich mit dem Nomen παρήγορος der Begriff des Nutzlosen, ja Unbrauchbaren."

²⁴ It has, therefore, taken on several permutations; cf., e.g., SCHOECK (n. 1) 23 f.; KULLMANN (n. 4) 310, 312–3, 316–7; MÜHLESTEIN (n. 13) 49 f.

²⁵ BURGESS, *Beyond Neoanalysis* (n. 2).

²⁶ KULLMANN, *Die Quellen* (n. 1) 315 (his italics).

[i]m Θ wird das Beipferdmotiv nicht ausgenutzt, da Nestor nicht mit seinem eigenen Gespann, sondern mit dem des Diomedes zurückfährt; der Tod eines der beiden Hauptpferde hätte fast denselben Handlungsablauf ergeben können.²⁷ Im Π hat das Beipferdmotiv ebenfalls keinen großen Funktionswert: Der Tod des Pferdes bleibt ohne Folgen und gibt nur Situationskolorit.²⁸

What is ‘Funktionswert’ and ‘ohne Folgen’ depends on the function or consequences one thinks one should find, and so the problem reveals itself with particular clarity: the motif is defined according to a reconstruction of what *may* have happened in the *Aithiopis*, and then the *Iliad*’s failure to fall into line has to be explained away. This cannot be considered sound methodology, for it assumes what it seeks to prove.

C. MÜHLESTEIN

MÜHLESTEIN’s treatment of the *Nestorbedrängnis* is part of a broader argument on the relationship between Patroklos and Antilokhos.²⁹ He interprets the former’s name as ‘one who heeds his father’, which is very appropriate to Antilokhos’ action in the *Aithiopis*. Secondly, he observes that ἵπποκέλευθος is only used of Patroklos, defining it as ‘the one who finds a way for the horses’ – again, more apt for Antilokhos’ self-sacrifice than anything Patroklos does in the *Iliad*.³⁰ Thirdly, his father’s name (Μεν-οῖτ-ιος) means ‘someone who waits for death’, the character who kills Antilokhos in the *Aithiopis* is called Μέμ-ων (< Μέν-μων), and the poet of Θ repeatedly uses forms of μένειν in narrating Nestor’s stranding and rescue, as does Pindar in *Pythian* 6. Finally, MÜHLESTEIN concludes that “Ἀντί-λοχος heisst er, weil er dort ‘an Stelle (seines Vaters) kämpft (und fällt).’”³¹ Thus, their names show that Homer constructs Patroklos as a calque on Antilokhos in the *Aithiopis*, and that the *Nestorbedrängnis* is an allusion to the death of Nestor’s son in that earlier poem.

However, these derivations are simply too uncertain to support the argument. Firstly, VON KAMPTZ relates -κλέης to κλέος itself rather than the full range of

²⁷ This would be entirely unparalleled in the *Iliad*, and create a major narrative difficulty. The chariot needs to be able to be driven back, either to the Greek camp or to Troy. In the latter case, it would be the only example of a Greek chariot being claimed by Trojans, let alone the chariot of a prominent hero who will use it again in an episode of some importance in Λ.

²⁸ KULLMANN, *Die Quellen* (n. 1) 315.

²⁹ MÜHLESTEIN (n. 13) 47–54. Other of his similarly derived conclusions have found general acceptance; cf., e.g., JANKO (n. 2) ad 16.777–867, 410. For the relationship between the characters, cf. above, nn. 24–5.

³⁰ HEITSCH (n. 13) 172 (and f.), develops the definition even further: “eine Person, die ein Weg der Pferde ist, sofern sie durch ihre Leistung einen solchen Weg der Pferde verschafft.”

³¹ MÜHLESTEIN (n. 13) 54.

κλύω ('Επι-κλέης: "wo Ruhm ist = berühmt"),³² in which sense NAGY has connected the name ('the glory of the ancestors') with the rather central epic notion of κλέα ἀνδρῶν.³³ Secondly, Patroklos is closely linked with Akhilleus' horses (*Il.* 17.426–8, 23.279 f.), so ἵπποκέλευθος reflects his traditional character.³⁴ Thirdly, Menoitios' name, meaning either 'dem Schicksal standhaltend' or 'Kraft bringend',³⁵ is generally significant even if the former definition is favoured, for remaining steadfast in danger is frequently stressed as an heroic quality, one most characteristic of Telamonian Aias. The same may be said of Memnon, whose name VON KAMPTZ in any case derives from μέδομαι 'reign'.³⁶ Further, (οὐ) μένειν is highly appropriate in such a situation, and verbal repetition in a catalogue is common (e.g., 23.287–293, 23.354–57).³⁷ Finally, VON KAMPTZ notes that ἀντί- compounds may mean either 'gegen' or 'anstatt', deriving Ἀντίλοχος from λοχάω.³⁸ Thus, Antilokhos' name could signify 'lying in wait *against*' rather than 'lying in wait *instead of*'.³⁹ Homeric onomastics, in short, are a particularly unsteady foundation to argue for Θ's dependence on the *Aithiopsis*.

d. HEITSCH

HEITSCH's analysis is centred around the trace-horse scenes in Θ and Π, and their relationship with the *Aithiopsis*.⁴⁰ He proceeds, with more detail, in much the same way as KULLMANN; again the unattested *Aithiopsis* becomes the ideal, and again he finds difficulties with the Θ passage, beginning with the criticism that one appar-

³² H. VON KAMPTZ, *Homerische Personennamen*, Göttingen 1982, 88; also HEITSCH (n. 13) 126–7.

³³ G. NAGY, *The Best of the Achaeans*, Baltimore 1979, 102–3, 111–15. MÜHLESTEIN and HEITSCH both point to the fact that Patroklos' name cannot mean this, because his father seems at best a background figure. In any case, NAGY's argument would be that Patroklos' name has significance for Akhilleus as his surrogate.

³⁴ At 17.427, he is called ἡνιόχοιο even though Automedon is clearly the actual charioteer at that moment, as he is again at 23.281 by Akhilleus; cf. JANKO (n. 2) ad 16.145–8, 336. Furthermore, ἵπποκέλευθος can be interpreted in several ways: JANKO (n. 2) ad 16.126, 332–3, favours 'charioteer'; ERBSE (n. 5) 397: "der es versteht, die unsterblichen Rosse des Peleus auf dem Wege zu halten."

³⁵ VON KAMPTZ (n. 32) 33.

³⁶ VON KAMPTZ (n. 32) 81, 163.

³⁷ cf. below, p. 15, for Pindar's repetition of this verb.

³⁸ VON KAMPTZ (n. 32) 74. STEPHANIE WEST suggests to me that Antilokhos could also mean 'equal to a company'.

³⁹ Certainly the ambush is a good epic test of courage; cf., e.g., 13.276 f., *Od.* 11.523–32.

⁴⁰ HEITSCH (n. 13) 155–68, 174 n. 53. This work is the most detailed statement of the case for the *Nestorbedrängnis*' derivation from the *Aithiopsis*, and KULLMANN (n. 4) 442 deems it the authoritative treatment. Another discussion by HEITSCH of this episode is forthcoming in the journal *Gymnasium* (KULLMANN, *Ilias und Aithiopsis* (n. 1) 23 n. 45).

ently expects Diomedes simply to rescue Nestor and remove him from the field, not go on a rampage.⁴¹ He feels that Diomedes' influence seems out of proportion to his actions, that he should not be able to turn the battle, and that the passage is obviously constructed out of a desire to continue or outdo the narrative in E.⁴² Furthermore, HEITSCH decides that Diomedes' speech upon his arrival is unconnected with Nestor's predicament: "es ist, als hätte Diomedes bei seinen Worten eine ganz andere Situation vor Augen."⁴³

HEITSCH's invocation of 'the reader's' expectations is problematic, for why should such a figure expect retreat? Sending a character to the aid of another is a common action in the *Iliad*, after which the augmented group then faces and usually defeats the threatening individual (e.g., 5.565–70, 11.575–7), and such aid may also come after a summons (e.g., 12.333–77, 13.477–95, 17.237–61, 17.507 f.). There are plenty of parallels for an endangered character then proceeding onto the offensive, with greater or lesser levels of success, in the company of the character who came to assist him.

One could object that rescue in the *Iliad* usually ends with the removal of the figure from the battlefield (e.g., 3.374–82, 5.311–18, 5.344–6 | 432–48, 5.353–66, 5.663–7 | 692–8, 8.330–4, 11.462–88, 11.510–20, 13.533–9, 14.424–32, 20.443–54, 20.291–340, 21.416–7, 21.596–8). This is certainly true, but it does not prove that the 'reader' is intended to expect one of these situations to the exclusion of the other when Diomedes rolls up. Indeed, *his* intentions were already made clear, in several respects, by his speech to Odysseus (8.92–6). Firstly, he rebuked Odysseus for failing to show the proper level of heroism (κακὸς ὥς), asking a question in a typical form (πῆ [94]) which elsewhere implies that the journey is unusual or unjustifiable,⁴⁴ predicting an unheroic end (μή τις τοι φεύγοντι μεταφρένῳ ἐν δόρυ πῆξι [95])⁴⁵ and stating his own desire to face Hektor (ὄφρα γέροντος

⁴¹ HEITSCH (n. 13) 156.

⁴² HEITSCH (n. 13) 157, referring approvingly to W. LEAF, *The Iliad of Homer* (2 vols.), London 1900–2, ad 8.130, 341.

⁴³ HEITSCH (n. 13) p. 157.

⁴⁴ cf. 6.377, 8.94, 8.413, 10.385, 10.406–7, 13.307, 13.770–1, 14.298, 16.422 (πόσει), 24.362. There is also another type of these questions, in which the speaker demands present evidence of a past quality or claim; cf. 2.339, 5.171–2, 5.472, 8.229, 13.219–20, 15.440–1, 20.83, 24.201. The treatment of traditional structure in this note and elsewhere in this article, viz as a function not only of denotation but also connotation, is heavily dependent on the groundbreaking research of J. M. FOLEY, whose work represents the most fruitful recreation of oral formulaic theory in Homeric scholarship; cf., e.g., J. M. FOLEY, *Oral tradition and its implications*, in: I. MORRIS & B. POWELL (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, 146–73; IDEM, *Homer's Traditional Art*, Philadelphia 1999. His work is endorsed by G. DANEK, *Traditional referentiality and Homeric intertextuality*, in: F. MONTANARI & P. ASCHERI (eds.), *Omero: Tremila anni dopo*, Roma 2002, 3–20.

⁴⁵ cf. 5.40, 8.258, 11.447, 22.283. The last example is very similar to the current one, as Hektor declares that Akhilleus will not be able to kill him in such an inglorious manner.

ἀπόσομεν ἄγριον ἄνδρα [96]). His ultimate concern is with the heroic, even when the will of Zeus is against him.⁴⁶

HEITSCH's next criticism, that the battle ebbs and flows too quickly, and that Diomedes is powerful out of all proportion, seems based on an unjustified expectation of Homeric military realism.⁴⁷ Heroic ability to determine the course of the battle is so common in the *Iliad* that one should not expect to see the issue raised for this purpose; the only weighty objection, that this all happens too swiftly, is surely to be considered (again) in the light of Θ's compressed narrative.⁴⁸ Diomedes' impact, though in shorter compass than the previous day's play, is entirely consistent with the technique of this book.

Further, there are three responses to HEITSCH's disapproval of Diomedes' following speech which show just how typical – and so meaningful for a traditional audience – this passage was. Firstly, such 'reactivated' chariot attacks are common in the *Iliad*, and they are always prefaced by a criticism of one of the members of that new team.⁴⁹ That such a tone should be found at this stage is therefore far from unexpected and, given the conciliar authority which Nestor generally commands, at whom else other than the charioteer could the rebuke be directed?

Secondly, this inaction is intended to be notable because it leaves to Nestor the task of cutting clear the horse. The old man's physical inability is a theme found elsewhere (4.311–16, 23.616–23) and, each time, Nestor so feels the potential slight to his honour as to point out occasions where he did exhibit the absent quality (4.317–25, 23.624–50). That he does not answer here is presumably a concession to the requirements of the narrative, and not unconnected with the active nature of the role being granted. Hence, both the criticism of the charioteer and the apparently insulting reference to his age⁵⁰ have excellent Homeric pedigree and purpose.

⁴⁶ This is a constant for Diomedes' character in the *Iliad*, from the abuse to which he is subjected in the *Epipoleis* to the pointed reminders of it he gives Agamemnon during the *agore* before the embassy to Akhilleus and the *boule* which closes it.

⁴⁷ Much the same may be said of his objections (157–8 nn. 6 & 7) to the historicity of the trace-horse; cf. J. WIESNER, *Fahren und Reiten: Archaeologia Homerica I F*, Göttingen 1968, 20–2, 66–7 & 66 n. 203, 99; also S. WEST (with A. HEUBECK & J. B. HAINSWORTH), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*; Vol. I Introduction and Books I–VIII, Oxford 1988, ad 4.590, 229.

⁴⁸ cf. above, p. 4 and n. 16.

⁴⁹ 5.166–310, 8.91–171, 11.521–43, 16.712–43, 17.466–542: Pandaros rebukes himself and his choice of weapons in E, Kebriones finds fault with Hektor's current activity given the desperate straits of the Trojans on the other side of battle in A, Hektor is again rebuked by Apollo for his inaction in Π, and Alkimedon tells off Automedon for driving around the battle in such a dangerous manner in P. Diomedes' rebuke in this circumstance is thus the signal that he is to counterattack with Nestor, and not simply drive him from the field.

⁵⁰ HEITSCH (n. 13) 157 also notes the strangeness of Diomedes' suggestion to someone "von dem er sieht, daß er wegen seines Alters und der Unzulänglichkeit seiner Ausrüstung den Aufgaben des Einzelkämpfers nicht mehr recht gewachsen ist . ." However, invocations of old

Thirdly, Diomedes sees in this circumstance mainly an opportunity to prove his heroic stature; his reference to the inferior qualities of the charioteer and then (104) Nestor's team as a whole (cf. 23.309 f.) allows a natural transition to a comparison with his own team's quality (105 f.), as Akhilleus does in Ψ when introducing the chariot race (271–86). For Diomedes, the fact that he was able to take them as plunder from Aineias is proof positive of his martial valour, an important theme already seen in his preceding call to Odysseus.⁵¹ Diomedes' speech, in short, makes perfect sense in its context.

HEITSCH summarises his position by denying that the poet of the *Iliad* is using a 'stereotype Szene' and relating his examples to the *Aithiopsis* in an (admittedly) cautious *stemma*. The use of the trace-horse in the *Nestorbedrängnis* is 'überflüssig' because Nestor does not use his own chariot, whilst in Π the motif is 'ohne Folgen' because the combatants have dismounted,⁵² though at least it is more appropriate than in Θ because Akhilleus' two immortal horses cannot of course be killed. His general conclusion is that either the two scenes in the *Iliad* are derived independently from the earlier poem (*Aithiopsis* with a trace-horse), or that the course of derivation ran *Aithiopsis* → Π → Θ (*Aithiopsis* without a trace-horse). In any case, with regard to the Θ passage, he has no doubt "daß das Motiv hier seinem eigentlichen Sinn und Zweck entfremdet ist."⁵³

The stemmatology is awkward, and requires here detailed consideration. On the latter conclusion, that there was a direct relationship between the scenes in the way proposed and the *Aithiopsis* did not have the trace-horse, why did the poet of Π think of the *Aithiopsis* episode at all as a model for his scene? There is no obvious connection between either the context or characters, given that Patroklos and Antilokhos have different roles (hero whose horse has been killed and rescuer of the man whose horse has been killed) and the situations are reversed (hindered hero and his side in the ascendant, hindered hero and his side in desperate

age in this general form tend to occur where the disability is being qualified: *Il.* 1.29, 4.315, 4.321, 8.103, 18.515, 23.623. The audience could well infer that Nestor would not prove himself an unworthy participant (cf. also 11.510 f.).

⁵¹ Thus it does not, as KIRK (n. 20) ad loc., 307 believes, have "an especially complacent ring."

⁵² However, heroes habitually dismount to fight in the *Iliad* (as in Π), with the chariots kept close by for any burst of pursuit or flight; cf. O. HELLMANN, *Die Schlachtszenen der Ilias*, Stuttgart 2000, 141–9. Charioteers are often killed when the hero is in the vehicle, but also when they are not; cf. 15.445–54, 17.609 f., 16.463–5. Given that no horses are ever struck outside Θ and Π (in itself unrealistic), the impediment represented by the wounding or death of the trace-horse is obviously considered dangerous either for a hero actually seeking to flee (as Nestor in Θ) or one who may need to (as in Π). For chariots used to remove wounded heroes directly after combat, cf., e.g., 11.510 f., 14.428–32, 17.614–25 (also 5.217–28). For chariots used in pursuit, usually where the hero was on foot in the immediately preceding narrative, cf., e.g., 8.348–9, 15.352–3, 20.495–503.

⁵³ HEITSCH (n. 13) 167.

danger).⁵⁴ In any case, the contextual and character link between the *Aithiopis* and Θ would have been more obvious as a first step. But in that case, why should the Θ poet have decided to use a trace-horse? If he took it from Π , where it is a 'necessary' addition to a divine team not for a moment inconvenienced by its demise, what led him to do so? Nestor's horses are not divine, and the poet already had, apparently, all the elements in the *Aithiopis* he needed for Nestor to be stranded, so there is no reason to take the motif from a scene which is otherwise quite unconnected with that in Θ .

The second suggestion, that the episodes of Θ and Π are not directly connected but derived from the common 'Vorbild' of the *Aithiopis* (whose episode did contain the trace-horse), is no less troublesome. The situation or personnel of the *Aithiopis* are easily enough linked with those of Θ , but again how to account for Π ? Is the case purely inferential, that Sarpedon is by some felt to be a doublet for Memnon (as Patroklos for Antilokhos)? But, in Pindar's narrative, Nestor's horse is struck by Paris, not Memnon. Perhaps the poet of Π is combining Paris and Memnon into the character of Sarpedon? But Memnon wins the coming encounter, Sarpedon dies. At what point, finally, do the departures from the proposed model become great enough to sunder the link? One might go around in circles over these relationships for an even longer time, but difficulties with such precise *stemmata* would still remain.

To sum up: HEITSCH's search for difficulties in the *Iliad*, and his reconstructions of the trace-horse motif's evolution in linear terms, have proven fruitless. But he has not been alone in the search.⁵⁵ The neoanalytical argument for derivation of the *Nestorbedrängnis* from an external source, insofar as it depends upon the insufficiencies of the scene or its constituent elements, is unconvincing. In fact, if the case were drawn only from the evidence of Homer, there would be no case at all.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ This argument is of course not unrelated to the belief that Patroklos is a doublet of Antilokhos; cf. above, p. 6 and nn. 24–5.

⁵⁵ KULLMANN, *Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung* (n. 1) 442, seems to retreat somewhat from his former certainty – though this is hardly apparent in *IDEM*, *Ilias und Aithiopis* (n. 1) 22–4 – granting that "auch wenn die Priorität allein von dieser Entsprechung her nicht gesichert werden kann, steht doch fest, daß beide Szenen nicht unabhängig voneinander sind." Even then, however, he still refers approvingly to HEITSCH (n. 13) as the authoritative treatment; cf. above, n. 40.

⁵⁶ This is also the conclusion of WEST (n. 1) 10–11, but this is probably not unconnected with his belief in the post-Homeric provenance of Memnon. Nothing in the preceding discussion proves that Homer did not know the death of Antilokhos in the *Aithiopis* or a story like it; indeed, it would be very surprising had he been unable to compose such an episode. Nonetheless, this observation should not be used as an argument for an allusive dynamic if an effect on the 'derived' episode cannot be demonstrated, for it would be tantamount to maintaining that such a dynamic should be assumed because it cannot be shown *not* to exist.

2. *Pindar and the Nestorbedrängnis*

This article has hitherto proceeded on the assumption that Pindar's narrative of Antilokhos' death is derived primarily from an episode in the *Aithiopsis*, but in this section I will attempt to demonstrate that Pindar seems to be drawing extensively upon the *Iliad*. His story cannot, therefore, be employed as evidence for the *Aithiopsis* without serious qualification. Here, firstly, is his version of the myth (*Pythian* 6.28–42):

ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς νόημα τοῦτο φέρων,	
ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός, ἐναρίμβροτον	30
ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων Μέμνονα. Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἄρμ' ἐπέδα Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαιχθεῖς· ὁ δ' ἔφεπεν	
κραταιὸν ἔγχος· Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος	34/35
δονηθεῖσα φρὴν βόασε παῖδα ὄν, χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριπεν· αὐτοῦ μένων δ' ὁ θεῖος ἀνὴρ	
πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός, ἐδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ	40
ὀπλοτέροισιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις ὑπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.	

There is, no doubt, an essential similarity with the situation of Θ: Nestor is stranded on the battlefield because one of his horses has been killed by the archer Paris, he is threatened by the advance of the leading Trojan warrior, and a younger man comes to his aid. This powerful scene seems to be reflected by several subsequent sources (chronologically the earliest is Xenophon *Kynegetika* I.14, who refers to Antilokhos as the paradigm of filial piety),⁵⁷ the *Odyssey* is at least aware of his death at Memnon's hands (4.187–8), and when this is compared with the relevant section of Proklos' summary (καὶ συμβολῆς γενομένης Ἀντίλοχος ὑπὸ Μέμνονος ἀναιρεῖται, ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνονα κτείνει [17–18]),⁵⁸ the conclusion that Pindar is drawing upon the *Aithiopsis* seems not implausible.

Despite this, the precise manner of Antilokhos' death in the *Aithiopsis* remains unknown, and any hope that Pindar can remedy this situation must be dented by the realisation that he was particularly aware of the Θ passage (and the *Iliad* in

⁵⁷ cf. WELCKER (n. 10) 174–5 n. 5 (to which WILLCOCK (n. 1) 180 n. 4, adds the reference to Xenophon). It has also been suggested that Vergil's depiction of Lausus' death in *Aeneid* 10 relies on the cyclic version of this story rather than Pindar; cf. WILLCOCK (n. 1) 180, referring to E. FRAENKEL, Vergil und die Aithiopsis, *Philologus* 87 (1932) 243–8, and S. HARRISON, Vergil: *Aeneid* 10, Oxford 1991, ad *Aeneid* 10.789–832, 260–1. This is not an inevitable conclusion, given that FRAENKEL (esp. 246 f.) discovers in Vergil several direct reminiscences of Pindar's language.

⁵⁸ *Aithiopsis* arg. 12–14; also T 8 & 9.

general) as he composed his narrative. It is, I hasten to add, no part of my current purpose to deny the existence in the *Aithiopis* of a scene narrating Antilokhos' death.⁵⁹ Instead, I propose only that Pindar's worth as witness to this episode is severely compromised by his Homeric intertext. In fact, his use of the *Iliad* is so pervasive as to suggest that the myth of *Pythian* 6 is a recasting of specifically Homeric actions and characters for a non-Homeric event.⁶⁰ Furthermore, there is a consistent policy of alteration behind Pindar's Homeric adaptations, one by which the lyric poet changes the meaning and associations of the chosen parallel in order to challenge, usurp, and so appropriate the authority of his great predecessor.

I begin with the *Nestorbedrängnis*, and Pindar's most suggestive phraseological parallel – βόασε (36). This verb is unusual in this context, because βο- stem formations are always employed in Pindar where the noise is aggressive or victorious.⁶¹ Looking to the Homeric narrative, note that Diomedes' call to Odysseus is denoted by ἐβόησεν (8.92), a verb with a similar connotation in the *Iliad*, and one which is only employed in Θ because Diomedes' intentions are overwhelmingly belligerent.⁶² Is it not striking that Pindar uses βοάω in the same context as Θ, but reverses its Homeric connotation in a way utterly antithetical to his own usage of the word? An attractive explanation is that he has transformed Diomedes' offensive call to Odysseus in the *Iliad* into Nestor's defensive call for aid, but without changing the verb.⁶³

⁵⁹ cf. below, p. 23 and n. 91 for suggestions about what Pindar may have found in that poem.

⁶⁰ Orthodoxy holds that Pindar felt other early epics or their material to be as 'Homeric' as the *Iliad*; cf. esp. E. FITCH, Pindar and Homer, CP 19 (1924) 57–65; cf., however, R. MANN, Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths, GRBS 35 (1994) 313–37, and B. GRAZIOSI, Inventing Homer: the early reception of Epic, Cambridge 2002, esp. ch. 5, for arguments in favour of an early differentiation between Homeric and cyclic material. Even if Pindar did believe in Homer's authorship of the cycle (and I hope to argue elsewhere that the basis for this *communis opinio* is very weak), there is evidence for a distinction within that material by the early fifth century.

⁶¹ *Ol.* 3.8, 7.37, 8.40, 9.93, 13.100, *Py.* 1.13, 10.39, *Nem.* 3.67, 5.38. Only at *Nem.* 8.9 does a related word (ἀβοασί) have a non-aggressive sense, referring to the fact that local heroes flocked unbidden to the court of Aiaikos in their eagerness to serve such an exceptional figure, but this is hardly the defensive sense of βοάσε at *Py.* 6.36.

⁶² cf. above, pp. 9–11, for the tone of this action.

⁶³ Consider also βοήν αγαθός Διομήδης (8.91). Pindar's use of βοάω is not a 'mistake', as argued by MONRO (*apud* MANN (n. 60) 323–4) of the way in which *Nem.* 2.14 (ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἐκτώρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν) refers to *Il.* 7.225–32, where Hektor hears Aias' threats before replying to them, while *Nem.* 2.13–14 (καὶ μὲν ἁ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν | δυνατός) makes pointed reference to *Il.* 7.197–9 where Aias speaks of his own confidence in the duel (οὐ γάρ τίς με βίηι γε ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα διηται, | οὐδέ τι ἰδρεΐηι, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νήϊδα γ' οὕτως | ἔλπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέν τε). This is a good analogy for my case, the poet combining several Homeric details which are thematically linked but spatially separated, and I shall return to this phenomenon below.

One might of course immediately object that this verb could have been employed in the *Aithiopsis*. A straightforward denial would be unwise but, assuming that the *Aithiopsis* poet shared the same traditional language as the Homeric poet, the overwhelmingly aggressive βοάω would have been unsuitable in such a circumstance.⁶⁴ For such eventualities, the *Iliad* employs the expression αὔε δ' ἐταίρους, once by the wounded Odysseus (11.461), once by the endangered Idomeneus (13.477). Caution is required here, for there is a defensive use of the verb in the *Odyssey*, αὔε is itself used of Ares and Athene in aggressive postures at *Il.* 20.48 and 20.51, and the extent to which phraseology was shared between the poets of the *Iliad* and *Aithiopsis* must remain unknown.

However, there are many parallels of this subverting variety between *Pythian* 6 and the *Nestorbedrängnis*; taken by themselves they would be insignificant, but together they comprise a powerful case. Compare, firstly, the Pindaric result of the call for aid (χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριπνεν [37]) with Odysseus' failure to hear Diomedes' summons and join him in saving the old man (οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε [8.97]). This reversal is resumed in the emphasis on Antilokhos' immediately following action (αὐτοῦ μένων [37]), juxtaposed with Odysseus' continued flight to the ships (ἀλλὰ παρήϊξεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν [8.98]),⁶⁵ and in Pindar's repeated use of μεν- formations (ἀναμείναις [31], μένων [37]), which corresponds not merely to Diomedes' imperative (ἀλλὰ μέν' [8.96]), but to Θ's constant repetition of the same verb (οὔτ' .. τλῇ μίμνειν [78], οὔτε .. μενέτην [79], ἔμιμνε [80]).⁶⁶ In every case, Pindar reflects a Homeric feature but reverses its function or connotation.

The process continues with Antilokhos' νόημα, which is one of the key points of the ode's *exemplum* and therefore emphasised at the start of the myth (νόημα τοῦτο φέρων [29]) as the hero is introduced. It is surely not unconnected with Diomedes' notice of Nestor's difficulty (εἰ μὴ ἄρ' νόησε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης [8.91]), which also introduces the youthful warrior in his scene, but again with an alteration in the precise meaning of the vo- formation. Further, Diomedes' characteristic concern for reputation, explored in the following sequences in Θ, can also

⁶⁴ cf. 8.92, 11.15, 17.89, 17.334, 17.607, 23.847. Only at 17.607, where the Trojans cry out as Idomeneus' strike on Hektor succeeds only in breaking his spear, could one doubt the connotation. However, the Trojans are clearly in the ascendant, and they are reacting to Hektor's safety and continued advance; cf. also *Od.* 4.281, 5.400, 6.294, 8.305, 9.473, 10.311, 12.181, 24.537. At *Od.* 9.403 the verb refers to a defensive cry, as the other Kyklopes use it to describe Polyphemos' cries for help and lamentation; cf. M. NAGLER, *Spontaneity and Tradition: a Study in the Oral Art of Homer*, Berkeley 1974, 30 n. 5.

⁶⁵ Consider also that Pindar only here uses θεῖος of a mortal; cf. *Ol.* 2.88 (Zeus' eagle), *Py.* 4.119 (Kheiron) & 261 (the city of Kyrene). Homer uses the word frequently, most commonly of Odysseus (4 x), and the epithet adds to the ode at least an appearance of epic authenticity for the story.

⁶⁶ S. SCHEIN, *Unity and Meaning in Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode*, *MHTIS* 2 (1988) 235–47, 238, relates this theme to the name of the victor's clan (Emmenidai) and the verb ἔμιμνε (43).

be seen in Pindar's ascription of a similar reward to Antilokhos for his filial piety (40–2), not merely in kind but also phraseology, for the expression **γενεῇ | ὀπλοτέροισιν** (40–1), though linked by SOTIRIOU with **ὀπλοτέρος γενεῇ** at *Il.* 2.707,⁶⁷ would be better referred to Nestor's reply to Diomedes in I, specifically where he corrects the impetuous quality of the younger man's speech (31–49) on the grounds of their disparity in age (**ἤ μὲν καὶ νέος ἐσσί - ἐμός δέ κε καὶ πάις εἷς | ὀπλότατος γενεῇφιν** [57–8]).⁶⁸

Nor is Pindar only redrawing the Diomedes of Θ. The Iliadic Antilokhos, specifically as he is depicted in the chariot race in Ψ, also becomes an important source, subject to the same process of alteration. This may firstly be seen in the expression **κομιδὰν πατρός** (39), which recalls Antilokhos' threat to his father's team in the Funeral Games (**οὐ σφῶιν κομιδὴ παρὰ Νέστορι ποιμένοι λαῶν | ἔσσεται** [23.411–12]), with the by now familiar treatment of **κομιδὴ**. But this is not the only use *Pythian* 6 has for this episode. After the race has finished, Menelaos accuses Antilokhos of 'shackling' his chariot, when he demands an oath **μὴ μὲν ἑκὼν τὸ ἐμὸν δόλωι ἄρμα πεδῆσαι** (23.585); this may be compared with the Pindaric expression **Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἄρμ' ἐπέδα** (32), which transfers the image from the race to a deadly combat situation. Furthermore, Menelaos' concern that a decision in his favour would be considered a function of his greater **βίη** (**βηισάμενος** [23.576]; **βίη** [578]) is paralleled in Pindar by the application of **βιατάς** to Antilokhos (29) himself, and perhaps reflected again in Θ through Diomedes' comment to Nestor about his old age (**σὴ δὲ βίη λέλνται** [8.103]). This is not merely the shared possession of **βι-** formations, which are very common in Homer, but Pindar's reversal of the implication of these words in the *Iliad* episode, downplaying as they did the **βίη** of Antilokhos (and Nestor).

Finally, Θ provides two more of these subverted parallels: as has already been noted, Pindar's **κομιδὰν** (39) is to be connected with Ψ, but spatially a closer analogue is provided in Hektor's speech to his own horses, on the same theme as Antilokhos' exhortation to his (**νῦν μοι τὴν κομιδὴν ἀποτίνετον** [8.186]). Lest anyone object that this is too indirect, Hektor refers in the very same speech to the **ἀσπίδα Νεστορέην** (8.192) which, when combined with the reference to the **Νεστορέας ἵππους** (8.113) as Nestor and Diomedes embark on their venture in

⁶⁷ M. SOTIRIOU, Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien, Göttingen 1998, 71.

⁶⁸ **ὀπλοτέρος** (v.l.) has good authority. 9.57^b is important for Pindar's version, for Diomedes is compared negatively to his father in the *Iliad* (4.368–400, 5.799–813), and suffers generally from a mistaken denigration of his qualities which he does much to disprove. This paternal link will be important; cf. below, p. 18 f. SCHEIN (n. 66) 247 also notes this factor, though he points to 4.325–6 as an indication that this sort of theme was traditionally associated with Nestor, which Pindar took over from his 'sources'. He does not see the complex of references identified above, and so relates the *Aithiopsis* to the Θ scene in the usual manner. Further, he ignores the fact that this expression (**ὀπλοτέρος** / **ὀπλότατος** and **γίγνομαι**) is frequently applied in the Homeric poems to characters (*Il.* 2.707, *Od.* 19.184; also *HHDem.* 116) other than Nestor (*Il.* 4.325, 9.58).

Θ, may be compared with the Pindaric **Νεστόρειον** ἄρμα (32).⁶⁹ The Iliadic references have a hostile or deprecatory connotation, firstly in that Hektor's call places the old man in the position of a potential victim, and secondly in that the Pylian's mares have already been criticised by Diomedes as βραδέες (8.104); though Nestor is stranded in *Pythian* 6, there is no suggestion that this is a result of failure or weakness on his (or his charioteer's) part.

Given these correspondences, their concentration around the characters Nestor, Antilokhos and Diomedes in the *Iliad*, in scenes concerned with chariot combat and racing, and the consistency in Pindar's agenda of appropriation, pure coincidence must be an insufficient explanation. I print here Pindar's text again, but this time with the parallels discussed above set out in bold, next to the Homeric expressions from which they seem to be derived:⁷⁰

Pindar <i>Pythian</i> 6.29–42	Θ	Ψ
ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατάς νόημα τοῦτο φέρων, ὃς ὑπερέφθιτο πατρός, ἐναρίμβροτον ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων Μέμνονα. Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἄρμ' ἐπέδα Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαιχθεῖς· ὁ δ' ἔφεπεν κραταιὸν ἔγχος· Μεσσανίου δὲ γέροντος δοηθεῖσα φρὴν βόασε παῖδα ὄν, χαμαιπετές δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀτέρινεν· αὐτοῦ μένων δ' ὁ θεῖος ἀνήρ πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός , ἐδοκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾶ ὀπλοτέρουσιν ἔργον πελώριον τελέσαις ὑπατος ἀμφὶ τοκεῦσιν ἔμμεν πρὸς ἀρετάν.	βιῇ λέλνται (103) εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε (91) μῖμνεν (78, 79, 80, 96) Νεστορέας ἵππους (113) ἀσπίδα Νεστορέην (192) ἐβόησεν (92) οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε (97) μῖμνεν (78, 79, 80, 96) κομιδὴν (186) [ὀπλότατος γενεῆφιν (9.58)]	βησάμενος (576) βίη (578) κομιδὴ παρὰ Νέστορι (411)

This diagram illustrates the pervasiveness of Pindar's Homeric inheritance. Not only is it a question of the general context of the old man stranded by Paris' strike and confronted by the greatest enemy warrior in advance. Nor are there just a series of scattered or haphazard reflections from, principally, Θ and Ψ. The myth of *Pythian* 6 appears to be a concentrated and deliberate recomposition of the Θ and Ψ episodes, a conclusion which becomes even more attractive when the sequence of events in the two tales is set side by side:

⁶⁹ The *Iliad* has one other instance of the adjective formed from Nestor's name, Νεστορέη (2.54), and Pindar uses such adjectives only four other times: *Py.* 2.69 (Kastor), 8.19 (Xenarkes); *Isth.* 7.7 (Herakles), 3/4.44 (Adrastos).

⁷⁰ I have not included Paris under Pindar's Homeric appropriations (though I suspect he is one) because he frequently wounds people with his bow in the *Iliad*, after which the narrative is concerned with the recovery of the position: 11.369–78, 11.505–7, 11.581–4. In other words, this is a typical thing for him to do (and so could have been in Pindar's 'source'), though the following tables make a powerful circumstantial case for his presence in Pindar as yet another sign of that poet's dependence on the *Nestorbedrängnis*.

Θ	Pindar <i>Pythian</i> 6.29–42
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. stranding (80–1) 2. Paris strike (81–6) [1a. stranding / trace-horse (87–8)] 3. approach of Hektor (88–90) 4. noticing (vo-) of Diomedes (91) 5. call to Odysseus for assistance (92–7) 6. call in vain (97–8) 7. intervention (99–100) 8. victorious episode and following narrative in which glory is the central theme (101 ff.) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Antilokhos' intent (vo-) (29 f.) 1. stranding (32) 2. Paris strike (33) 3. approach of Memnon (33–4) 5. call to Antilokhos for aid (35–6) 6. call not in vain (37) 7. intervention (38) 8. death resulting in glory (39–42)

Pindar has set the frame of his narrative firmly within that of the *Nestorbedrängnis*, following the order of events with one major and one minor exception. The former consists of taking the vo- element (4) out of its Homeric position and putting it at the beginning of the narrative in order to emphasise it, and link the following *exemplum* with the preceding *gnome* (ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς ἰάμειπειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον [26–7]). The latter amounts to not following Homer in his ring construction of 8.80–8, the outer ring comprising the fact of Nestor's stranding (Νέστωρ οἶος ἔμιμνε Γερήνιος, οὔρος Ἀχαιῶν, ἰοῦ τι ἐκῶν, ἀλλ' etc. [80–1]) encircling the description of the strike (81–6), and the closing ring (ὄφρ' ὁ γέρων ἵπποιο παρηγορίας ἀπέταμνε | φασγάνῳ αἰσῶν [87–8]; 1a) with its trace-horse theme introducing Hektor in the usual manner for these ὄφρα / τόφρα transitional devices (τόφρ' Ἑκτορος ὠκέες ἵπποι etc. [88–90]). This simplification, as the alteration above, is an adaptation of the model to the requirements of the ode (for which a description of the horse's wound is superfluous), and cannot obscure the obvious structural correspondence with the Homeric model.

This powerful series of parallels is in a sense unsurprising, given that the *Iliad* itself to a large degree suggests the link between these three characters. Attracted perhaps initially by the speech of Nestor in I, particularly where he reasons that Diomedes is young enough to be his own son ὀπλότατος γενεῆφιν (58), Pindar compares the qualities of Diomedes in the *Iliad* with those of Antilokhos in the same poem: they are both young, both overshadowed by the figures of their more glorious ancestors, both the victims of a somewhat impetuous nature. The connection between Nestor and Diomedes is also very strong,⁷¹ particularly in Θ and I, but also in K where the old man makes him run off to wake the others (157–76), and in the exchange before the mission (esp. 219–26), after which Diomedes is given a sword, shield and a helmet (255–9) by Nestor's other important son in the *Iliad*, who bears the rather significant name of Thrasymedes.⁷² This twin associa-

⁷¹ Noted by DOWDEN (n. 1) 57; cf. also *Od.* 2.166–7 and Σ bT ad *Il.* 8.91a.

⁷² As STEPHANIE WEST points out to me, the name provides a ready link with Thrasyboulos; cf. below, nn. 75–6.

tive complex (Nestor – Diomedes / Diomedes – Antilokhos) could readily propose the depiction of Antilokhos in a role like that of Diomedes in Θ.

In doing so, Pindar takes some of the more negative qualities and actions of the former character in Ψ and recasts them in such a way as to challenge the Homeric picture without explicitly attacking it. Antilokhos' lack of βίη in Ψ becomes Antilokhos the βιατός in Pindar; his impetuous quality, when he impedes Menelaos' chariot, now becomes the sense of duty which impels him to assist his father's impeded chariot; the threat that his father would withdraw the horses' κομιδή is now Nestor's continued κομιδή earned by Antilokhos' death. Then, Diomedes' action in Θ when rescuing Nestor and attacking Hektor before reluctantly retreating, which reveals his need to prove his status (and live up to his father's example),⁷³ becomes in Pindar the self-sacrifice of Antilokhos, as he earns an even greater reward in reputation by dying for his father. To state the case bluntly, the Antilokhos of *Pythian* 6 is a composite of Antilokhos in Ψ and Diomedes in Θ. But this figure is also a new and improved model, and not merely on his old self. His motivation for saving his father surely contrasts positively with that of Diomedes, whose own motivation – though thoroughly heroic – is not quite so purposeful in the victory ode, and he also overcomes the Odysseus of Θ in hearkening to the call.

If this analysis is correct, then there should be some purpose or advantage to the recomposition in the victory ode. *Pythian* 6 was composed in honour of Xenokrates of Akragas, but both the story of Antilokhos and the myth of Kheiron's advice to Akhilleus which precedes it (19–27)⁷⁴ are directly addressed to his son Thrasyboulos. NAGY suggests that this figure is someone suited by name and background not only to athletic competitions, but also potentially to the characterisation of Antilokhos in the *Iliad* – i.e. a successful and somewhat reckless young man.⁷⁵ The link between Thrasyboulos and Antilokhos is furthered by the onomastic equation with Nestor's son Thrasymedes,⁷⁶ and the aptness of the paradigm is reinforced by another aspect of its Iliadic heritage, as both Pindar and

⁷³ cf. above, n. 68.

⁷⁴ L. KURKE, Pindar's Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry, TAPA 120 (1990) 85–107, argues that Pindar used poems like the pseudo-Hesiodic *Precepts of Kheiron* to associate Antilokhos with Akhilleus (*Py.* 6.22), as well as with the advice Nestor gives his son before the chariot race in Ψ (cf. above).

⁷⁵ G. NAGY, Pindar's Homer, Baltimore 1990, 207–14 (though at 208 n. 59, he seems to endorse the derivation of Antilokhos' death from the *Aithiopis*), 207: "the very identity of our victor, Thrasyboulos . . . has been planned, presumably from birth onward, by virtue of his name to participate in the epic themes of the Antilokhos story." It must be more likely in my opinion that Pindar should choose and shape the myth of Antilokhos' death in order to make it resonate with his *laudandus*.

⁷⁶ The similarity between the names is suggestive, and Thrasymedes is prominent in the *Odyssey* (4.442 ff.), but also in the *Iliad* he is found at 9.81, 10.255 f., and 14.9–11, where Nestor takes his shield because his son is still out in the fighting with his father's shield.

Xenokrates take on an exemplary and parainetic function approximating to Nestor's role before the chariot race in Ψ (already an important source), for which type of victory the ode was composed.⁷⁷ In this respect, once again, the Pindaric conception overtakes its Homeric model, because Xenokrates is a more successful charioteer than Nestor (cf. 23.638–42) or Antilokhos, and Pindar's own advice is more authoritative, in that the specifics of the father's instructions to his son play very little role in the somewhat unwise way in which Antilokhos actually runs his race.⁷⁸ The myth's frame reflects the importance of the paternal link, connecting Xenokrates and his victory with the son's piety in that regard (15–17 | 44–5). Thus, the relevance of the 'new' Antilokhos revolves around his relationship with his father, evinced in heightened form by the central element in Pindar's reworked and improved Iliadic myth.⁷⁹

The preceding discussion has raised the question of Pindar's relationship with his sources, and his freedom to alter, adapt or even change them. There are many other such cases where he manipulates a mythological *exemplum* in this way, and one might do no more than point to the Pelops myth of *Olympian* 1, where the poet openly disagrees with previous versions in order to construct a suitable paradigm for his *laudandus*. However, mainly because the manner of Antilokhos' death before Pindar is unknown (but also because he does not in *Pythian* 6 take the explicitly anti-traditional stance of *Olympian* 1), a slightly more precise parallel is required, one where the Pindaric myth dresses a non-Homeric situation in Homeric clothing.

Such an analogue does exist but, before getting to it, it should be noticed that Pindar seems to combine two expressions from the *Nestorbedrängnis* (κουλινδόμενος περὶ χαλκῶι [8.86]; φασγάνωι ἄϊσσων [88]) when talking about the death of Aias at *Nemean* 8.23 (φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις). This would suggest not

⁷⁷ cf., e. g., T. HUBBARD, *The Pindaric Mind*, Leiden 1985, 133 f. for other examples where both *laudator* and *laudandus* are reflected in the myth. One might also compare Pindar and Kheiron in *Pythian* 9.

⁷⁸ I cannot agree with the interpretation of NAGY (n. 75) 208 f., that Antilokhos' victory is the intelligent application of Nestor's instruction. Antilokhos' victory over Menelaos is gained by a dangerous ruse *not* before the turning point (so NAGY), with which Nestor was so concerned, but in the home leg (cf. N. RICHARDSON, *The Iliad: A Commentary*; Vol. VI Books 21–4, Cambridge 1993, ad 23.326–33, 210–1), and his later retreat when faced with Menelaos' rebuke does not prove "the overarching principle of rational behaviour" in his conduct of the race. He has been rash, as heroes are wont in the pursuit of victory, but he is able to back down in the face of competing obligations and considerations in a way, for instance, that Akhilleus in A was not. Menelaos, similarly, shows a malleability in this situation which Agamemnon had earlier been unable to exhibit, and the episode as a whole is an excellent doublet illustration of that first quarrel, and how other characters are able to resolve such crises.

⁷⁹ For the commonplace of the ancestral, paternal and filial benefits of victory, cf. E. BUNDY, *Studia Pindarica*, London 1986 (reprint of IDEM, *Studia Pindarica I & II*, Berkeley 1962), 64–5; also L. KURKE, *Fathers and Sons: A Note on Pindaric Ambiguity*, *AJP* 112 (1991) 287–300.

only that he knew Θ well, but also that he understood the ‘useless’ quality of the παρήγορος (the subject of the first and object of the second expression in Θ), to which he alluded here in order to make Aias all the more pathetic, a *desideratum* in an ode where the *exemplum* is based around the unworthy nature of Aias’ defeat and demise.⁸⁰ This is roughly the formal poetic agenda suggested for *Pythian* 6, but there is a much more powerful and extensive example.

In a landmark study, KÖHNKEN has shown how the exchanges between Apollo and Kheiron in *Pythian* 9 reflect the Homeric Διὸς ἀπάτη in both general construction and detailed phraseology.⁸¹ Pointing to the fact that “[d]ie Wortverbindung κρυπτῇ κληίδι (*sic*, 14.168) ist bei Homer ebenso singulär wie κρυπταὶ κλαίιδες bei Pindar (39)”,⁸² he details the correspondences and alterations, among them ἀμφανδὸν ἀδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνᾶς (41) as a reconfiguration of εἰ νῦν ἐν φιλότῃ λιλαίει εὐνηθῆναι .. τὰ δὲ προπέφανται ἅπαντα (14.331–2), leading to the conclusion that:

[D]iskretion, die Zeus, ebenso wie Apoll, I vernachlässigen will, um sofort an das Ziel seiner Wünsche zu gelangen, ist die notwendige Vorbedingung der Liebesvereinigung ... Apoll ist von Kyrene genauso hingerissen wie Zeus von Hera, und wie Zeus von Hera, so muss auch Apoll von Chiron an das zu respektierende Schamgefühl erinnert werden.⁸³

He then shows how Here’s preparation, specifically the description of Aphrodite’s girdle (ὀαριστὺς ἰ πᾶρφασις [14.216–7]), is reflected in Apollo’s deception as summarised by Kheiron (παρφάμεν [43]). Thus, the Pindaric Apollo moves between the roles of the Homeric Here and Zeus, just as Antilokhos in *Pythian* 6 is reminded of his Homeric self even as he is drawn as Diomedes. The similarity should be clear by now, but the parallel must be pushed further, specifically to provide a case where Pindar’s innovation actually contradicts or supercedes previous versions, since the *Aithiopis* did set out the hero’s death in some form. KÖHNKEN again comes to the rescue, showing that *Pythian* 9 alters the consummation’s location from Thrace to Libya, and emphasises Kyrene’s martial qualities as the primary reason for Apollo’s attention, instead of the exceptional beauty which was apparently the usual spark.⁸⁴ Crucially, he points to the *Nachleben* of Pindar’s story, which was “erst von daher in die Kyrenegeschichte übertragen.”⁸⁵

⁸⁰ cf. C. CAREY, Pindar’s Eighth Nemean Ode, PCPS 22 (1977) 26–42; on the παρήγορος, above, n. 23.

⁸¹ A. KÖHNKEN, ‘Meilichos Orga’: Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars, in: A. HURST (ed.), Pindare: Entretiens Fondation Hardt 31, Geneva 1985, 71–116, esp. 86 f. For similar Pindaric appropriations and recompositions of Homeric passages and themes, cf., e.g., H. PELLICIA, Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1–80, HSCP 91 (1987) 39–63; F. NISÉTICH, Pindar and Homer, Baltimore 1989; MANN (n. 60).

⁸² KÖHNKEN (n. 81) 87 n. 45.

⁸³ KÖHNKEN (n. 81) 88–9.

⁸⁴ KÖHNKEN (n. 81) 98–9.

⁸⁵ KÖHNKEN (n. 81) 100.

The comparison between *Pythians* 9 and 6 is suggestive: ancient authors since Xenophon extolled Antilokhos as the model of filial piety, and the innovation in *Pythian* 9 establishes itself as a highly influential, if not definitive, source of subsequent mythography. KÖHNKEN himself suggests that these departures from tradition serve the purpose of the victory ode, adding to the praise of the *laudandus* through the glorification of his homeland and its eponymous nymph. The 'new' Antilokhos of *Pythian* 6 is similarly shaped to the nature and circumstance of his *laudandus*, and the myth as a whole is an excellent illustration of the ambiguous relationship between two of the most influential singers of the heroic in ancient Greece.

In that regard, one is tempted to ask why Pindar should do this type of thing to the *Iliad*. It has been noted before that he avoids explicitly recasting material from the two Homeric poems, preferring instead the stories of the cyclic epics.⁸⁶ Explanations have varied, but the preceding analysis would suggest an agonistic purpose behind the agenda of appropriation and alteration. As SOLMSEN says:

... to prevail against the tremendous authority of Homer a mere assertion would not suffice. Pindar has made the new version acceptable by resorting to a motif – and a motivation – which in addition to its intrinsic attraction gained force by a Homeric precedent.⁸⁷

Pindar provides a specifically Homeric armature to his narrative in order to lead – or even trick – the audience into granting the mythological authority which the *laudator* requires if he is to practise his craft. Whether he intended one or every witness of the performance to pick up on the allusions to the *Iliad* is actually unimportant, for their task is still to determine the level of authority between poetic narratives using what seems to be roughly the same type of mythical material. In other words, the question of which poet to trust is placed firmly in the foreground. By constructing this suggested contest in *Pythian* 6 around its similarities with the narrative(s) of his greatest competitor,⁸⁸ Pindar presents himself and his tale with the mythographical authority of Homeric poetry.

Where does this leave an understanding of what may have happened to Antilokhos in the *Aithiopis*? The preceding discussion has undermined Pindar's status as a reliable extra-Homeric witness to that text, but it would be rash to assume that he had no warrant at all for his story. Neoanalysts (and others) will therefore still insist that the Pindaric version reflects authentically the story of the *Aithiopis*. This position, that the *Nestorbedrängnis* and *Aithiopis* episodes are so

⁸⁶ cf. above, n. 60.

⁸⁷ F. SOLMSEN, Achilles on the Islands of the Blessed: Pindar v. Homer, *AJP* 103 (1982) 19–24, 20.

⁸⁸ There were, of course, other contemporary figures with whom Pindar was in more direct competition, yet Homer seems to have been such an enormously influential mythical source, even in the early Classical period, that he was a natural target for appropriation and subversion. Pindar wanted to claim for himself the type of authority which was routinely granted the Homeric poet.

closely connected as to account for the verbal, thematic and structural parallels between the Iliadic passages and Pindar, must in the end be regarded as unlikely. Though thematic and structural resemblances are indeed plausible in an oral tradition of verse-making, the *Nestorbedrängnis* itself is not so much typical *in toto* as an individual configuration of typical elements. Moreover, the verbal parallels traced above could only be produced by detailed copying of almost entirely non-formulaic phraseology.⁸⁹ No two oral poets compose in the same way, even when dealing with the same traditional feature. Copying of the required sort is only really possible from a written text, so the counterargument would have to assume what it seeks to prove, viz. that there were fixed written texts on which Homer was consciously drawing.

But it may be possible, nonetheless, to advance a reconstruction of the *Aithiopsis* episode, or whatever traditional narrative on which Pindar was drawing. I propose that, just as he did with Kyrenaian myth in *Pythian* 9, so in *Pythian* 6 Pindar combined the *Nestorbedrängnis* and the death of Antilokhos in the *Aithiopsis* in order to give Homeric weight to what was already a less authoritative story.⁹⁰ In that poem, there were several forms for Antilokhos' death to take, and in such a way that Pindar's recomposition would not strike an audience as too outlandish or removed from the stories with which they were familiar.⁹¹ Yet, however the death of Antilokhos was achieved, and however many versions there were of the episode, it was Pindar who gave this event the tincture of an Iliadic respectability with which it has been viewed ever since.

Before closing this part of the discussion, it should be asked whether there are any other examples of Homeric episodes so considerably influencing subsequent records of cyclic material. The best case is Herodotos' differentiation of the *Kypria* from the *Iliad*, on the basis that the journey of Paris and Helen from Sparta to Troy in the former poem was achieved in three days, but in the latter included a stop at Sidon.⁹² Proklos' summary of the *Kypria*, however, 'agrees' with the *Iliad* in having

⁸⁹ Only ὀπλότερος / ὀπλότατος γίγνομαι and εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε are formulaic.

⁹⁰ cf. above, n. 60, for the argument that Pindar felt all epic poetry to be equally Homeric.

⁹¹ For instance, he could indeed have been coming to protect his father, as figures often do for endangered characters in the *Iliad*. Nestor himself may also have been stranded, perhaps by the death of one of his team, but perhaps also by the death of his charioteer, as in the case of Idomeneus' driver Koiranos (17.609–25). That both trace-horses in the *Iliad* are killed by *alienum vulnus* might suggest an easy interchangeability to Pindar and his audience between the trace-horse and the charioteer, who is often killed in this way; cf. 8.119–21, 8.311–13, 15.445–7, 16.736–7, 17.608–11. The possibilities should even be considered that Nestor was in no danger, for Pindar is the first author to mention it, and that there was more than one version of the *Aithiopsis* (or the episode itself), as the case of Herodotos 2.117 (cf. next nn.) might intimate.

⁹² Herodotos 2.117 (*Kypria* F 14; *Il.* 6.289–92); cf. also BURGESS, *The Tradition of the Trojan War* (n. 2), 19–21, 201–2 nn. 64–8; M. FINKELBERG, *The Cypria, the Iliad and the problem of multiformity in oral and written tradition*, CP 95 (2000) 1–11, 6–11.

Paris stop off at (and sack) Sidon on the way home.⁹³ The most likely explanation is that the Homeric poems have in the interim become so authoritative that they 'bend' even the extant versions or records of other heroic poems.⁹⁴ This is of course a much later and more direct phenomenon than the one proposed for *Pythian* 6, though any conclusion about the date at which this happened must be tentative, but it still shows the distorting power and authority of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

The preceding section has suggested that Pindar's construction of Antilokhos's death in *Pythian* 6 was drawing extensively on the *Iliad* and, principally, the *Nestorbedrängnis*. There are no earlier treatment of this story, no recognisable representations of the scene in *LIMC*,⁹⁵ and so it is impossible to be certain that something very much like it did not happen in the *Aithiopis*. Nonetheless, whatever occurred in that poem, it is now certain that Pindar can no longer be used as its witness without serious qualification.

Conclusion

This article has tried to make two points. First, there are no difficulties with the *Nestorbedrängnis*, and no reason to believe that the *Iliad* poet was drawing on anything other than traditional motifs for this scene. Second, Pindar's relationship

⁹³ *Kypria* arg. 18–20.

⁹⁴ This discrepancy between the *Iliad* and the *Kypria* might well be evidence of traditional variants. A 'three-day' journey sounds conventional for an easy trip (cf. *Iliad* 9.362–3), so the *Kypria* poet could have simply made his choice in order to focus on that fact, whilst the *Iliad* poet wanted to remind his audience of Paris' heroic stature as someone able to receive guest-gifts (or sack a city), or else his relatively poor record in that regard. There may have been several versions of Paris' trip extant even at a very early stage.

⁹⁵ I know of only one depiction which might be related to this scene; cf. A. KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN, art. on Antilochos, in: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae I 1*, Munich 1981, 830–8, esp. 836 (no. 33). Unmentioned by HEITSCH (n. 13) 165 n. 24 (an otherwise admirable collection), an Attic amphora (c. 500 BC) depicts an older man dressed in an *himation* and carrying the body of a younger man out of the fray whilst, to the right and left, two pairs of warriors fight. If the central pair are Nestor and Antilokhos, this can hardly be a direct reflection of Pindar, but it might reflect an *Aithiopis* version (Pindaric reliance on which would be even shakier). However, artistic representations have only a very limited value for the reconstruction of early epic poems; cf. esp. S. LOWENSTAM, *Talking Vases: the Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth*, TAPA 127 (1997) 21–76. A. SHAPIRO, 'Τῶν Ὁμηωδῶν ἑξήκοντα: Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi, MH 45 (1988) 1–5, examines one of the friezes of the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi (c. 525 BC) depicting two sets of warriors clashing over a corpse, each framed by a *quadriga*, and what appears to be an unarmed older man (labelled N) on the right. SHAPIRO argues that this reflects the *Aithiopis*, referring to Θ as its earliest indirect, and Pindar as its earliest direct, form. However, though it may draw on the *Aithiopis*, the frieze has no connection with Pindar's narrative beyond the inferences addressed in this article.

with the *Iliad* renders his status as witness to the *Aithiopsis* deeply problematic. Together, these arguments suggest that there are severe weaknesses in the existing neoanalytical treatments of the *Nestorbedrängnis*.

The implications of this study are limited firstly to this passage from Θ, but it indicates some directions for engagement between oralists and neoanalysts, not to mention the many Homerists who would adhere entirely to neither school. If it is no longer acceptable to use simplistic models of oralist criticism, so the shortcomings in the neoanalytical heritage should not be ignored. In examining the song culture of the Homeric poems – and before one can talk confidently about specific debts, allusions or borrowings – it must not be forgotten that Homer drew on a tradition stretching far back into the prehistory of Greek epic poetry.

St. Anne's College, Oxford, OX2 6HS

ADRIAN KELLY