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INTRODUCTION

The bulk of this thesis is an investigation of Pindar's treatment of myths involving the Aiakids - Aiakos, Phokos, Peleus and Telamon, Achilles and Aias, and Neoptolemos. In particular, I consider the relation of Pindar's versions to those of his antecedents.

This relation has become a matter of some importance in work which addresses itself to establishing the relevance of Pindaric myth to its epinician context - work which has rightly been seen as central to the interpretation of Pindar. In this introduction, I shall first describe how this has become a focus for debate.

\[\text{ἐμε} \tau', \ ζ\ χρυσάρματοι \ Αιακίδαι, \\
\text{τέθμιόν μοι φαμι' ασφέστατον ἐμμεν} \\
\text{τάνδ' ἐπιστείχουτα νάσου ραινέμεν εὐλογίαις.} \]

(I.6.19-21)

In the odes for Aeginetan victors, there is an obvious sense in which the myth is relevant to its context. Pindar presents myths which describe the exploits of the family of Aiakos, the first king of the island.¹

But how significant is this? It has long been recognized that some of Pindar's myths spring from some such external

¹ 0.8.31-52; H.3.32-64; 4.25-30, 46-68; 5.7-13, 25-37; 6.49-53; 7.33-44; 8.23-32; I.5.35-42; 6.27-56; 8.19-58. P.8 is the exception; although there is a little Aiakid material in the closing prayer (99f), the main myth springs from the Theban saga (but see Greengard, Structure 98). Pindar advertises this practice as his tethmos at N.3.28f; 6.45ff; I.5.19ff, 34f, and above all, I.6.19ff, quoted above.
relation: they may be connected with the victor's home or family; or with the scene, tutelary deity, or discipline of the victory.² But do these data provide any more than starting points from which Pindar digresses?³ Pindar does not in fact dwell upon the obvious possible reason: the Greeks *provocabant, ut virtutem hominis cuiuslibet explicarent, ad maiorum virtutem, unde et illam emanasse dicebant.*⁴ And even if this does lie behind Pindar's selection, this external relation explains only why the Aeginetan patron should be treated to an Aiakid myth; and goes no way towards explaining why any particular Aeginetan ode should feature any particular Aiakid adventure narrated in any particular way.

It is this further question which has fascinated many critics.⁵

---


³ The scholiasts call the myths πατερβασίων, whether they are grounded in this way or not (e.g. Σ.Ν.7.71; Lefkowitz, *Scholia* 274; Heath, *Unity* 160f).


⁵ Willcock's review of Köhnken, *Funktion*, CR 24 (1974), 191-6, here 192. For a history of approaches to this question, see Köhnken, *Funktion* 1-18; Young, *PC*, with Lloyd-Jones, *Modern Interpretation* 116f and Heath, *Origins*. Early judgements, some acute and charming, are to be found in P. B. Wilson, *The Knowledge and Appreciation of Pindar in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Diss., Oxford, 1974) (e.g. 75 (Cowley), 141 (Dryden), 145f (Congreve)). See too Goldhill, *Poet's Voice* 128.
Now, if there is a satisfactory answer to it, it will mean that the myth relates to something else; that it is not simply a digression. Whatever that other thing is (perhaps some circumstance of the victor; or ideas propounded elsewhere in the poem), the myth will exemplify it. This seems straightforward; two difficulties are that Pindar does not label the myth with the notion that it is illustrating; and the possibility that that notion is a very simple one (as, for example, that Aiakid blood is good), which goes no way towards explaining the complexities of the myth.

Modern discussion of these matters may conveniently be said to begin with the work of Elroy Bundy, which galvanized the debate. And this is so despite his own avoidance of the problems of the myth. He examined the genre of epinician; and argued that "the choice involved in composition is mainly a choice of formulae, motives, themes, topics, and set sequences

---

6 It was the search for an external relation of sufficient explanatory richness that impelled Boeckh's approach of "historical allegory", damned by Young (PC 9f), but which Boeckh considered unavoidable (2.2.6f; cf Most, Measures 28f).

7 Young, Isthmian 7 37 n.125.

8 Carey, 5 Odes 8f.

9 Which thus becomes simply pleasurable - but alogos - narrative (Verdenius, Com. 1.5; H. V. Carter, "The Mythological Paradigm in Latin And Greek Poetry", AJP 54 (1933), 201-24, here 202.)

10 SP 1 and 2, published in 1962.

11 Of the two poems Bundy treats, only 1.1 has any mythical material - the catalogue of the victories of Kastor and Iolaos (14-31); and this he considers briskly (SP 2.44-7; see Carey, 5 Odes 14 n.3). Elsewhere, he seems to suggest that mythical material is foil (SP 1.6 n.21); an unhappy term, in view of his descriptions of it as "thrust aside", "rejected" (6) and "dismissed" (8, 9): Young, PC 87.
of these that have, by convention, meanings not always perceived from the surface denotations of the words themselves."  

This approach is anathema to the type of biographical speculation which adduces jealous rivals from the appearance of envy in the odes; instead, the frequency of the topic shows that it is a convention: the talk of envy heightens the glory of the victor.  

Bundy's approach laid down a stern challenge to the student of Pindar's myth. He ruled out the appeal to the unknowable external circumstance, which seemed the only possibility for explaining the importance and complexity of the myths; but at the same time insisted on the discipline and integrity of the poems, thus ruling out the possibility that the myth is simply digression. "There is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent encomiastic": how can the myths be interpreted on this model?  

Thummer attempted to do so in the narrowest sense, arguing that the myths connected with the victor's ancestry, his home, his discipline, or the festival at which he has won, enhance the victor. But this throws up counter-intuitive results, and in any case fails to answer the question of selection in any

12 SP 2.92; cf 36, 91.
13 SP 2.40f, 63f; Köhnken, Funktion 19-36; Slater, Hypothekai 80.
14 Young, 3 Odes 1 n.1; Köhnken, Funktion 9f, 228f.
15 SP 1.3, with Slater, Doubts 196 n.22.
16 Thummer 1.110-120. These are categories we have already seen, but they are now explained teleologically (cf Most, Measures 29f).
more than the broadest terms — leaving Thummer with the inescapable conclusion that myth is "vorwiegend dekorativen Bestandteilen des Epinikion".¹⁷

Thummer was attempting to link myth directly to laudandus.¹⁸ This proving impossible, the critic must return to the rest of the poem: if the myth is to contribute to the praise of the victor, it must do so through its enhancement of the whole poem, which is an encomium.¹⁹

To interpret a Pindaric myth, then, requires an analysis of the poem in which it occurs, demonstrating how the myth contributes to that poem. If the result seems complicated, the critic will argue that it must be so: "the complex nature of Pindar's poetry... demands a complex kind of criticism."²⁰ In the years after Bundy, a number of interpretative tours de force appeared: the work of Segal, Young, and Köhnken. Segal chased what lay beyond generic features: "I should not want to throw out the Bundy with the bathwater, only remind us that every bathtub obeys those fundamental laws of hydraulics which

¹⁷ 1.107; see Young, Isthmian 7 36f.

¹⁸ He thus shares a fundamental assumption with the historical allegorists: "that the chief interest of any given Pindaric myth is the relation of the details of the myth to the details of the victor's circumstances. Their disagreement is over the breadth of those circumstances which merit consideration. For the strict Bundyists only those circumstances which involve the victor's identity as a professional athlete seeking enduring praise are relevant; for the historical symbolists the victor's identity includes his social and political roles — whether or not there is evidence available" (Rose, Paideia 147).

¹⁹ Lee captured the shift by differentiating between the study of Pindar qua poetic encomium and qua encomiastic poetry (Historical Bundy 67).

²⁰ Young, 3 Odes 106.
make plumbing possible."  

A Pindaric myth should be considered as contributing to a "significant moral and aesthetic structure".  

For Young, too, the interpretation of an ode's myth was part of the answer to the question of the ode's meaning. Of I.7: "Through the example of the homonymous uncle, the poet clarifies how he views the young athlete's achievement." The myth of P.3 explores the tensions of near and far, possible and unattainable, which run through the ode.  

In Funktion, Köhnken produced integrated interpretations of six odes, concentrating on the role of the myth in each, including P.10, a test case for the relevance of myth ever since the scholiast: Perseus' visit to the happy Hyperboreans parallels the temporary happiness of the victor's celebration. He sums up his view of Pindaric myth: 

Pindar sie mit Bedacht ausgewählt und für das spezielle Gedicht gestaltet hat und daß man nirgendwo von einer funktionslosen Digression oder von einem gedichtfremden politischen oder

---

23 Isthmian 7 34; 3 Odes 2.  
24 Isthmian 7 43.  
25 3 Odes 59-62; see too PC 35.  
26 Funktion 181; the scholiast wrote (S.P.10.46b): μέχρι δὲ τούτων ὁ Πύθαρχος καλῶς τῶν ἐπίμνησιν γράφει· ἢστόχης δὲ τὰ μετὰ ταύτα ἀλόγω παρεξβάσει χρησάμενος.  
27 Funktion 227.
persönlichen Zweck sprechen kann. Wichtig aber ist auch, daß keine Gedichtpartie bei Pindar aus ihrem Zusammenhang herausgenommen und für sich beurteilt werden darf: Viele Auffälligkeiten, für die man so oft historische und persönliche Motive erfunden und verantwortlich gemacht hat, finden ihre Erklärung, wenn man den Kontext beachtet und sie im Rahmen des Liedes, in dem sie stehen, interpretiert.

This approach generated models on which an ode could be considered as Bundy had hoped: as "a complex orchestration of motives and themes that conduce to one end: the glorification of... the victor". But others argue that such interpretations could go far beyond the evidence provided by the text. (A charge made doubly plausible if the interpretative critic claims to be recovering an interpretation possible for the first audience.) Superfine examination of the details of a myth could lead to bizarre ramifications.

If the doctrinaire unitarian interpretation is thought inconceivably complicated, it can be simplified by the exclusion of some parts of the poem from the process of integration. Various strategies are used: the myth is

28 Bundy, SP 2.91.

29 See Radt’s review of Köhnken, Funktion, Gnomon 46 (1974), 113-21, especially 117-9 on P.10; Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 117; Verdenius, Comm. 1.3, 5, 8f.

30 Slater, Doubts 193, 199f; Heath, Unity 155 with n.3; id. Origins 98.

31 Köhnken, Funktion 115f; Gärtnner, Siegeslieder 40; or, more spectacularly, S. L. Schein, "Unity and Meaning in Pindar’s Sixth Pythian Ode", MHTIE 2 (1987), 235-47, especially 237-9.
digressive after all (but still encomiastic); or some elements are coincidental historical data. Most attractively, the notion of myth as paradeigma, as a form of argument, is emphasized. We should not look for a one-to-one relation between the paradeigmatic myth and a real event, for the exemplum typically presents an extreme - that is one reason why it is an effective form of argument. So the search for parallels between the two is doomed; instead, we should consider how aspects of the myth indicate an area beyond the direct statements of the poem, yet with which the poem is concerned.

An effective starting place for an interpretation of a myth which proceeds on lines like these is a detail which is

32 Verdenius on 0.1: "the myth serves to enhance the glory of Olympia and hence, indirectly, that of Hero, but... from a literary point of view it forms a digression which does not have a specific connexion with the praise of the victor" (Comm. 2.4); on the function of the myth of 0.7: "to add lustre to the present situation by putting it under the light of a great and sacred past" (Comm. 1.57; cf 4f); "the victor... basks in a reflected glory by being the cause of this entertainment to his fellow citizens" (Lee, Historical Bundy 67 n.13); Hurst, Aspects du Temps 162-6.

33 Even Köhnken appealed to historical speculation in Funktion (85); cf Mullen, Pindar and Athens passim and particularly 489 for a return to the notion of an anti-Athenian slant in N.8 (Bowra, Pindar 298f, 412); Rose, Sons of the Gods 154-9, and especially 158.

34 Slater, Doubts 195.

35 Carey, Pythian 4 149-50; Davies, Thetis and Helen 262 n.23 and passim; cf Van Groningen, Composition Littéraire 345 n.1.

perceived as Pindar's invention. Now, if Pindar's myth is regarded as argument, it will, typically, present traditional material: "there is a criterion for... illustrative exempla that makes them concern legendary people. They must be so well known that their exemplary value is intelligible and accepted; a rather obscure historical person may not well serve as a paradigm." The argument must proceed from agreed premises.

If this is so, Pindar's apparent departure from the traditional becomes significant. The scholiast offers the clue: 

Indeed, the alteration of traditional myth so that it is more paradeigmatiс is as old as the paradeigmatic use of myth itself. Where we find Pindaric innovation, it should show that the new version offers something which the old did not: "Der Überlieferte Mythos wird bei Pindar faktisch allen Veränderungen unterzogen, die er in einem literarischen Werk überhaupt erfahren kann." This principle was a linchpin of the discussion of P.3 in Young's 3 Odes: assuming that Pindar "never changes or invents myths unnecessarily", Young integrated the changes he saw in the myth of P.3 into his

37 Contrast e.g. Farnell, Works 1.260.  
38 Young, Isthmian 7 45; cf Molyneux, Herakles 305.  
39 Slater, Hypothekai.  
41 Il.24.601ff; Willcock, Mythological Paradeigma 147; Davies, Thetis and Helen.  
42 Tonia, Mythen-Interpretation 39; Slater, Doubts 196 n.17; N. F. Rubin, "Pindar's Creation of Epinician Symbols: Olympians 7 and 6", CH 74 (1980/81), 67-87, here 67f; Most, Measures 33.
interpretation of the whole: they "serve the poetic purpose and form of the poem". Now Köhnken and others exploit it.

This thesis is concerned with the validity of this strategy of seeing in mythic innovation the poetic purpose of the ode. In the last chapter I shall consider the myths of P.3, 0.1 and 0.9, which have been considered spectacular examples of Pindaric innovation; but the main part of the work is an investigation of Pindar's versions of the Aiakid myths. In this, I shall proceed on the basis of two propositions. First, I shall look for the sources of the myths using the proposition that they are in fact traditional. Secondly, where there is evidence of change, I shall investigate it on the proposition that an explanation for it is to be found elsewhere than in the appeal to Pindar's poetic purpose. It will, I hope, become clear that there is evidence to support these propositions - evidence which has not been the subject of comprehensive study because it runs counter to the interpretative strategy favoured by Young and others, which I have just outlined. My two propositions merit some explanation here (although they are legitimate tests of the strategy).

On the first head. I have suggested (p.8) that Pindar's mythical material, qua argument, is typically traditional.

---

43 54, 34, 34-43.
44 Köhnken: Poseidon Hippios 204, 206; Gods and Descendants 27f; "Mythological Chronology and Thematic Coherence in Pindar's Third Olympian Ode", HSCP 87 (1983), 49-63, here 57f; Meilichos Orga 101. Also Rubin, op. cit. 70ff; March, Creative Poet 23; Hubbard, Aiakos 5f; Nisetich, Immortality 12; Carey, Prosopographica 5f.
This suggestion is supported by the allusive manner in which Pindar habitually narrates his myth. Further, the tradition informs Pindar's narrative, enabling more daring use of language, unintelligible if the audience does not know what it refers to (e.g. I.8.24); and enriching the sense (e.g. the treatments of Achilles' childhood).

That Pindar's mythical material was, typically, known, is suggested also by the fact that where critics have searched out the probable sources, rather than concluding from the lack of an extant forerunner that Pindar is innovating, they have discovered that there are indeed sources and that Pindar is faithful to them. This will be my conclusion for the Aiakid myths. Richard Stoneman surveyed Pindar's treatment of the myths of the Theban Cycle and found it traditional. He also considered the myth of the Dioskouroi fighting with the Apharids in N.10, and concluded that it was not an example of Pindar's *Mythenidealisierung*, but a version of the account

---

45 See e.g. below p.189, 199, 87; cf Kakridis, *Pelopssage* 182; Fogelmark, *KAI KEINOIZ* 70.


47 Too often the critic assumes that only Pindar could change a myth; and yet also, defending the possibility of change, points out (or assumes) that such changes are typical of the late archaic age (e.g. Lloyd-Jones, *Modern Interpretation* 136f; Köhnken, *Heilichos Orga* 100f). The second statement in fact shows that it need not be Pindar who alters myths.

48 As it had been Carnes', in his examination of Pindar's treatment of the careers of Aiakos, Peleus and Telamon (Autochthony 84, 107f, 230, 261f).

49 *Mythological Tradition.*
given in the Cypria. Robbins thought the myth of 0.3, pace Köhnken, traditional. Young himself examined 0.7.53, and concluded that his interpretation "subtracts yet another passage from the arsenal of those who see Pindar (Huxley's 'Editorial Pindar') as a constant carper against other poets and previous mythological traditions." Finally, we note that, although he chose odes that shared mythological subjects in order to show how Pindar's treatments of them varied, Köhnken threw up no difference of hard fact between any of them. Pindar returns thrice to the adventures of Peleus, and to the death of Aias (note too the adventures of Telamon); and the data remain constant.

Finally, even where Pindar advertises that he is innovating, he still uses traditional material. Already in

---

50 "Mythology and Interpretation: Two Notes on Pindar's Nemean", Maia 28 (1976), 227-32, here 229ff. Innovations had been argued by F. Staehlin, "Der Dioskurenmythos in Pindars 10 nemeischer Ode (Ein Beispiel einer Mythenidealisierung)", Philologus 62 (1903), 182-95; and by A. Puech, "La Mort du Castor dans la X° Néeeéne", REG 43 (1930), 398-403, who suggested that the theme of fraternal devotion in the poem would be subverted if the innovations which he saw had been absent (401). Stoneman does not, however, answer the charge that Polydeukes' evasion of injury is an innovation (N.10.68; cf Apoll. 3.11.2: Staehlin, op. cit. 194; Stoneman, op. cit. 232 n.24). We shall see an answer to this.


52 D. C. Young, "Pindar and Horace against the Telchines (Ol. 7.53 and Carm. 4.4.33)", AJP 108 (1987), 152-7. Young gave a paper entitled "Making the Believable unbelievable: Pindar Olympian 1 and the Theory of a Kernel of Truth" to the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in 1986, which I suspect cast doubt on the inference from 0.1.36 that the myth in that poem is a Pindaric innovation. Young's paper is cited by Nagy, Pindar's Homer 66 n.75.

53 Funktion 15.
1940, Robertson noted that features "carefully designed to recall the rejected story" appeared in Pindar's renovated myths—in other words, that details from the old version stubbornly remained in some guise in the new. On the correction in P.3, Young wrote: "There is some reason to believe that Pindar elaborates and clarifies the Hesiodic story [sc. of Koronis] and its moral rather than 'revising' and 'correcting' them." Van Groningen before, and Woodbury afterwards, made similar observations on O.7 and N.7. I shall argue that the peculiar character of the rejection in P.3 can best be explained by appeal to the power of the Hesiodic model; and that the notoriously defensive tone of N.7 is explicable by consideration of the powerful but confused mythological tradition about Neoptolemos. Even the narrative in O.1, which contains "the most salient and self-assertive example of literary revisionism in Greek mythology" reveals traditional material. Finally, N.5, in which Pindar refuses to tell of the fratricide

---

54 Food of Achilles 179.
55 3 Odes 37 n.1.
56 On διορθώσις (0.7.21), Van Groningen wrote: "Appliqué à un λόγος, un récit, ici un mythe, il doit indiquer une combinaison nouvelle des données et une interprétation plus précise. Le narrateur qui entreprend de διορθώσις un λόγος ne reproduit pas machinalement ce que la tradition lui offre, mais il reconstruit et s' efforce de montrer par cette présentation modifiée et améliorée quel est le sens réel de ce qu' on racontait imparfaitement auparavant" (Composition Littéraire 355). Woodbury concluded his analysis of the mythological tradition behind N.7 by suggesting that Pindar was "the interpreter of myths that are given rather than invented" (Neoptolemos 133); cf Hubbard, Pegasus' Bridle 32.
57 Below, pp.402-8; ch.7.
58 Hubbard, Cooking 3, 13; below, pp.409-28.
of Phokos by Peleus and Telamon, still suggests that murder, a
traditional detail; and N.7, in which Neoptolemos is eulogized,
still allusively suggests his brutal killing of Priam.\(^{59}\)

On the second head. It may be argued that some (but
certainly not all) of the observations made above in fact fit
the notion of paradeigmatic myth, changed to perform its func­tion more efficiently, perfectly. After all, if the myth must
be traditional to be publicly accepted, and yet is adapted to
context, should we not expect the rejected material to crop up
in the new version, to identify it (fraudulently) as the trad­i­tional version? So the motif of petrification in \textit{Iliad} 24.
The new \textit{exemplum} still has the authority of the old.

This is so. But it fails to account for all the evidence.
When in the case of P.3 Young argued as I have outlined above
he was attacking the popular view that such changes as those in
that poem are to the honour of the gods, and are irrelevant to
their poetic or encomiastic context.\(^{60}\) But he also conceded
that the popular view could not simply be gainsaid.\(^{61}\) Is it
just a coincidence that the famous changes in 0.1, P.3 and P.9
all involve the amelioration of the gods' image? Certainly, we
should be reluctant to explain them as reflections of Pindar's
piety;\(^{62}\) a better approach is: "Das mythologische Subjekt wird
von Pindar verändert, wenn das traditionelle Schema seiner

\(^{59}\) Below, p.75ff; 373.
\(^{61}\) "Although Pindar's changes do compliment Apollo in
general..." (3 \textit{Odes} 34); cf Rose, \textit{Paideia} 151.
\(^{62}\) As e.g. Bowra, \textit{Pindar} 61.
Grundkonzeption von den Göttern entgegenstent. For, I shall argue, the corrections involving the gods can be subsumed under a broad umbrella of rationalism, the exclusion of the paralogon. And we see this strategy time and again: men are not invulnerable (Aias, Kyknos) nor immortal (Memnon); and they do not have magic weapons (Peleus, Achilles).

The two propositions on the basis of which I shall examine the Aiakid odes are, then, not simply negative, but represent a valid viewpoint from which to consider the Pindar's mythology. We shall find that we are left with a Pindar, in the Aeginetan odes, whose myths are traditional and rationalized. They are authoritative. If we may draw solely from the Aiakid odes a broad conclusion which covers all of his epinicians, it is simply stated: a critic's perception of innovation is not an open Sesame which discloses Pindar's poetic purpose; for it is likely that the apparent innovation can be more naturally explained by appeal to the mythological tradition.

63 Tonia, Mythen-Interpretation 41; cf de Feo, Aiace 122.
64 Aias: below, 272f; Kyknos: 211; Memnon, 252; Peleus: 116f; Achilles: 201.
65 Nagy, Pindar's Homer; and for a single example, Hubbard, Pegasus' Bridle 28-32.
66 I believe we may - though the Aeginetan odes are sui generis (Hamilton, Epinikion 41f). But see 443f below. I am not suggesting that there is no paradeigmatic myth in Pindar. The Paeans lie outside my scope (as do, sadly, the attractive slogans of fr. 169).
Aiakos was the child of Zeus and the Asopid Aegina; and was, according to Pausanias, the only king whose memory could be cherished by the Aeginetans - for none of his sons remained on the island. But, although Pindar frequently uses his name to refer to his descendants, or his kingdom, he plays a part in only two mythical episodes described in the epinicians.

In 8.8, before naming the victor, the Aeginetan Deinias, Pindar focuses briefly on Aiakos:

\[\text{ἐξαλατευ δ' υίος οἰνώνας βασιλεύς χειρί καὶ βουλαίς ἄριστος. πολλά μυὶ πολ- λοί λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν.}\
\[\text{ἀβοατὶ γὰρ ἄρων ἄωτοι περινειητᾶντων ἕθελον χείνου γε πείθεοθ' ἀναξίας ἐκόντες, o' τε κρανασίς ἐν Ἀθήναιου ἄρμοζον στρατόν, o' τ' ἀνδ' Σπάρται Πελοπηνόδαι.}\

(N.8.7-12)

We must first consider the surprising appearance of Athens and Sparta here. It is implausible that this reflects any mythical datum, and rather more likely that these two states have intruded from the realities of fifth century politics.

1 N.8.6f; I.8.16-23. Paus.2.29.2.

2 cf Bowra, Pindar 412. Carey (Nemean 8 39 n.18) compares Eur. Herakles 476ff:

\[\text{ἐγὼ δὲ νύ-plane ἴκροδιηναξόμην κηδὴν ουκάσωον' ἔκ τ' Ἀθηναίων χθονὸς Σπάρτης τε θηβῶν θ', ὡς ἀνημένωι κάλως πρωμηχαίοις βίου ἔχοιτ' εὐδαίμονα.}
This seems confirmed by the use of the word οτρατός for the Athenians, which in this specifically non-martial context suggests their fifth century democracy. But these observations do not entail the conclusion that the mythical material of 9-12 is to be interpreted as an allegory of contemporary events. And so Köhnken successfully explains the particular mention of Athens and Sparta: "für 'die mächtigsten Griechenstämmen' setzt Pindar die beiden Hauptmächte seiner Zeit."5

But he does not consider to what episode the lines do refer. This is a nice question, for the lines seem to sit unhappily with the obvious mythical candidate for the object of the allusion, the Panhellenic drought, which ended after Aiakos prayed to Zeus for rain. And so Carey sees an equivocal exaggeration of the story of the drought. This is broadly right, although the exaggeration is rather less than he suggests.

First, πολλὰ μὲν πολλοὶ λιτάνευσον ιδεῖν need not refer to more than one occasion.7 πολλὰ need not be πολλάκις here, but

---

3 Bury ad loc.; cf λάβρος οτρατός (P.2.87).
4 Rose, Paideia 148; Mullen, Pindar and Athens 449, cf 486f. The allegorical approach is exemplified by Farnell, who dates the poem to shortly before Aegina's annexation by Athens in 458 (cf 13f), arguing that these lines are "an appeal to the powers of Greece to deal considerately with her" (Works 2.303; cf Podlecki, Athens and Aegina 410).
5 Köhnken, Funktion 21.
6 Although he implicitly accepts that they describe a traditional episode when he writes: "Der erste Teil (1-18) gilt der Aiakidentradition (Zeus - Aegina: Aiakos), in welcher der aktuelle Sieg steht" (Funktion 36).
7 As, recently, Race Pindaric Encomium 147, takes it.
may simply be "greatly". The imperfect alone does not warrant understanding that it was their habit. Now only ἰδεῖν does not quite fit with the depiction of the embassy of Greeks to Aiakos on the Aiakeion in Aegina, as given, for example, by Pausanias:

ἐπειραγομένοι δὲ εἴσοι κατὰ τὴν ἔσοδον οἱ παρὰ Αἰακῶν ποτὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σταλέυτες, αἰτίαν δὲ τὴν αὐτῆς Ἀλκιβιάδης καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ λέγουσιν: αὖχμος τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπὶ χρόνου ἐπίεζε καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἐκτὸς Ἰαδοῦ χώραν οὕτε Πελοποννησίων ὅν ὁ θεός, ἐς ὡς ἐς Δελφοὺς ἀπέστειλαν ἐρωτομένους τὸ αἰτίον ἡ τι εἰς καὶ αἰτήσοντας ἡμῷ λύσιν τοῦ κακοῦ. τούτοις ἡ Πυθία ἐπὶ Δία ἠλακάσθαι, χρῆμα δὲ, εἴπερ ὑπακούσει σφίσιν, Αἰακὸν τὸν ἴκετεύσατα εἶναι. οὕτως Αἰακὸς δεησομένους ἀποστέλλουσιν ὡς ἐκάστης πόλεως καὶ δὲ μὲν τῷ Πανελλήνιῳ διὶ θύσας καὶ εὑρέμμενος τὴν Ἑλλάδα γῆν ἐποίησεν ἔσοδαί, τῶν ἡ ἐλάχιστων ὡς αὐτῶν εἰκόνας ταύτας ἐποίησαντο οἱ Ἀλκιβιάδης.

(Paus.2.29.7f)

So the embassy had to supplicate Aiakos to act on their behalf – and this is so in all accounts. Now, Pindar's language

8 Donaldson ad loc. Slater gives this meaning only for 0.2.8. But it must be right at N.5.31f also:

πολλὰ γὰρ μιᾷ παντὶ θυμῷ

παρφαμένα λιτανεύειν.

The logic of the situation here suggests that Hippolyta is pleading passionately, and not often (see too below, p.88). LSJ s.v. πολὺς IIIa notes that this adverbial use is especially applied to earnest commands or entreaties; we note λιτανεύω at N.5.32 and 8.8; cf 0.6.79. Any idea of repetition in either passage should be restricted to the earnest repetition of an entreaty, on a single occasion.

9 B. L. Gildersleeve, "Studies in Pindaric Syntax. 3 - Aorist and Imperfect", AJP 4 (1883), 158-63; Braswell on P. 4.114 (a).

10 Rather than that all the Greek leaders gathered together and chose Aiakos as the most likely to succeed with their prayer to Zeus. So:
simply suggests that they also had to plead for an audience first – and this might very easily have been part of the traditional story.

The major difficulty with this interpretation is that 9-12, describing the Greeks’ compliant obedience to Aiakos’ orders, must at least elaborate upon the previous statement of their prayers to him. But there seems to be no place for behests made by Aiakos in the drought story; and so Pindar seems to be exaggerating the old story almost out of all recognition.  

A solution appears in Isocrates’ report on the success of the embassy to Aiakos:

\[
\text{συνελθόντας τοῦς Ἑλλήνας καθιστεύσας τὸν Αἰακὸν...} \quad \text{(Isoc.9.14)}
\]

This temple is plainly the temple of Panhellenic Zeus, which Pausanias describes:

\[
\text{ὑλῆσθαι πρὸς τῶν πόλεων ἱερέας} \quad \text{(Isoc.9.14)}
\]  

Cf Σ.Ν.5.17b: συνελθόντας τοὺς Ἑλλήνας καθιστεύσαι τὸν Αἰακὸν... 13f, though syntactically discrete (on transitional asyndeton, see Dissen (1830) 1.279) must also suggest the supplication of the ambassadors (see Silk, Interaction § 52).

11 Slater, *Lexicon* s.v. γάρ.

12 Carey, *Nemean* 8 29: "Aiakos’ only act of Panhellenic authority, the prayer to Zeus during the drought, is here magnified, with careful loss of focus, to a virtual elective monarchy over the whole of Hellas"; cf Norwood, *Pindar* 260 n.27.
Pausanias' shorthand description of the foundation is not at odds with Isocrates' aetiology of the temple. The obvious reconstruction of the story is that the Greeks promised a temple if the drought was lifted. When this is melded with the known detail that Aiakos had to be supplicated to intercede on the part of all Greece, it is equally attractive to see the construction of the temple as the condition of his intercession. He told the Greeks to build the temple of Panhellenic Zeus; and they readily agreed, knowing that it would mean the end of the drought.

This is, I think, the command referred to at N.8.9-12, although dressed up in language "at once august and vague", which redounds to Aiakos' credit. For a similar deception, compare the misleading genealogy at P.4.176, with Braswell's note (a). Though his language is strained, and might be thought suggestive of something more than what it actually means, Pindar remains within the bounds of the traditional story.

The scholiast glossed ἀβωστὶ as ἀμαχὴτι; Dissen rendered as non vocati. The former makes better sense of the adverb itself, and of the context: the word describes the obedience of

---

13 On the cult, see Müller, Aeginetorum 14-19. Clem.Alex. Stron. 6.3.28.5 confirms that Aiakos did pray from the peak.

14 The phrase is Norwood's, describing ἀναστὰς - which occurs nowhere else in this sense (Pindar 151); cf Carey Nemean 8 29. ἀβωστὶ is a hapax.

15 Σ.Ν.8.14a; Dissen is followed by LSJ.
the Greeks, not their arrival. It certainly emphasizes the obedience of the Greeks to Aiakos: they did what he told them, without taking up arms in protest. Köhnken points out that, in the case of a ruler, the willing obedience of his subjects is an encomiastic motif.

I conclude that the lines refer only to Aiakos’ prayer to Zeus to relieve Greece of the drought. I suspect that they reflect the Aeginetan aetiology - also given by Isocrates - of the temple of Panhellenic Zeus. Certainly, the language generously colours Aiakos’ traditional role; but no more: it does not invent a new story of an elective monarchy over all Greece.

16 Carey compares πενθοσας at N. 9. 34, and points out the emphatic position (Nemean 8 39 n. 16).

17 It may also contrast with a story of a war behind the drought - perhaps an Athenian version (Müller, Aegineticorum 20f; Carnes, Autochthony 39f). Diodorus explains the drought as the result of Minos’ curse against the Athenians, uttered as he warred on them in revenge for his murdered son Androgeos. The curse was lifted from the rest of Greece by Aiakos, and from Athens by the institution of the tribute for the Minotaur (Diod. Sic. 4. 61. 1-3). Apollodorus ascribes the drought to the murder by Pelops of the Arcadian king Stymphalos, whilst at war. Pelops failed to bury the body, and so the drought.

One cannot but note, without committing oneself to a historico-political interpretation, that the peaceful collaboration of all Greeks would have contrasted piquantly with the actualities of fifth century Greece.

18 Funktion 21. An excellent example is Menelaos’ autoencomium in the Helen:

πλείστον γὰρ οἴμαι - καὶ τόδ᾽ οὐ κόμπω λέγω -
στράτευμα κάπη διόρισαι Τροίαν ἐπι,
τύραννος οὐδὲν πρὸς βίαν στρατηλάτων,
ἐχοῦσι δ’ ἄρεξ Ἐλλάδος νεανίσις.

(Eur. Helen 393-96)
There is no other extant record of Aiakos settling a dispute among gods. It seems, then, either that Pindar is here using a story obscure enough to leave no other trace but this (Aeginetan legend, perhaps?), or that he has invented this detail. But if it is an invention, no critical interpretation has yet offered a convincing explanation for it. Further, the brevity and baldness of the narration here - δικαίας ἔπειρανε - suggests that it is an allusion, which demands illumination from outside the text. If that is so, it

---

1 But Snell conjectures a similar allusion at Pae.6.155f:

Ζημὺ Συρίν Στυρὸς ὄρχεν ἔξ ἀβ-

[νοι δύμοσαντα φρενὸς] δικάς

This is endorsed by Thummer (2.133); but is plainly a speculative reconstruction.

2 Following the second possibility, Farnell suggests that the story suggested itself to Pindar on the model of the Areopagus court trying Poseidon's charge against Ares (Works 2.379; cf 1.214 n.1), which is rather far-fetched. To be fair, the story would only be an extension of Aiakos' role as aarbiter of human disputes - a role suggested by χαί (cf Paus.1.39.6; Carey, 5 Dem 193).

3 Carey suggests that it emphasizes the "civil and military" virtues of the Aiakids (Pindarica 30); more elaborately, the passage has been seen as the first instance of the canon of four virtues (A. North, "Pindar, Isthmian 8.24-28", AJP 69 (1948), 304-308) - but the vocabulary is not quite right. In either case, this unknown anecdote is no more effective than, say, the known story of Aiakos' role as judge in the underworld (e.g. at Plato Apology 41a; Gorgias 523e; Isoc.9.15).
cannot be Pindar’s invention. But the other alternative, the appeal to local tradition, is, on its own, flaccid.

Hubbard slashed through this impasse by arguing that the lines are not an allusion to another story, but point forward to the myth of 1.8: Aiakos solves the dispute between Zeus and Poseidon by having sired Peleus. The existence of a suitable hero for Thetis is down to Aiakos; "it is in this sense that Aiakos can be said to be the one ultimately responsible for the gods’ selection of Peleus as a solution to their problem." Hubbard notes that the father is often credited with the success of his son (cf 1-5), and draws attention to the vague and grandiloquent phrase δίκας ἐπείρασε ("he provided an end to their disputes"); and the μὲν solitariun at 24, with its "quasi-connective, progressive force". If Hubbard’s explanation is right, then 23f is effectively the beginning of the

---

4 Hubbard, Aiakos 7 (and on one of his problem cases, Molyneux, Herakles 305f).
5 As North, op. cit. 306, demonstrates: "We do not know the circumstance in which these judgements were delivered, but at least it is clear that Aiakos at some time won renown for settling a dispute among the gods." Commentators have been rightly reluctant to disappear down this avenue. Cf Wilamowitz, Pindaros 197; Fehr, Mythen 42f.
6 Hubbard, Aiakos 6-10; 9. In fact, Carnes had sketched this solution (Autochthony 80f); and before him, Thummer had almost hit upon it, by arguing that the lines foreshadow the dispute between the two gods (2.133); but his line is spoiled by his reduction of that story to "Lob der Heimat des Siegers" (2.126; cf 134), and his comment that 25f "raßt gut in das Epinikion Pindars".
7 Aiakos 7f. For the mention of the father, Thummer 1.49-54. The absence of a parallel for δίκας ἐπείρασε led West to emend to ἐπέρασε (cf Bacch.13.45; Eur. Hæld.143); he felt little compunction to retain ἐπείρασε, which is itself an emendation for the unmetrical ἐπέρασε ("Melica", CQ 20 (1970), 205-15, here 212). But Triclinius’ correction is slight enough to evade suspicion. For μὲν solitariun, Denniston, GP 360f.
myth - which is then, typically, introduced by a relative pronoun, and also begun at the moment in time of its conclusion. In fact, we may go further and see here a kephalaion ring. The kephalaion is δια μισόν κάτω δίκας, which is then explained by the narrative of 24-46. Finally, the kephalaion is restated in different terms (46f); and some further narrative of Achilles' deeds added (49-60).

Hubbard's explanation of these lines seems right. Little can be added. We note that, like N.8.8-12, line 24 is explicable not by appeal to a mythological fabrication, but to the violent distortion of language to describe a known episode. Its proper comprehension depends on the audience's reluctance


9 It is a "knappe Inhaltszusammenfassung zu Beginn der eigentlichen Erzählung" (Illig, Erzählung 20); cf Hamilton, Epinikion 68 n.5; 57, 61-5. Slater, Lyric Narrative 119 with n.7, notes the similarity of the kephalaion ring to his own Ring Composition, which focuses on the temporality of the story.

10 Compare to Hamilton's paradigmatic description: "the kephalaion (A), usually introduced by a relative pronoun (16 out of the 22 occurrences), is followed by a unit of varying length in which the actions leading up to the opening statement are narrated or the kephalaion is explained (B). Then the result of these actions is given again, with perhaps some further narration, but never in precisely the same terms as in (A) (A1)" (Epinikion 57). This fits neatly. Hamilton does not identify I.8 as a kephalaion ring myth (59, 45f); see instead Greengard, Structure 33f.

11 Although it is slightly contaminated by his comments on the main mythical material of I.8, with which I do not agree. He sees the quarrel of Zeus and Poseidon as Pindar's invention; and so 23f, too, is a novelty. I shall argue that the myth of I.8 is not an invention; and so neither is 23f.
to invent an otherwise unknown referent for it. That reluctance naturally complements my hypothesis of Pindar’s habitual mythological conservatism.

**Aiakos and the Walls of Troy**

It is well known from the *Iliad* that the walls of Troy were built by Apollo and Poseidon. In 0.8, Pindar describes an incident which took place upon the completion of the wall, and concentrates on the role for Aiakos,

> τὸν παῖς δὲ Λατοῦς ἐφρυμέδων τε Ποσειδάν,
> Ἰλίῳ μέλλουτες ἐπὶ στέφανον τεῦ—
> ἐμι, καλέσαντο συνεργῶν
> τεῖχεος, ἢν ἦτο μὲν πεπρωμένων
> ὀρυμένων πολέμων

35 πτολιπόθης ἐν μάχαις
> λάβρου ἀμπελεόσια κατιόν,
> γιακωτε ἔδε δράκοντες, ἐπεὶ κτίσθη μέον,
> πύργον ἐχαλλόμενοι τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ δύο μὲν κάπετον,
> αὔτε δ᾿ ἀτυχόμενοι ψυχᾶς βάλον,

40 εἰς δ᾿ ἐνόρουσε βοάσαις.
> ἐνυπε τοῦ ἀντίου ὀρμαίνων τέρας εὐθὺς Ἀπόλλωνι:
> "Πέργαμος αὕτη τεαίς,
> ἢρως, χερὸς ἐργασίας ἀλίσκεται:
> ὑς ἐμοί φάσμα λέγει Κρονίδα
> πεμφθέν βαρυγυδόπου Διός,

45 οὕς ἄτερ πάλαμίνι ἀκεθεν, ἀλλ᾿ ἢμα πρῶτοις ἀνεξαί
> καὶ τερτάτοις." ὡς ἦρα θεὸς σάφα εἰπαίς
> εἶται Σάμου ἦπειγεν.

(0.8.31-47)

45 ῥάξεται Wilamowitz 46 τερτάτοις Ahrens: τετράτοις MSS

Apollo’s prophecy clearly refers to the exploits of Aiakids at Troy – a glorious battle ground for Telamon, Aias, Achilles and

---

1 e.g. 7.452f.
Neoptolemos. But, despite Pindar's assurance that the god had spoken clearly, the details are obscure — and further complicated by textual uncertainty.

First, then, to establish the exact drift of the *tera* and prophecy.

The last Aiakid generation must be that of Neoptolemos, whose presence, as we shall see, is necessary for the city's final sack, and who distinguishes himself by killing Eurypylus, son of Telephos, and Priam himself.

The snakes cannot represent generations of Aiakids. For Telamon successfully attacked Troy, as a member of Herakles' expedition, and in fact was the first to break in. His generation might be omitted from the *tera*, or shown successfully attacking the city; but not shown failing.

If we read Ahrens' ΤΕΡΑΤΟΤΟΙ, the failure of two snakes and the success of the third cannot be mirrored by the second part of Apollo's prophecy, which involves two generations of successful Aiakids, the first and the third (Telamon and Neoptolemos), and only one unsuccessful (Achilles).

If, on the other hand, we retain ΤΕΡΑΤΟΤΟΙ, and have Aiakos and Neoptolemos as the first and fourth generation, working together to produce one sack, then the snake which succeeds might be Neoptolemos, and those which fail, Aias and Achilles. But then the description of the snakes falling back

---

2 As Beattie, *Olympian* 8, argues.

3 Hubbard *Aiakos* 17 n.33.

4 H. L. Ahrens, "Coniecturae Pindaricae", *Philologus* 16 (1860), 52-9, here 52.

5 Σ.0.8.51, 52a, 53e; Farnell *Works* 1.45; Hill, *Olympian* 8. That Aiakos was the first of his generations was argued by
in death (39) seems neither decorous nor particularly to the point. 6

So the prophecy of 45f cannot simply be a reading of the teras of 37-40. The three snakes are not Aiakids, but each demonstrates the efficacy of the work of one the three builders. Two show where the wall is impregnable, and the third, where it may be broken. 7 Apollo first reads this teras to Aiakos (42); and then gives the extra information of the time and personnel of the capture. 8

No certainty is possible in the counting of 45f. 9 If we retain the MS reading of τετράτοις, 45f must refer to Aiakos and Neoptolemos. But there is no satisfactory verb, with Πέργομος as the subject, which can accommodate both of the very different roles that they perform: Troy was built by Aiakos,

---

6 Beattie, Olympian 8 2. Robbins, The Broken Wall 319f, attempts to prove it by comparison with P.4.47f, arguing that Medea includes the parents in τετράτων παιδῶν πατρὸς ἐπιγεινομένων / ἀμαύ; but I cannot follow his calculations, which must in any case be bedevilled by the question of whether ἀμαύ introduces another generation. Pace Borthwick, Zoologica 203 n.29, the problem is not simply a matter of inclusive counting, but whether the addressee father can be counted as one of παιδῶν ἀμαύ. For the idea of collaboration cf also Huxley, Pindar’s Vision 27f.

7 Gildersleeve saw the difficulty of applying ἄμαυομένῳ to Aias and Achilles, whilst still applying it; cf Robbins, The Broken Wall 318. For the propriety, Hubbard Aiakos 19.

8 Σ.0.8.49b, 52b above, 53b; Boeckh on 31-52; Robbins The Broken Wall 318; Hubbard Aiakos 18 with n.34. We note too, that even if the failing snakes are seen as Achilles and Aias, the logic of the situation, the explanation of Aiakos’ involvement (33ff) and ἀμαύ (42) all suggest that Aiakos is building a vulnerable point in the wall. It is possible to argue that this is not the main point of the teras, but perverse.

9 Robbins The Broken Wall 320.

9 Farnell concluded that there is simply an arithmetical slip here (Works 2.64).
but destroyed by Neoptolemos. Carey keeps ἄρεταται and translates "will begin with the first and (end) with the fourth"; but this, as he concedes, is awkward. Further, it seems to me improbable that Telamon should be entirely forgotten. If, on the other hand, we accept Ahrens' correction, τερτάτοις, the two generations are Telamon's and Neoptolemos'. Both sacked Troy, so there is no need to find an ambiguous verb. But τερτάτοις is otherwise unexampled; it is an invented Aeolic form. Nevertheless, τερτάτοις makes much the best sense of the prophecy, and I would read it.

The τέρας and prophecy of 0.8, then, are separate from each other. The former shows that the wall may be broken where it is Aiakos' mortal workmanship - that it has a weak spot, and Aiakos knows where this is. Apollo's prophecy adds that it will be Aiakos' descendants, in the first and third generations, who will break it.

10 Beattie (Olympian 8); and on his own ἄρεταται, see Hill, Olympian 8 4. ἄρεταται (Jurenka, "Analecta Pindarica", WS 17 (1895), 197-203, here 199f) is safest (Carey, Prosopographica 4 n.17). Wilamowitz' ἄρεταται (Pindaros 404 n.3; cf Hill Olympian 8 2 n.2) is attractive (von der Mühll, Weitere Notizen 52f); but still does not answer the problem: even if Aiakos did introduce mortal workmanship into the wall, could he be said to have overthrown it?

11 Carey, Prosopographica 4 n.17.

12 Hill Olympian 8 3. There is no good reason for an Aeolic-Thessalian form here (pace von der Mühll, Weitere Notizen 51). Hubbard Aiakos 18 n.35 is the best attempt to defend it on linguistic grounds.

13 The scholiast kept the best sense for the prophecy, and for τετράτοις, by changing from an exclusive (πρώτοις = Telamon) to an inclusive (τετράτοις = Neoptolemos) count (Σ.Ο.8.59, 60, now followed by Race, Style and Rhetoric 151f); but this is a desperate measure.
On this myth, the A Scholiast records:

That Didymus did not know of an earlier source for the story is reliable testimony to the fact that it did not exist in the Greek literature extant in the Augustan age. The implication, it has been argued, is that the story is Pindar's invention.

But, first, no-one has yet offered a convincing integrated interpretation of the gain won by the invention. Robbins sees the myth as paradigmatic of cooperation: Aiakos and Neoptolemos combine to take Troy, and Zeus and Apollo combine to show the future. This emphasis on cooperation in the myth is matched by the emphasis on the trainer in the rest of the poem. But the obvious Aiakid paradigm for the pupil is Achilles. Aiakos is neither pupil of the gods nor teacher of Neoptolemos. Hubbard sees the context as the "intergenerational reflection of glory", in which the laudandus figures both as the distant

---

14 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 276f.

15 Hubbard, Aiakos 17-22; Carey, Prosopographica 5f; cf Robbins, The Broken Wall 317; Fehr, Mythen 61; Pini, Correzioni 373.

16 Robbins, The Broken Wall 319f; Zeus provides the portent, which Apollo interprets with interest - he gives when the wall will be breached.

17 As at N.3.57ff.
descendant of Aiakos and the winner of a victory which belongs to "the whole family, through his training and the values that the elders have instilled in him, even as Telamon's and Neoptolemos' conquests of Troy were prepared in advance by Aiakos' labours." To give this myth a paradigmatic import, beyond exemplifying Pindar's habitual use of an Aiakid myth on the occasion of an Aeginetan victory, Hubbard refers to "the values that his elders have instilled in him" as the parallel for Aiakos' assistance to Neoptolemos. But there is no warrant for this in the text; indeed, the communication between the generations in Alkimedon's family all goes the other way: the boy victor gladdens his grandfather (70) and the dead Iphion and Kallimachos (81ff). Finally, Carey identifies three links between myth and victory, of which the most important is the "destiny which takes generations to come to fulfillment". But the generation gap which features in the victor's family seems to be that of grandfather to grandson (70f), which might have been exemplified by the known legends of the exploits of Peleus and Telamon and Neoptolemos and Teukros. The introduction of Aiakos, the great-grandfather, mars this parallelism.

If the story is not Pindar's invention, then the obvious explanation for Didymus' ignorance of it is that it was a local Aeginetan story, which failed to leave a trace in the

---

18 Aiakos 21f; cf Huxley, Pindar's Vision 27f.
19 Prosopographica 6.
20 Carey's counter-arguments to this objection do not convince (Prosopographica 6 n.26).
On this line, Carey writes: "No argument is offered for this belief, which appears to rest on a disinclination to credit Pindar with invention on this scale." An argument could be offered if one could find traces of Pindar's story elsewhere. I now consider whether there is any evidence in the traditions about Troy which does confirm these data of a weak spot in the wall and the necessity of an Aiakid, who knows about it, to storm the city.

At first, there seems little possibility of other evidence for a weak spot. The couplet of Euphorion quoted by Didymus seems to look only towards Pindar. Elsewhere, the assistance of a mortal is not mentioned in the context of other descriptions of the supernatural building of the wall. Commenting on his work, Poseidon rules out a weak spot: he built a wall round the city ἐθρυ τε καὶ μάλα καλῶν, ἐν δρηταῖς πόλισ εἶ (Il.21.446f). This seems borne out by the fact that the city is everywhere captured through the device of the Wooden Horse - which seems to be a device specifically designed to circumvent an unbreakable wall.

21 So Boeckh on 31-52; Van der Kolff Quaeritur 30f; von der Muhl, Weitere Notizen 54.
22 Prosopographica 5 n.19.
23 Fr. 54 Powell: ἡ γὰρ δὴ θοῖβος τε Ποσειδῶν τ' ἐκάλεσσαν Αλακών, οὐκ ἄβοηθε περὶ κρήνεμα δέμοντες.
24 For a survey, see Von der Muhl, Weitere Notizen 53f.
But there is, nonetheless, some evidence for the existence of a weak spot. The most important piece is Andromache's exhortation to Hektor in *Iliad* 6:

> λαὸν δὲ στῆσον παρ' ἔρινεόν, ἐνθα μάλιστα ἄμβατός ἐστι πόλις καὶ ἐπιτρόπον ἔπλετο τεῖχος. τρὶς γὰρ τῇ γ' ἐλάφωτες ἐπειρήσανθ' οἱ ἀριστοὶ ἄμφ' Αἴαντε δύο καὶ ἀγαλματί 'Ἰδωμενέα ἦδ' ἄμφ' Ἀτρέιδας καὶ Τυθέους ἄλκημον υἱόν. ἥ ποὺ τὶς αἰφνὶ ἐκμετάθει θεοπροπίων ἐν εἰδώς, ἥ νῦ καὶ αὐτῶν δυμὸς ἐποτρύνει καὶ ἀνώγει.

(*Iliad* 6:433-439)

These lines troubled Aristarchus, who athetized them,

> ὅτι ἄνοιξεν οἱ λόγοι τῇ Ἀνδρομάχῃ ἀντιστρατηγεῖ γὰρ τῷ Ἐκτορί. καὶ ἰοῦδος περιεχομεν' οὐ γὰρ παρέδωκεν εὐπιτρόπον τὸ τεῖχος κατὰ τούτο τὸ μέρος, οὐδ' οὕτως ἐστιν ἔλεγον ἢ μάχη τοῦ τείχους. καὶ δ' Ἐκτωρ πρὸς τὰ πρῶτα ἀπαντῶν ἱερὰ ἔγων: ἢ χαλέμοι τάδε πάντα.

(*Σ. Aris t on. Iliad 6:433-9)*

Because they raise matters not dealt with in the *Iliad*, these lines do not fit neatly into context. No neoanalytic argument satisfactorily explains them,* and so we must explain what is gained by their inclusion.*

---

26 This is not necessarily second-hand Aristarchus. Van der Valk, *Text and Scholia* 1.558 (on Σ.II.12.175-80), shows that Aristonicus, while following Aristarchus' obelizations, did not necessarily reproduce his reasoning. Maybe the lines were simply missing from some texts which Aristarchus respected.

27 *pace* Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* 56. The model of the putative Meleagris, on which he argues that this part of the *Iliad* is based, accommodates only the fact of the attacks; Meleagros' Kalydon was similarly hard pressed (*Iliad* 10.588). But there is nothing about a weak spot.

28 For a survey, see Bolling, *Athetized Lines* 99-101; Van der Valk, "Homer's Nationalistic Attitude" *Ant. Class.* 22 (1953), 5-26, here 21) suggests that Homer is stressing the critical situation in which Troy finds herself; Willcock, *Kirk ad loc.*: "it is a competently composed and interesting suggestion in
A sensible suggestion is that the passage refers to an episode elsewhere in the Cycle. Leaf (ad loc.) suggests that the fighting referred to is the attack on the city described in the Cypria (Chrest.153f).

Equally, Andromache's concern for the weak spot in the wall may look forward to the eventual breaking of the wall. What is important here is that the use of the device of the Wooden Horse in no way precludes the existence of a vulnerable point in the wall. For the sources often state that the Trojans knock down some part of the wall to enable the horse's entrance.

Further, if they do have to demolish part of the wall to let the horse in, they will naturally choose that part which affords an easy approach and easy dismantlement: ἢπα μᾶλιτα ἀμβοτός ἑστὶ πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος (II.6.433f). Andromache's words in fact specifically look forward to the entrance of the Horse. For the easy access to the vulnerable point is unimportant if the wall is to be stormed, but crucial if the Horse is to be dragged in.

As e.g. Hubbard: "The story of the Trojan Horse seems to obviate this difficulty [the breaching of divine handiwork] by providing a way for Troy to be penetrated without actual destruction of the wall" (Aiakos 20).

Knight, Vergil's Troy 115. Little Iliad: οἱ δὲ Τρῳς... τον δοῦρευον ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν πόλιν εἰσδέχοντο, διελέπτες μέρος τι τοῦ τεῖχους (Chrest.233ff); Stesichorus' Iliupersis, perhaps: PMG S 88 col.ii 6, with Davies, Stesichorus 612f; Aeneid: dividimus muros et moenia pandimus urbis (2.234); Dio Chrys. Or.11.123: καὶ τῶν πυλῶν οὐ δεχομένων, μέρος τι τοῦ τεῖχους καθελὼν.
And so this difficult passage in *Iliad* 6 may have been included by an interpolator to point to the entry of the Wooden Horse as it appears to have been described in the *Little Iliad*, in which the Trojans tear down part of their wall to admit it. Its motivation should be explained on the model of the picture of the orphaned Astyanax (6.432), which they follow, and the subsequent anticipation of the fall of Troy by Hektor (6.447ff). It hints at the impending fall of the city. Hence the difficulty in the immediate context - Hektor does not notice what Andromache suggests - and in the context of the *Iliad* - the fig tree in the wrong place; the otherwise unknown stormable point; the three previous attacks by the Achaeans, not mentioned in our *Iliad*. The passage seems to be an early interpolation by an editor of the Cycle, intended to generate some irony.

This hypothesis explains the curious tension between 433f - ἐνθα μᾶλλα / ἄμβατος ἔστι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος - and the possible reasons for the attack on this spot - ἥ ποὺ τῆς ὁπίν ἑνισθε θεοπροπίων ἐν εἰδῶς, / ἥ νῦ καὶ οὕτων θυμὸς ἐπιτρύνει καὶ ἀνύψει (438f). The wall is weak in an obvious fashion; but that does not relate to the possibility that the Achaeans have been guided to the point by a soothsayer. 438f is only explicable by appeal to the fact that the wall will be broken there, whether announced by an oracle about which Andromache knows, fearing that the Achaeans have witnessed a similar

---

31 The misplacement of the fig tree is still a problem. Kirk ad loc. argues that the fig tree moves around anyway; but 11.166ff and 22.145ff both at least have it out on the plain. It is not an important point. What is important is that the interpolator’s motivation has been explained.
oracle, or announced by an oracle about which Andromache does not know.\footnote{II.6.433-9, then, gives evidence of a spot in the wall of Troy revealed as weak by an oracle. That is what happens in the myth of 0.8.}

Even in this short Iliadic passage, we see the overdetermination of the point where the wall will be broken. This is symptomatic of the complexity of the tradition about the sack. Even the familiar elements do not quite meld together: both the treachery of Sinon and the Wooden Horse are devices whereby a force may be admitted to the city other than by a frontal attack.\footnote{The version of the fall of Troy even in the Cycle was a conflation of traditions which featured different devices to circumvent the city walls.} The irony of the fictional characters guessing at the existence of an oracle which turns out in fact to exist when Nestor, speaking of Achilles, suggests that Patroklos could go out to fight if

\begin{quote}
τινά ἐφεσίν ἢν θεοπροσήπην ἀλείπει
καὶ τινά αἱ πάρ Ζηνὸς ἑπέφραξε πόλυνα μῆτις.
\end{quote}

(II.11.794f)

In neither case is the guess exactly right.

\footnote{Dares Phryg. 40 actually does only have Sinon, and omits the horse; cf Dict. Cret. 5.11, whose horse is solid - so producing a gap in the wall through which the Greeks may stroll that night (5.12). Sinon is usually reduced to lighting beacons for the Greeks (e.g. Iliupersis: Chrest.252f); although at Aen.2.258f he unbolts the Horse to enable the others to get out, having seen a beacon from the fleet (cf 6.518f, where Helen sends the signal). See Robert, Heldensage 1244, 1252-4; Immisch in Roscher s.v. Laocoon 4.939f. Burkert suggests that the Horse is, ultimately, a scapegoat (S&H 61f); Sinon certainly is. So they cannot act together, because they are playing the same role.}
muros (Aen.2.237f). This naturally refers to it being "heaved over broken walls" (Conington). But later the horse is taken in through the Skaian Gate, which must be enlarged.34 So Servius explains the muros of 237 as superpositos Scaeae portae. Perhaps the threshold on which the horse pauses in the Aeneid (2.242f) is not metaphorical; and then the ascent of the walls might be an ascent of the ramp outside the walls.35

On this model, the place of easy access necessary for the entrance of the Horse has simply become a gate - where access will, of course, be easiest.36

Two other data may tie up with this. First, Hektor specifically mentions the gate as the place of Achilles' death, when he tells Achilles of the day

δεις καὶ Πάρις καὶ θυρίδας Ἀπόλλων έσαθλὼν ἔόυτ' ἀλεσμαίνει ἔνι Ξαλίττι πύλησιν.

(Il.22.359f)

And Apollodorus confirms that Achilles, διώκεσθαι τις καὶ τοὺς Τρόιας πρὸς τοὺς Ξαλίττις πύλας τοξεύεται ὧπο τὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος (Ep.5.3). Proclus describes Achilles εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτοκράτειν (Chrest.191f). Now, Pindar explicitly describes Apollo's intervention here as saving Troy: Ἰλίου δὲ δὴ θηκεῖν ἀνατρέψαι ἀλλοι (Pae.6.81f); equally Achilles ἔπραξεν, εἰ μὴ φύλασσεν Ἀπόλλωνος (Pae.6.91). Achilles would have sacked the city; and he would have entered it through the entrance

34 Knight, Vergil's Troy 112-131, especially 118, 131.
36 In the Odyssey, the Horse seems to be brought in and then discussed, which suggests no demolition, and thus entrance through the gate (8.504ff; cf Davies, Epic Cycle 74, suggesting that this was the version of the Iliupersis; Bethe DuS 2.253).
later used by the Horse, when the city was sacked.

Secondly, a tradition that Laomedon was buried in the wall over the Skaian gate gives another explanation of its importance:

nam novimus integro sepulcro Laomedonti s, quod super portam Scaeam fuerat, tuta fuisse fata Troiana.

(Serv. ad Aen. 2.241)

The burial of the founder over the gate plainly must have had defensive symbolic significance; but exact parallels are impossible to find. Best is the story of the Babylonian queen Nītokris:

Darius finally disturbs the tomb both for the money and to übbe euneca, ὅτι ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς οἱ ἐγκυντο διεξελᾶνοντι (1.187.4), but only to find the body and an inscription chiding him for his unscrupulous greed. This story seems to me a conflation of motifs of the burial of treasure with the dead and

37 Similarly, there are three fata of Troy in Plautus' Bacchides: tertium quom portae Phrygiae limen superum scind—eretur (955). Cf Quint. Smyrn. 1.801f: the Trojans set about burying Penthesilea:

ἂνυμένοι τάρχυσαν ἐδύμητον περὶ τεῦχος τόργῳ ἐπὶ προδόχουτι παρ' ὀστέα Λαομέδουντος.

38 Barsby on Bacchides loc. cit. cites Paus. 5.4.4, which is not to the point.
that of the burial of the founder of a city over the gate.  

And so the Horse could be represented as going through the gate and disturbing Laomedon’s tomb. Hence the importance of the enlargement of the gate; once his body has been disturbed, the protection which it provided through the long siege disappears.

Finally, Herodotus furnishes comparative evidence for the existence of a weak spot. The siege of Sardis by Cyrus offers a neatly over-determined example. The wall over a difficult rock face was left unguarded, because of the perceived impossibility of climbing up. It had also been left without supernatural protection, for the same reason: a prophecy had guaranteed that Sardis would not be captured if a lion was carried around the walls; and this the king, Meles, did — but omitted the wall over the cliff (Hdt.1.84.2f). Cyrus’ men climbed the unassailable cliff. Cyrus’ capture of Babylon is

39 For the first, see How and Wells ad loc.; for Nitokris’ building work, Hdt.1.185f. The second is suggested by the parallel between Nitokris’ and Laomedon’s burial, and between the stories of the fall of Babylon to Darius and of Troy to the Greeks. Babylon revolted, and was impervious to a siege of nineteen months (Hdt. 3.152.1). Zopyros, a Persian nobleman, mutilated himself by cutting off his nose and ears, and had himself whipped (3.154.2). He then gave himself up to the Babylonians, posing as a deserter who had been maltreated by Darius for suggesting that the siege was hopeless, and offering intimate knowledge of Darius’ plans (3.156). He won the Babylonians’ confidence by leading three victorious sallies against lightly-armed Persian forces, stationed as sitting ducks by Darius (3.157). When he was in a position of power, he opened two of the town gates to Darius’ men, who poured in to take the city. Finally, Darius τὸ τεῖχος περιέλθη καὶ τὰς πύλας πόλος ἀποκράτησε (3.159.1). The similarity with the story of Sinon and the fall of Troy is plain.

40 Knight, Vergil’s Troy 131.

41 Servius ad Aen.2.241 — the horse pausing on the threshold: tanta fuerat vis consecratiionis in porta Troiana ut etiam post profanationem ab ingressu hostes vetaret. nam novimus...
similar. In these stories of Cyrus' campaigns, old enough to incorporate mythical and folkloric motifs, the technique of capturing a stubborn and apparently impregnable besieged town is the exploitation of an overlooked vulnerable point.

The story of a weak spot in the walls of Troy is, then, both mythologically plausible, and also evidenced by Il.6.433ff. Even in narratives where a frontal attack on the city has been supplanted by the device of the Horse, the Trojans may break down part of the wall to bring it in.

I turn to the second element in the myth of O.8, the necessity of an Aiakid. Explicit evidence is extant, but late and faint:

λογίον δὲ ἐς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἐμπεσόντος, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλῳ τῷ ἀλώτῳ ἐπυκτῷ ἡ Τροία πλὴν τοὺς Αἰακίδας.

(Philostr. Jun. Imag.1b.3)

The natural inference is that Neoptolemos is brought to Troy qua Aiakid. He replaces Achilles:

ὡς οὖ θέμις γίνοιτ', ἐπεὶ κατέφθιτο πατήρ ἐμὸς, τὰ πέργαμ' ἄλλων ἢ μ' ἔλειψ.  

(Soph. Philoct.346f)

42 Hdt.1.190f.
43 "Archaic man always reckons with probabilities of this kind" (Van der Valk, Text and Scholia 2.417). The folktale motif is that of the Unique Exception. Achilles’ heel is a neat example, especially appropriate here; he was wearing armour made by a god.
44 Serv. ad Aen.2.13: one of the fata was such ut de Aeaci gente aliquis interesset, unde Pyrrhus admodum puer ductus ad bellum est.
45 On the various versions of the fata of Troy in the Philoctetes, see A. R. de Elvira, "Filoctetes y Neoptolemo", Cuadernos de Filología Clásica 16 (1980), 9-15. Every conceivable combination of Neoptolemos, Philoktetes and Philoktetes' bow and arrows can be evidenced by the play (1055-60; 604-13, 841; 1334f (cf 604-610, 1338-41); 1434f; 68f, 113-15; 345-47).
Everywhere, of course, he arrives only after Achilles’ death.  

Secondly, when Achilles petulantly decides to go home, he advises the other Achaeans to follow him:

\[\text{καὶ δὲν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἔγὼ παραμυθοᾶμαιν οὐκαδὴ ἀποπλέειν, ἐπεὶ οὐχέτι δὴτε τέχνωρ Ἰλίου αἰτευτῶς μάλα γὰρ ἔδειν εὐρύσα εὐρύς ἀέτω ἔπερεσχε, τεθαροῦσαν δὲ λαοὶ.}\ 

(II.9.417-20)

This all makes sense without the necessity of an Aiakid for the fall of Troy. But the lines follow Achilles' revelation of his choice of a brilliant career or an undistinguished old age - a prophecy which never quite sits happily in the plot of the Iliad. Perhaps the lines are a reminiscence of the possibility that Achilles' departure would have meant the failure of the whole expedition.

We have seen that Achilles is on the point of storming Troy through the Skaian Gate when Apollo kills him, so postponing Troy's fall.

Finally, Telamon's importance in the sack of Troy with Herakles is highly suggestive:

\[\text{πυργοκράφου λέγει τὸν Τελαμώνα τὸν πορθόμαντα τὴν Ῥώμην. Ἰστορεῖ γὰρ Ἑλλάνικος (FGrH 4 F 109) ὅτι}\]

46 On the fact that he arrives after Ajax' death also, see below. One might also attribute the timing of Neoptolemos' arrival to the deep mythological equivalence of Achilles and his son, which makes it impossible that they appear together (for this equivalence, see Fontenrose, Pyrrhos 207-209; some of his twenty-one similarites are convincing, but perhaps better explained on a neoanalytical model - which is another reason for their separation). It is also artistically impossible that they should be together: the topos of Neoptolemos' succeeding and emulating his father became by the time of Philostratus a cliché (Hubbard, Aiakos 204 with nn.34, 37). All these three explanations function on a different level to the hypothesis that traditionally an Aiakid was necessary at Troy, and are not incompatible with it.

47 cf Griffin, Uniqueness 48.
Earliest testimony to Telamon’s pre-eminence on the expedition is Pisander, writing at the end of the seventh century:

Telamon’s priority over Herakles is surprising; and that he was first through the wall by virtue of being an Aiakid is an attractive hypothesis.

48 Apollodorus tells much the same story, but the altar is to Herakles Kallinikos (2.6.4). Diodorus (4.32.5) agrees that Telamon was first to breach the walls:

If Herakles is attacking the strongest part, then Telamon must have been attacking a weaker part; perhaps, the weakest part—in other words, the weak spot: Robert, Heldensage 554 n.1.

49 Test. 1 B = EGF T 1 puts him in the middle of that century (cf Huxley, CEP 100–2); but Wilamowitz argues that he cannot predate the sixth (Herakles 1.66 n.121). He is so frequently cited as the originator of Heraklean motifs (e.g. the canon of twelve labours (test.2 B = EGF T 2); the lionskin (fr.1 B = EGF F 1)) that he belongs, I think, as early as caution allows.

50 Telamon’s aristeia is confirmed by Sophocles (Ajax 434–6) and Isocrates (9.16).
It certainly makes sense of what would be otherwise a series of coincidences. Elsewhere, Telamon's prize is not an aleison, but Hesione.\textsuperscript{51} Teukros, reacting to the important charges of bastardy in the Ajax, explains his parentage:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ἐκ πατρός μὲν ἐμὶ Τελαμώνος γεγός, δότις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτα ἀριστεύοις ἐμὴν ἱκεῖ ξύνευμον μητέρα, ἡ φύσει μὲν ἕμι βασίλεια, Λαομέδουντος ἔχοντον δὲ ὑμνὸν δόραμ' ἓκεινης 'Αλκμήνης γόνος.}
\end{quote}

(Soph. Ajax 1299-1303)

But in the Iliad, Aias and Teukros appear to be whole brothers, ἀδειγμήτως.\textsuperscript{52} This ties in with the Iliadic conception of the earlier sack as a much smaller affair: it was Herakles, boasts Tlepolemos,

\begin{quote}
\textit{ός ποτε δεύτερ' ἔλευθ' ἑνεχ' ἵππων λαομέδουντος ἔξ οἰκής σώμα νησία καὶ ἀνδράσι παυροτέροις Ἰλίου ἐξελάπαξε πόλιν...}
\end{quote}

(II.5.640-42)\textsuperscript{53}

And this in turn ties in with the fact that in Homer Telamonian Aias is not an Aiakid. He is never Ἀιακίδης; nor is there any mention of kinship with Achilles.\textsuperscript{54} Pindar gives the first...

\textsuperscript{51} She is both the king’s daughter and the rescued maiden (Apoll. 2.5.9).

\textsuperscript{52} e.g. 12.371, with Σ. But at 8.264; Agamemnon remarks to Teukros that Telamon ὑπὸν ἔργα πέρ ἔσοντα χαμόοοτα. But the line was athetised by Aristarchus and omitted by Zenodotus: it does not make much sense in its context of a speech of encouragement to Teukros. ἀδειγμήτως is used of Hektor and Polydoros at 20.419, although they are elsewhere of different mothers (21.91).

\textsuperscript{53} Contrast e.g. ὃς μὲν τιμέες φαίνει, μανμιλιαὶ ἀντωπαῖς ἂντωπα ἀγαθεία, ὃς δὲ Ὀμήρος γέγραφεν, ἔς ταῖς ἀπάδας (Diod.4.32.2).

\textsuperscript{54} cf e.g. Hes. Theog.1003ff, which mentions only Phokos and Peleus as Aiakos’ sons; Pherec. FGrH 3 F 60.
explicit statement of his membership of the Aeginetan family; he is a late acquisition from neighbouring Salamis.  

And so, when Telamon was not an Aiakid, he did not accompany Herakles to Troy. When he is an Aiakid, he does, and breaches the walls. By the time of Pisander, he has been introduced to Herakles' expedition to figure as the Aiakid known to be necessary for the sack.

Telamon's distant cousin, Epeios, cuts a similar figure. He is the carpenter who makes the Wooden Horse. He is not in the Iliad a conspicuous figure, until the funeral games of Patroklos, where his importance anticipates his role later in the cycle. As the Horse is not mentioned in the Iliad, nor is Epeios' role as its maker, nor his ability as a carpenter.

---


56 There are a very few traces of Peleus' participation in Herakles' expedition along with Telamon:

57 II.Parv. fr.8 B = EGF F 10.

58 At II.23.664-99 he wins the boxing easily; but he apologizes for his lack of prowess in battle at 669f, and is laughably
It is usually accepted that he was an Aiakid, through Phokos. Homer makes him the son of Panopeus (II.23.665); Pausanias, while outlining the Aiakid family tree, records his full genealogy:

On this genealogy, Epeios is an Aiakid of the same generation as Neoptolemos. But Robbins objects to the almost universal assumption that Pindar is including Epeios in his prophecy in 0.8. For this genealogy is simply confusing the Aeginetan Phokos with the eponymous hero of Phokis. The confusion is clearly shown by Paus. 2.29, in which the sons of the Aeginetan Phokos are said to have settled in what was already called Phokis after the son of Ornytion, who had lived there earlier.

incompetent at throwing the weight at 839f; cf Simmias fr.25 Powell. He is, according to Willcock, "decidedly unheroic"; his strongest apologist is R. G. Austin, "Vergil and the Wooden Horse", JRS 49 (1959), 16-25, here 17 ("that remarkable all-rounder"); and on Aen.2.264. R. L. Howland, "Epeius, Carpenter and Athlete", PCPS 183 (1954-5), 15f, attempts to argue that Epeios' depiction in the Iliad is both artistic and to his credit. Cf Davies, The Epic Cycle 68.

59 e.g. Gildersleeve 196f.
60 cf [Hes.] fr.58.7ff; Σ.Ευρ.Ωρ.33.
61 The Broken Wall 318 n.6; cf Carey, Prosopographica 4 n.17.
62 cf Paus.2.4.3; Σ.ΙΙ.2.517. Cf RE s.v. Phokos 497f. Robbins also argues that if Epeios is a bona fide Aiakid, he is suspiciously absent from the Aeginetan odes. This does not go very far; there is not much Teukros, either (only N.4.46); and
Plainly, at some stage there is confusion between two heroes who share the same name. But it seems that they were originally the same character. When the Aiakid family removed from central Greece to Aegina, Phokos bifurcated into a Phocian and an Aeginetan instantiation. The genealogy recorded by Pausanias in fact reunites these two parts. So his grandson, Epeios, the maker of the Wooden Horse, is another Aiakid linked to the fall of Troy.

We have seen, then, that Telamon is first through the wall of Troy on Herakles' expedition; that, in some accounts Peleus is also on that expedition; that Achilles is only prevented from storming the city by the intervention of Apollo; that Neoptolemos must, after the death of his father, be brought to Troy to act the part of an Aiakid; and that Epeios is the maker of the Horse.

It must be that Aiakids alone can storm Troy. The myth of 0.8 provides a reason. Aiakos' involvement in the building of the walls makes the necessity of one of his descendants for the sack dramatically decorous. The other two of the three fata of Troy - the Palladium and Herakles' bow - are decorous in this way.

The evidence seems to suggest the slow erosion of the story of the weak spot by the dominance of the story of the Wooden Horse. On this model, the story reproduced by Pindar in

Epeios' role and reputation was less glamorous than his. Austin, op. cit. 17, makes as much of it as is possible.

West, Hesiodic Catalogue 163f; cf his note on Theog.1004.

Parke, Bones 159. The palladium was a heaven-sent endorsement of the foundation of the city, and Herakles' bow had already been used in its successful capture.
0.8 represents the early form of the story. Only Aiakos knows the weak point on the wall; and he passes the secret on to his descendants. So Telamon is able to pre-empt Herakles over the wall in the first siege of Troy. But the story of the Wooden Horse, in which the impregnable city is taken not through a loophole in its defences, but by guile, becomes the dominant tradition. Initially, it assimilates certain features of the story of the weak spot: its builder is made an Aiakid; it is dragged through the crucial point in the walls; and Neoptolemos, as we shall see, is first out of it. But a weak spot is no longer necessary for the dynamics of the story; and so the Horse, as is natural, goes in through the gate (although there may still be some pathetic dismantling, and the gate retains some magical importance).

The story of the necessity of an Aiakid is, however, maintained by those for whom it is important - the Aeginetans, who cherish the Aiakids. For this we have not only the testimony of Pindar, but also the suggestive evidence of the pedimental sculpture of the temple of Aphaia on Aegina, dated to the end of the sixth century, or the beginning of the fifth. The west pediment showed, it seems, Aias in action during the Iliadic expedition; the east, Telamon, during the Heraklean.  

Further light may be shed on the disappearance of the 0.8 myth by an examination of the story of Laokoon. For it seems plausible that the story of Aiakos helping build the walls of Troy was effaced, ultimately, by the pressure of this story also.

65 Welter, Aegina 64-90, in particular, 90; Podlecki, Athens and Aegina 405-8; LIMC 5.1 no.2792; Carnes, Autochthony ch.2.3.
At the base of the confused Laokoon tradition appear to lie two stories - neither of which is the version familiar from Vergil. First, the appearance of the snakes is an omen of the fall of Troy. After the Horse is in the city, in the midst of the celebrations around it,

\[
\text{Δύο δράκοντες ἐπιφανέντες τὸν τε Λαοκώντα καὶ τὸν ἄτερον τῶν παῖδων διαφανέρωσαν. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τέρατι διαφορίσαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Λινεάν ὀπειξήθηκαν εἰς τὴν Ἰδη.}
\]

(Iliupersis: Chrest. 248-51)

The attack of the two snakes is explicitly a sign of the city’s fall. But the version in Hyginus does not link Laokoon’s death with the fall of Troy, but makes it the result of an offence against Apollo:

Laocoon Ἄκοετις φίλιος Ανχίσας φράτερ Ἀπολλίνος sacerdos contra voluntatem Apollinis cum uxorem duxisset atque liberos procreasset, sorte ductus ut sacrum faceret Neptuno ad litus. Apollo occasione data a Tenedo per fluctus maris dracones misit duos qui filios eius Antiphantem et Thymbraeum necarent, quibus Laocoön cum auxilium ferre vellet ipsum quoque nuxum necaverunt.

(Hyginus fab. 135)

Robert argues that there is a good deal of Aeneid 2 in this, contaminating another story, of which the bones are:

---

66 Robert, Bild und Lied Excurs 1 (192-212) is a good analysis; but cf Pearson 2.38ff.

67 Robert interprets it in detail: Laokoon’s death represents the fall of the city; that of his elder son the death of Priam, son of Ilos, the eldest son of Tros. The survival of the younger son represents the survival of Aeneas — descendants of Assarakos, the younger son of Tros (Bild und Lied 193). This is perhaps too neat (Davies, Epic Cycle 74f). Cf Knox, The Serpent 382-84.
Laocoon Capyos filius Anchisae frater Apollinis sacerdos contra voluntatem Apollinis cum uxorem duxisset atque liberos procreasset, Apollo occasione data dracones misit duos, qui filios eius Antiphantem et Thymbraeum necarent. 68

Now, another reason for Apollo's displeasure is given by Servius ad Aen. 2.201: ante simulacrum numinis cum Antipoa uxore sua coeundo. Rose ingeniously explains the difference by arguing that Hyginus' contra voluntatem Apollinis is a mis-translation of the Greek ἐναυτίον τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπαιδευόμενον. Servius' note on 2.201 does, indeed, begin Laocoön ut Euphorion dicit... 69

Whether Servius' note, or Hyginus, reproduces Euphorion is not of the first importance here. For it would seem that Bacchylides also used either this story, or at least a version on which this story impinged:

Sane Bacchylides de Laocoonte et uxore eius vel de serpentibus a Calydnis insulis venientibus atque in homines conversis dicit.

(Bacch. fr.9)

Bacchylides' mention of Laokoon's wife must have been prompted, at some remove, by the existence of the story of sexual misconduct. 70

68 Bild und Lied 194ff. The most telling reminiscence of the Aeneid is the paraphrase of 201 - Laocoön, duc tus Neptuno sorte sacerdos; but there are also echoes of 216f, 229ff, and the shared detail that the snakes come from Tenedos (203). On the emendation Capyos, see below, p.50.

69 Rose Hyginus 99f. Scholars have been suspicious of Servius' citation of Euphorion, arguing that his authority may only be adduced for the first part of Servius' note - the detail that when the Greeks arrived, Neptune's priest was killed (so e.g. Knight, Vergil's Troy 89f).

70 Although it also adds a touch of Bacchylidean pathos. Sophocles' Laocoön would appear to have included Laokoon's death as a teras of the fall of the city, and prompt to Aeneas
This explicit statement that the snakes metamorphosed into men is implicitly supported by the curious detail of the snakes’ names, which Servius ad Aen. 2.204 (Soph.fr. 372 P) claimed Sophocles gave in his Laocoön. Tzetzes gives their names: Πόρκις καὶ Χαρίβδοι δυόματα δραχώντων οί πλεύσασι τινὶ τῶν Καλλιδών νήσων ήλθον εἰς Τροίαν καὶ διέφθειραν τοὺς παῖδας Λαοκόωντός ἐν τῷ τοῦ θυμβραίον Ἀπόλλωνος νεῖ.  
(S. Lyc. Alex. 347) 71

But whether the metamorphosis belongs in the version of the omen or that of the punishment is at present impossible to say. The Bacchylides fragment, mentioning Laocoon’s wife, and the precision of ἐν τῷ τοῦ θυμβραίον Ἀπόλλωνος νεῖ — the scene of the crime, and so a decorous place of punishment — would

(fr. 373 R); and also Laocoon’s offence against Apollo (Robert, Bild und Lied 197; but see Pearson 2.40f for a more cautious interpretation of the evidence).

71 cf Serv. ad Aen. 2.211, who cites the Alexandrian Lysimachus as authority for the names Curifis and Periboea — a curious corruption. Robert argued from πλεύσασι that, as snakes could not sail, men must have changed into snakes rather than vice versa (Bild und Lied 198f). But the Lycophron scholium would seem to be connected with the description of the event in Apollodorus:

Ἀπόλλων δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐπιπέμπει· δύο γὰρ δράκωντες διανυσάμενοι διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐκ τῶν πλησίου τῶν νῆσων τοὺς Λαοκόωντος νυός κατεσθίουσιν.  
(Apoll. Ep. 5.18)

This would seem to settle that if there was any metamorphosis, it must have been the other way (so Roscher s.v. Laocoön 2.1840ff).
suggest the latter. 72 But the source of the snakes - Calydnae or Tenedos - suggests the omen of the fall of the city: there the Greek fleet anchored overnight. 73

Now, the manuscript of Hyginus gives Laokoon's father as an unknown Acoetes. Given that Hyginus also makes him Anchises' brother, the easy correction is to Capyos - the Iliadic Kapys. 74 But this produces an unpleasant difficulty of generation: Laokoon is a father, Anchises a famously decrepit grandfather. 75 Now, there is an alternative genealogy for Laokoon given by Tzetzes on Lycophron Alex.347, where he is Antenor's son; 76 but this does not solve the problem of his fraternity with Anchises. 77

So Robert suggests that, as Hyginus' version has nothing to do with the sack of Troy, it may be set a generation back in time to before the Trojan War; and so Laokoon and Anchises might be brothers. 78 Now, Hyginus' version is plainly causally related to the story of the omen given in the Iliupersis - the two stories are versions of a basic story of snakes attacking Laokoon and his sons - and so it is natural to consider whether

72 On the last point, Robert, Bild und Lied 197.
73 cf Austin on Aen.2.203.
74 Robert, Bild und Lied 194 n.3; he is Anchises' father at e.g. 11.20.239.
75 Laokoon's vigour: Austin on Aen.2.40-56; Anchises' decrepitude: Soph. fr.373 R.
76 Two of Antenor's sons in the Iliad are Ków (11.248) and Λαόδοξος (4.87).
77 As Rose, who prefers Antenoris in his Hyginus concedes.
78 Bild und Lied 201.
the story of the omen might also have originally been set not
during, but long before, the sack.

If it were, then the entry of the snakes would represent
the breach of the wall; the *teras* would indicate the entry of
the Wooden Horse. Two considerations support this. First, the
Wooden Horse is commonly described as a snake. It is most
famously in *Aeneid* 2, where the similarity is part of the
"dominant, obsessive metaphor" which shows the attack of the
Greeks as the onset of a serpent. And so the Horse, like
Laokoon’s snakes, *inlabitur urbi*, despite the fact that it is
being jolted along.\(^79\) This might be explained simply as a
Vergilian, rather than as a traditional feature.\(^80\) But Pro-
pertius also uses the image: Cassandra

\[
\text{sola Parim Phrygiae fatum componere, sola}
\text{fallacem patriae *serpere* dixit equum.}
\]

(Prop.3.13.63f)

Vergil had almost ignored Cassandra (she appears at 2.246f);
and so it is unlikely that Propertius is using him as his
source.\(^81\) But even earlier, Aeschylus described the Horse as
the *'Apyeινον δάχος* (Ag.824). This must be a punning reference
to a snake: *δάχος* is used by Aeschylus only of snakes or

\(^79\) 240; cf 225-7 of the snakes, and 235f of the horse. Knox,
*The Serpent passim* and 384-87.

\(^80\) Knox points out that *Georgics* 3 is the source for some of the
snake descriptions in *Aen.* 2: 416f: 136, 683; 421: 381; 426,
437, 439: 473-5 (*The Serpent 399*).

\(^81\) R. G. Austin, "Vergil and the Wooden Horse", *JRS* 49 (1959),
16-25, here 18; cf Knox, *The Serpent* 386. Propertius 2 is
dated to 22 B.C.; but whether he knew *Aeneid* 2 by then is im-
possible to settle by appeal to their dates of publication.
creatures in some way serpentine, and an ἄργυς is a kind of snake. 82

Further, Apollodorus’ description of the sally out of the Horse is significant: καὶ πρῶτος μὲν Ἐχίων Πορθέως ἁπαλλόμενος ἀπέθετο (Eρ.5.20). Echion, Snake, son of Sacker, is elsewhere unknown, but he sits happily with the idea of the Horse as the fulfillment of the teras of the snakes. 83

The second consideration which supports the theory that the omen of the snakes foretells the entry of the Horse is the business of metamorphosis. Commentators have shied from explaining this feature. 84 But the entry of the snakes which change into men foreshadows the serpentine entry of the Horse which then disgorges the Achaean warriors. The Horse is a snake made men.

This reconstruction of a version of the Laokoon story is plainly broadly similar to the 0.8 story. The Laokoon story is set before the siege. Snakes breach the wall and change into men, representing the point of entry of the Horse, and, in riddling fashion, the device of the Horse itself.

Three observations confirm that this broad similarity is important. First is acknowledgement of the curiously human vocabulary with which Pindar describes his snakes: ἅπαλλομενοι;

82 Borthwick, Trojan Leap 22f with n.29.
83 I return to Echion below, p.54.
84 Pearson 2.39f ("it seems impossible"); Austin, op. cit. 20.
Both jumping words are difficult of snakes; but only the shout has excited comment. The easiest explanation for them is that they conceal a metamorphosis into men. The vocabulary accommodates the traditional metamorphosis, but Pindar, typically, does not explicitly use this magical and folkloric feature.

Some faint corroboration is found in the only good parallel for βοάω of a snake. In Aeschylus' Septem, Eteokles is told how Tydeus waits in front of a gate of Thebes:

Τυδεύς δὲ μοργὺν καὶ μάχης λελιμένος
μεσομβρινοὶς κλαγγαίσιν ὡς βράχων βοᾷ.
(Septem 380f)

Quite what the relation between the two passages might be, we cannot tell. But the similarity of context - the snakelike warrior shouting as he attacks a city - indicates some relation. Snakes can only shout when they are in fact warriors.

The second observation which suggests a relation between the O.β. and Laokoon stories follows smoothly. The most spectacular comparison of snake and warrior is Vergil's:

Vestibulum ante ipsum primoque in limine Pyrrhus
exsultat telis et luce coruscus aëna;
qualis ubi in lucem coluber mala gramina pastus...
(Aen.2.469-471)

85 cf the scholiast's paraphrase: βουλομένου εἰσελθεῖν
(Σ.Ο.8.50).

86 e.g. Gildersleeve ad loc.: "Mythical serpents may make mythical outcry".

87 cf e.g. Pindar's treatment of heroes' invulnerability and immortality: Kyknos' (below, p.211), Memnon's (p.252), or Aias' (p.272f); Grant, Folklore 33f; 103-105.
Neoptolemos is the distillation of the serpent metaphor of *Aeneid* 2. His attack on Priam recalls the snakes' rush on Laokoon's children (552: 214f); both seal the fate of Troy (241ff: 554ff). Again, the metaphor would seem to be Vergilian, but that it is used by Lycophron: Neoptolemos is a Σκύριος δράκων (185); a δεινὸς ἀρταμος δράκων (327).

Further, it has been elegantly shown that Apollodorus' Echion was originally Neoptolemos. The scholiast on Hephaestion *Enchiridion* names him as first out of the Horse. Now, Vergil has Machaon first out (2.263), which is in any case odd, and a problem in that he is already dead, killed in the action described in the *Little Iliad* by Eurypylus (*I. Parv.* fr.30 B = EOF F 7). In fact, Machaon, slightly known, has usurped the unknown Echion from his rightful place. [Hippocrates] confirms:

Μαχάων γέ τοι ψυχήν κατέθετο ἐν τῇ Τρώαδι, ὡς οἱ ταῦτα γράφοντες λέγουσι, ἐξ ὕππου ἐς πόλιν τῆν Πριάμου ἔσηλθε.

(Letters 27.50)

This is Apollodorus’ story of Echion told of his substitute. Given that Echion is otherwise unknown, and that Neoptolemos elsewhere is first from the Horse, and known as a snake, it

88 Knox, *The Serpent* 393f.
89 Austin identifies *I.22.93ff*, Nicander *Theriaca* 31ff and *Georgics* 3.425ff as the literary sources of 471ff (ad loc.).
90 Borthwick, *Trojan Leap* 18f.
91 ΣΒ.5.20.4. We recall his eagerness to be out of the Horse at *Od*.11.531f; he is the first to enter it at Quint. Smyrn. 12.314f; Tryph.153; Tzetz. *posthomo* 643.
92 Austin's comment ad loc. that "the surgeon would naturally precede, in case of accidents" serves only to demonstrate that this is a real problem.
seems a reasonable conclusion that he was originally the Echion first from the Horse.  

And so Laokoon's teras foretells not just the arrival of the Horse, but, specifically, that of Neoptolemos.

The third observation which ties the two stories is the involvement of Apollo and Poseidon in both. Poseidon's prominence in the Laokoon story is difficult. Laokoon is usually Apollo's priest; but Vergil makes him Poseidon's. Sophocles had a prayer to Poseidon in his Laocoon (fr. 371 R), suggesting that Laokoon was his priest in that play also. Servius explains:

Laocoon, ut Euphorion dicit, post adventum Graecorum sacerdos Neptuni lapidibus occisus est quia non sacrificiis eorum vetavit adventum. post abscedentibus Graecis, cum vellent sacrificare Neptuno, Laocoon Thymbraei Apollinis sacerdos sorte ductus est, ut solet fieri cum deest sacerdos certus....

(Serv. ad Aen. 2.201)

The double priesthood is an odd detail, which is not exploited in any version of the story. It is tempting to infer that, in some way, it reflects the involvement of both Apollo and Poseidon in the building of the wall.

93 The misidentification "arising from a misunderstanding of, or invention based upon, some Lycophron-style phrase in which he was so described" (Borthwick, Trojan Leap 19). Borthwick suggests, naturally, that Neoptolemos was first out in the Little Iliad. Echion's father, the Sacker, is, of course, Achilles, πτολιμόρθος (e.g. II.8.372). Once Echion becomes a separate person, he must die, because Neoptolemos must still be the first into the city. And so he dies, on the model of Protesilaos, who anticipated Neoptolemos' father onto Trojan soil.

94 cf Hyginus fab.135.
To sum up: one version of the story of Laokoon would appear to be set before the siege of Troy. It involved snakes breaching the wall of Troy, and perhaps even changing into warriors. It foretold the place of entry of the Greeks, the Horse, and Neoptolemos.\textsuperscript{95} We note that it gives a point in the wall which is important, without explaining why it should be that point which will fall rather than any other.

In other words, but for that the witness is Laokoon rather than Aiakos, this is exactly the portent sent by Zeus in 0.8, without the extra interpretation by Apollo. There must be a relation—but what is it? Some might argue that the Laokoon story was prior—even, perhaps, that Pindar used it as the bones for the myth he invents for 0.8. But, quite apart from the hints of the antiquity of the 0.8 story that we have already seen, this model explains neither the detail of the double priesthood, nor the reason for the important spot. Perhaps, then, the causality runs the other way: the Laokoon story sprang from the Aiakos story.

But I suspect that the relation is not a simple one, and that it is impossible to give either strict priority; for they go hand in hand.

The two stories must take place during different generations. The Laokoon story occurs during the generation

\textsuperscript{95} We note how, in the Cycle, it is after Helenos' capture that the Greeks summon Neoptolemos and begin to build the Horse. Perhaps, at some stage in the tradition, it recounted the teras which Laokoon witnessed. Conon has Helenos suggesting the Horse (\textit{FGrH} 26 F 1.XXXIV). But we cannot tell: in this matter, the poet of the \textit{Little Iliad} was "un poète en quelque sorte prisonnier de légendes plus anciennes... il a accumulé un peu pêle-mêle les nombreuses traditions sur la prise de la Troie" (Severyns, CE 333).
Before the Trojan War: he is brother, and thus roughly contemporaneous, to Anchises, whose son Aeneas fights in the Trojan War. But Aiakos is grandfather to heroes who fight in the Trojan War.

Now, a teras is entirely appropriate when the wall is newly finished (0.8.37). At what point in the next generation is one again appropriate, for Laokoon to witness? Perhaps, during a sacrifice marking the rebuilding of the wall rebuilt after Telamon has breached it, and after the defeat of the city, during Herakles' expedition. Perhaps the double priesthood points to a sacrifice to the two gods who, it is hoped, are now no longer angry at Laomedon's failure to pay them for their construction work.96

On this model, the two stories are two complementary episodes in the saga of Troy. After Herakles' attack, the Trojans may feel that the first omen has been fulfilled and that their city is now safe - but the second omen will cut away their optimism.

If this is so, the virtual disappearance of both stories is understandable. Troy through the ages is not a focus for epic. Each story is much the weaker without the other. So both stories are eroded. The Laokoon story is incorporated into the period covered by the Cycle - and changes accordingly. The Aiakos story evanesces, leaving only traces - in particular, the pre-eminence of Aiakids at Troy, but also, suggestions of a weak spot in the city wall. Only the

96 Servius' note on Aen.2.201 continues: alii dicunt quod post contemptum semel a Laomedonte Neptunum certus eius sacerdos apud Troiam non fuit.
Aeginetans, for whom it is important, preserve it: it emphasizes the excellence of their forebears, the Aiakids. This local tradition, otherwise unknown to Didymus, Pindar faithfully reflects back at his audience.
Aiakos fathered three sons: Phokos, Peleus, and Telamon.

Phokos' mother was the Nereid Psamatheia:

\[ \text{Aiakos } \varepsilon \nu \varphi \text{ιλότητη } \delta \nu \chi \nu \rho \sigma \epsilon \eta \nu \ \text{Ἀφροδίτην...} \]

(Hes. Theog. 1004f)

Pindar encapsulates the circumstances of his birth, writing of

\[ \text{βία } \zeta \chi \omega \nu \ \kappa \rho \varepsilon \rho \eta \upsilon \tau \zeta \varsigma, \]

\[ \delta \ \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \ \theta \varepsilon \nu, \ \delta \nu \ \varphi \sigma \mu \alpha \theta \epsilon \varphi \iota \varsigma \ \tau \dot{i} \kappa \zeta \tau \ \varepsilon \pi \iota \ \rho \eta \gamma \mu \iota \nu \iota \varsigma \ \pi \omicron \upsilon \tau \zeta \upsilon. \]

(N.5.12f)

Detail is added from a Euripidean scholium:

\[ \mu \gamma \nu \nu \tau \iota \ \text{Aiakos } \varphi \sigma \mu \alpha \theta \epsilon \iota \ \tau \dot{i} \varsigma \ \text{Νηρέως } \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \ \zeta \chi \omega \nu \ \eta \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \ \delta \iota \ \tau \dot{\omicron} \ \text{βούλευθαι } \sigma \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \tau \iota \nu \ \sigma \tau \dot{\omicron} \ \kappa \iota \varsigma \ \text{και } \ \tau \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \alpha \iota \ \eta \varsigma \ \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \iota \varsigma \ \pi \alpha \iota \delta \alpha \ \tau \dot{i} \varsigma \ \zeta \chi \omega \nu. \]

(Σ.Eur. Andro. 687)

Psamatheia bore Phokos on a beach because she had turned into a seal in an attempt to evade Aiakos' advances; hence Phokos' name, Seal. Like her sister Thetis, Psamatheia attempts to evade her mortal suitor through metamorphosis; and, as perhaps Thetis does, in early versions of her story, bears her son on the beach, during a brief visit to land from the deep. The crisp allusiveness of Pindar's τίκτη ἐπὶ βημαίην πόντου indicates that the story was known to Pindar's first audience.

---

1 cf Apoll. 3.12.6; West on Theogony 1004.
2 On similar stories, see Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 63-9.
3 See Séchan, Les Noces 678-81.
4 Arguing from the similarity of Σ.Eur. Andro. 687 and Apoll. 3.12.6, Schwartz suggests that Phokos' birth and death featured in the Hesiodic Catalogue, as his marriage did (fr.58.7ff) (Ps-Hesiodelia 391 n.3).
allusion anchors Phokos in a known body of folkloric legend; speculation about its contribution to the poem’s maritime imagery seems to me redundant.

Peleus and Telamon, on the other hand, are  Ἐνδείκτικος ἀνθρώπως μόρι (N.5.12). Endeis is daughter either of the Centaur Chiron, or of Skiron, the Megarian bandit killed by Theseus. Plutarch describes how the Megarians argued, using this latter genealogy, which linked, via Endeis, their hero Skiron with the renowned and upright Aiakids, that he must have been of good character (Theseus 10). Wickersham dates this version to the years following the Solonian crisis over Megara. Then Chiron would have a prior claim on Endeis; and this seems confirmed by his association with the Aiakids from the earliest times (e.g. Il.11.831f). His kinship with the family seems the best explanation for this.

Pindar does not explicitly consider the matter of Endeis’ father; but the scholiast thought that the description of the Aiakids as δὲ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἡρώως αἰχματάς φυτευθέντας

---

5 It is plainly a folkloric story: Stith Thompson, Motif Index B.601.18; cf Grant, Folklore 44.
6 e.g. Bury, Nemeans 61, Finley, Pindar and Aeschylus 141, cf 46-9.
8 Wickersham, Myth and Identity 18-20.
9 Myth and Identity 20f.
10 Severyns, CE 235f; March, Creative Poet 26. Further, we shall see that his particular roles as mentor to Peleus and tutor to Achilles are explicable by the particular relation in which he stands to them.
καὶ ἄπαν Χρονίδων (N.5.7) must trace Endeis' descent through Chiron, son of Kronos. So, the Aiakids are heroes sprung from Endeis, grand-daughter of Kronos, and Aiakos, son of Zeus; and from the Nereids, Thetis and Psamatheia. I suspect that this is right, given that Endeis appears a few lines later (12), along with Psamatheia (13) and Thetis (25, cf 36).12

The Death of Phokos

The first mythological episode featuring the Aiakids of this generation is the murder, by his half-brothers, of Phokos. Pindar shies away from describing it:

τὰν [sc. Aegina] ποτ' εὔσαρχαν τε καὶ οὐσικλυτῶν
θόσοντο, πάρ' βωμὸν πατέρας 'Ελλανίου
σταύτες, πίτυν πτ' εἰς αἰθέρα χείρας δύμας
'Ενδαίδος ἄργυρωτας υἱόι
καὶ βία δίωκον χρέουτος,
δ' τὰς θεοὺς, ἐν Ψαμάθειᾳ τίκτ' ἐπὶ βηγμένι πόντου.
αἰσθόμαι μέγα εἰπεῖν
ἐν δίκαι τε μὴ κεκυνθυμεμένου,
πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νάαοιν,
καὶ τις ἄνθρακς ἁλκίμους
δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώμας ἑλασεν.
στάσομαι.
(N.5.9-16)

The story to which these lines allude is explained by the scholiast:

φασὶ γὰρ Πηλέα καὶ Τελαμώνα ἐν γυμνασίοις
ἀνελόματα δίκων, τὸν μὲν δίκως τύπαντα, τὸν Πηλέα,

11 Σ.Ν.5.12.

12 cf Robbins, Nereids 31 with n.24, who also emphasizes the importance of distaff genealogy in this ode.
This story was told in the *Alcmæonid:*

...δ τήν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα πεποιήσας ήρθον περὶ τοῦ

Φῶκου:

ἐνθα μὲν ἀντίθεος Τελαμῶν τροχειδέως δίσκῳ

κλίθης κάρη, Πηλεύς δὲ θοῖς ἀνα κεντρα ταυτόσας

ἀξίνης ἕυκάλυχῳ ἐπετελήγει μέσα νύτα.

(*Alcmæonid* EGF F 1 = fr. 1 B)¹

But there were several versions of the murder. Most

sources agree that Phokos died after he had been struck on the

head by a δίσκος.² But there is disagreement over whether both

Peleus and Telamon, or only Peleus, were involved, and whether

the killing was deliberate or accidental.

In general, Peleus is the dominant figure. Often, Telamon

is not even involved:

Τοῦτον [ἐκ Αἰακοῦ] δ' ἐγένοντο νῦν Πηλεύς καὶ

Τελαμῶν. τούτων δὲ Πηλεύς δίσκῳ βαλὼν ἀπέκτεινεν

ἀκούσιως ζώιον διμοπάτριον ἄδελφών, ἐξ ἄλλης δὲ

μητρὸς γεγενημένου.

(Diod. Sic. 4.72.6)

Where the two brothers explicitly conspire, Peleus is often to

the forefront:

καὶ ἡμῖνα ζώιον Τελαμῶν καὶ Πηλεύς προσηγόντο ἐς

ἀγῶνα πεντάθλου καὶ περιπήθεν ἐς Πηλέα ἀφετιαὶ τοῦ

---

¹ This is quoted by the scholiast on Eur. *Andro.687,* where

Menelaos contrasts the *sophrosune* which he displayed when he
did not kill Helen after the fall of Troy with Peleus’ failure
to control himself when he killed Phokos.

² Everywhere, except Dorotheus *ForH* 289 F 4, and Lactantius

Placidus *ad Statius Theb.*2.113.
Here, Telamon attempts to deny his involvement, but is judged by the judges (2.29.10). Elsewhere, the two brothers each have a part to play, or their joint guilt is specified, but their roles are not. Only in Apollodorus and Plutarch is Telamon alone the murderer; and in the former, he and Peleus are conspirators: Telamon becomes the murderer by drawing the short straw.

Diodorus describes Phokos' death as an accident: Peleus hits Phokos (4.72.6, quoted above). Apollonius Rhodius writes that Phokos was killed (1.92f). Menea's rebuke of Peleus' lack of sophrosune (Eur. Andro. 687) might allude to such thoughtlessness.

Where the killing is deliberate, it is the upshot of jealousy - on the part of Peleus:

...τὸν θίγων δὲν ὅν Πηλεὸς ἀνεῖλεν ἐπιβουλεύσας διὰ τὸ ἐν τούς ἁγωνίας διαφέροντα αὐτὸν εἰναὶ Πηλεῶς καὶ Τελαμώνος...

(S.Eur. Andro.687)

or of his mother Endeis:

tαύτα δὲ ἐκχρίζομεν τῇ μητρί: αὐτοῖ μὲν γὰρ ἐγεγόνοισαν ἔν της Σκίρωνος δυνατρός, δῶκος δὲ οὖν


4 Vian and Delage comment that, in Apollonius (e.g. 2.237, 481) and in Homer (2.237, 481) "est en particulier le propre de la jeunesse": praising Nausicaa's mature poise, Odysseus comments αἰὲ γὰρ τε νεωτέροι ἄφραδεοσυν (Od.7.294) (Argonautiques 1.269).

5 The same motive is given at Apoll.3.12.6.
This slight story contains at least two Aeginetan aetiologies. Phokos' tomb lay near the Aiakeion, surmounted with a λίθος τραχύς (Paus.2.29.9); and this, one may infer from Pausanias, was the stone which Peleus threw to kill Phokos - οὕτως γὰρ ἀντὶ δίσκου φιλίαν ἦν. The second aetiology is for an earthwork in the harbour. After his banishment, Telamon pleaded his innocence.

No less important for Aeginetan mythology is that the story explains the absence from Aegina of Aiakids from the second generation onwards. This is, indeed, the only momentous exploit that the Aiakids performed in their homeland; and hence the density of local references in the story - the tomb, the discus, and the mound in the harbour. If the Aeginetans

---

6 "Multis seculis post Phoci sepulcrum a patre exstructum saxumque in tumulo, quo Peleum pro disco usum esse dictitabant, credulus vidit Pausanias, vidisse se somniabat etiam Chandlerus" (Müller, Aegineticorum 22); Chandler had become confused between the tomb and the earthwork in the harbour (R. Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor and Greece (London, 1817), 174).

7 Figueira, Aegina 189f.

8 cf Parker, Miasma 118f.

9 Σ.Ν.5.25a (above); Fehr, Mythen 47f; Thummer, 1.115f n.102; March, Creative Poet 7 n.32.
are to explain any part of their city by appeal to a widely accepted mythical past, they must turn to Aiakos (the cult of Zeus Panhellenios; the Aiakeion) or to this story.\(^\text{10}\)

It is remarkable that the family so important for the Aeginetans should have so little to do on Aegina. Their almost complete absence from their homeland is explicable by appeal to the Aeginetans’ late claim upon them.\(^\text{11}\) It would appear that Aiakos, Peleus, and Achilles were originally Thessalian characters.\(^\text{12}\) The Myrmidons, whom Achilles leads at Troy, were the people of his Phthia in south-east Thessaly (II.2.683f); the Spercheios, which flows into the Malian Gulf, his local river (II.23.142ff).\(^\text{13}\) Peleus sacks Iolkos, wrestles Thetis on Cape Sepia and marries her on Pelion. Phokos was the eponymous hero of Phokis.\(^\text{14}\) The Myrmidons themselves were made from ants, μύρμηνες, for Aiakos: most sources have them created on Aegina (e.g. [Hes.] fr.205); but Servius ad Aen.4.402 places the incident in Thessaly, in line with their Homeric homeland.\(^\text{15}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Paus.2.29.2:

\[\text{βασιλεύσαντα δὲ ἐν τῇ γῇ πλὴν Αἰακῶν ὀσσέων εἰπεὶν ἐξουσίων. Εἰπεὶ μὴ δὲ τῶν Αἰακῶν παιδῶν τινά ἱκανά καταμείναντα, Πηλεῖ μὲν οὐμῆν καὶ Τελαμώνι ἐπὶ φόνῳ φεύγειν τῇ θάλκου...}

\(^{11}\) I use here West, *Hesiodic Catalogue* 162-4.

\(^{12}\) West, *Greek Poetry* 189-91.

\(^{13}\) On the problems of the positioning of Achilles’ homeland, see Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* 126; Hope Simpson and Lazenby, *Catalogue of Ships* 128f.

\(^{14}\) See above, p.44; West on Theog.1004.

\(^{15}\) See J. S. Carnes, “The Aeginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on Nemean 3.13-16”, *CH* 84.1 (1990), 41-4, here 43f. Steph. Byz. makes Aiakos the founder of the Thessalian town of Dia (s.v.).
Finally, the cult of Zeus Hellenios appears to have been originally a local cult of the Hellenes of central Greece. Once this was settled in Aegina, as the notion of the Hellenes broadened, so did the cult into that of Zeus Panhellenios.

The *Iliad*, then, reveals that the main body of the Aiakids were first located in south Thessaly; and there are traces of this elsewhere. When were they relocated in Aegina? Certainly, before the composition of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, which locates the Myrmidons in Aegina, and notes that they πρῶτοι ζεύγον μέας ἀμφιελίσσας, / πρῶτοι δ' οἱ τέκνα τούτων περά ποιομόρφου (Hes.] fr. 205.6f). This characterizes them solidly as Aeginetans, and not Thessalians. (But note that fr.212 (a) reveals a trace of mainland Aiakids, by making Peleus the brother of Menoitios.)

West dates the final form of the *Catalogue* to the sixth century, giving a rough *terminus ante quem* for the Aiakids' migration. He dates the necessary genealogical revisionism to

---

16 Farnell, *Cults* 1.63; II.2.681-5:

17 Müller, *Aegineticorum* 14-19; Cook, *Zeus* 2.894f n.3; 3.1164f; Farnell, *Cults* 1.63.

18 On Aeginetan maritime prowess, see Figueira, *Aegina* 166-70, especially 169.

19 See West, *Hesiodic Catalogue* 163, 141.

rather before the final stage of the evolution of the Catalogue; that is, to the late seventh century.\(^{21}\)

Telamon's position is more marginal.\(^{22}\) He is mentioned in neither the Iliadic genealogy of Aiakids (II.21.189), nor the Hesiodic:

\[\text{Hesiodic Catalogue loc. cit.}\]

Telamon is, then, a comparatively late member of the family.\(^{23}\)

Indeed, Pindar is the first explicit witness to his membership of the Aiakids; and the roughly contemporary Pherecydes, who spent his life in Athens, gives a non-Aiakid genealogy:

\[\text{Hes. Theog. 1003-7}\]

This may well explain his subsidiary role in the killing of Phokos – see, especially, Diod. Sic. 4.72.6f (quoted above), where, though Phokos' death is explicitly the result of an accidental throw of the discus by his brother Peleus, he too has to go into exile.

\[\text{FGrH 3 F 60 = Apoll.3.12.6}\]

---

\(^{21}\) Hesiodic Catalogue loc. cit.

\(^{22}\) His very existence in the earliest epic is fortuitous. The formula which names him as Aias' father – μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αῖας – is, among similar end-of-line formulae (e.g. μέγας χορυσθόλος Ἐκτωρ) unique in having patronymic, and not descriptive, force. It has been elegantly argued that the patronymic is a misunderstanding of an allusion to Aias' τελαμώνες – the straps which hold his sword and shield, and which cross over his chest to stop Hektor's spear at II.14.402-6. See J. M. Aitchison, "Τελαμώνιος Αῖας and other Patronymics", Glotta 42 (1964), 132-8, here 134-6; cf Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments 182 on Aias' equipment, obsolete in comparison with other gear used in the Iliad, and so open to misunderstanding. Differently, M. Finkelberg, "Ajax's Entry in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women", CQ 38 (1988), 31-41, here 37.

\(^{23}\) This may well explain his subsidiary role in the killing of Phokos – see, especially, Diod. Sic. 4.72.6f (quoted above), where, though Phokos' death is explicitly the result of an accidental throw of the discus by his brother Peleus, he too has to go into exile.
Kychreus was king of Salamis;²⁴ and this would appear to be Telamon's original home. Aias' association with Salamis is attested twice in the Iliad.²⁵

Pherecydes' evidence shows that, even in the fifth century, Telamon had not been securely annexed to the Aiakids.²⁶ But he accompanied Herakles to Troy in Pisander's Heracleia of the late seventh century (fr. 8. B = EGF F 8), and I have argued that he did so as the Aiakid necessary to break the wall.²⁷ His membership of the family is implied also in his part in the conspiracy to kill Phokos in the Alcmaeonis (fr.1 B = EGF F 1), which Wilamowitz dated to the beginning of the sixth century.²⁸

Now, we have already seen that West suggests that the Aiakids were introduced to Aegina in the late seventh century. That introduction must have been prior to the incorporation of Telamon and Aias, who move from Salamis to neighbouring Aegina, into the Aiakid stemma. For their incorporation we have indirect testimony dating from the end of the seventh century.

²⁴ Hes. fr.226; Apoll.3.12.7. When Solon wished to establish Athens' claim to Salamis, he sailed over by night and sacrificed at Kychreus' grave (Plut. Solon 9.1-2).
²⁵ I.2.557f; 7.199. 2.558, assigning Aias' place next to the Athenians, was the line that the Megarians disputed (Strabo 394). Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments 182; Wickersham, Myth and Identity.
²⁷ Above, p.40ff.
²⁸ Homerische Untersuchungen (Berlin, 1884), 73 n.2. Schwartz suggests that it featured also in the Aethiopis; but highly speculatively (Ps-Hesiodia 391 n.2).
All the evidence suggests, then, that the Aiakids’ introduction to Aegina occurred in the second part of the seventh century.29

When Peleus does arrive in Aegina, he brings with him histories of exploits in central Greece. And so he must leave the island to perform them. After the death of Phokos, he flees to his original home in Phthia.


> =fowow nrjXetwj £«o TOU jiarpoc; <5c TOW fowow nrjXetwj £«o TOU jiarpoc; 6ce6e^a TOV (Diod. Sic. 4.72.6)

Equally, after the murder, Telamon flees to his original home in Salamis:


> TOW fowow nrjXetwj £«o TOU jiarpoc; 6ce6e^a TOV (Diod. Sic. 4.72.7)

And this seems to have been the time at which Aegina began to become a significant power (Figueira, Aegina 185-92).

This is the clearest expression of Peleus’ return to his rightful home. Elsewhere he marries Aktor’s daughter to acquire the kingdom (Eust. ad Il.2.684); or marries Eurytion’s daughter (Aktor’s granddaughter) and takes part of the kingdom (Apoll.1.3.13.1). Achilles’ relationship with Patroklos may echo Peleus’ original life:

(1) =fowow nrjXetwj £«o TOU jiarpoc; 6ce6e^a TOV (Diod. Sic. 4.72.6)

And Pindar gives Aegina as Akto’s wife (0.9.69f) and that [Hes.] fr.10a.101 (reconstructed through Apoll.1.1.377 (112.44ff)) makes Akto son of Myrmidon. All these instances show that Peleus’ exile to central Greece reinvented what had originally been genealogical links.

Aktor was Menoitios’ father (e.g. Il.16.14). West, Hesiodic Catalogue 163 n.85 notes that Pindar gives Aegina as Akto’s wife (0.9.69f); and that [Hes.] fr.10a.101 (reconstructed through Apoll.1.1.377 (112.44ff)) makes Akto son of Myrmidon. All these instances show that Peleus’ exile to central Greece reinvented what had originally been genealogical links.

cf Apoll.1.3.12.7: Telamon does not even marry Glauke, but receives the kingdom when Kychreus dies childless. This does
Marriage with the king's daughter, or the king's childlessness, brings Telamon what were elsewhere his ancestral possessions, just as they did for Peleus.

The story of the death of Phokos, then, is a vital episode in Aeginetan mythology, explaining the Aiakids' absence from their homeland. It also contains two local aetiologies - explaining the mound in the harbour, and, more importantly, the tomb of Phokos.

The detail that the tomb was surmounted by a stone, which the credulus Pausanias took for the primitive discus which struck Phokos, suggests another locally important facet of the story. Peleus won the discus at the first Pythian games (hypoth. P 3.2 Drachmann). Elsewhere, he is associated with the pentathlon:

δύναται δὲ καὶ ἱδίως ἀξιόσωδως διὶς φιλοπεντάθλων δυτῶν τῶν Αἰγινητῶν, ἐπεὶ δὴ Πηλεύς δοκεῖ εὐρηκέναι τῶν πένταθλον Αἰγινητῆς ὑπάρχων καὶ Αιακίδης.

(Σ.Μ.7.9b) 

Philostratus has a sad aetiology for the pentathlon: Peleus is second best, of the Argonauts, at almost every event; and so Jason invents the pentathlon so he may be a victor (6υφ.3). We recall that in some accounts Peleus killed Phokos because of his athletic superiority. It is during the pentathlon, evade the conflict of the marriage to Glauke with the marriage to Eriboia (1.6.45). Diodorus has Telamon marrying her on Glauke's death.

32 Müller, Aegineticorum 141.

according to Pausanias, who is reporting the local explanation of the grave and of the stone on top of it, that Phokos is killed by his brother's discus throw.

It is tempting to imagine that the story celebrates, in some sense, the event during which Phokos lost his life: that it had some aetiological force, now lost, explanatory either of the pentathlon or of the discus, which cited Peleus as the inventor.

This in turn would suggest further importance for the story, as an aetiology for local games. Though there is no explicit evidence, the story of Phokos' death makes an easy parallel with the aetiologies of other festivals. The athletic agon, sprung in part from funerary games, may be seen as an expression of the guilt and anger of those who survive. The aetiologies of the games reflect this: each of the crown games has at least one story which describes its foundation as the result of a hero's death. In particular, we note the story which ascribes the foundation of the Olympic games to Pelops, who instituted Ἐορταὶ καὶ Ἐμπληθὰ Ἐλέεις Οἰνομάῳ (Phlegon FGrH 257 F 1.8f). Dinomaos dies in a chariot race - itself plainly a precursor of the races of the games - and the games are then instituted in compensation for his death.

It seems to me highly plausible that the similar story of Phokos' death while involved in a primitive version of the

---

34 Burkert, GR 105-7.
35 E. Pfister, Der Reliquienkult im Altertum (Giessen, 1909, 1912), 2.496f; Brellich, Gli eroi greci (Rome, 1958), 94f; Nagy, Pindar's Homer 119f.
36 Nagy, Pindar's Homer 119 n.15, 120f.
discus might explain the foundation of Aeginetan games.\(^{37}\) The preservation of the stone discus on Phokos’ grave, the positioning of the grave, next to the Aiakeion, and his status as son of a Nereid certainly do not disconfirm the hypothesis.\(^{38}\)

Evidence about Aeginetan athletic festivals is slim.\(^{39}\) The best candidate for a festival which might be explained by reference to Phokos’ death is the Aiakeia.\(^{40}\) It is tempting to suggest that Aiakos instituted the games in honour of his favourite son.

Finally, we note that, despite the fact that Aiakos’ role in the underworld depends on his previous integrity as a mundane judge, that role is not widely evidenced.\(^{41}\) But the story

\(^{37}\) Although Pfister suggests that they are in honour of Aiakos himself (loc. cit.); and Brelich, after Σ.Ν.6.53a, in honour of Oinone (op. cit. 95 n.66).

\(^{38}\) On the position of the grave, see Welter, Aegina fig.36 (p.39). Melikertes, in whose honour the Isthmian games were instituted, was the son of Ino, the Nereid:

\begin{quote}
chorēōuσαι τοίνυν ποτε αἱ Νηρείδες ἐπεφάνησαν τῷ Σιαύφῳ καὶ ἐκέλευσαν ἐς τιμήν τοῦ Μελικέρτου ἀγείνα τὰ Ἱθυμα.
\end{quote}

(hypoth.1 192.13-15 Drachmann)

\(^{39}\) Müller, Aegineticoorum 140 n.y.

\(^{40}\) Σ.Ν.5.78c:

\begin{quote}
ἐστι δὲ ἄγνω ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀγώνεος τὰ Αἰάκεια, διῦτη δὴ καὶ ἐνίκησαν ὁ Πυθεάς.
\end{quote}

(On Pytheas’ victory, see C. Carey, “Two Transitions in Pindar”, CQ 39 (1989), 287-95, here 292ff.) Σ.Ο.7.156 notes that the Aiakeia were otherwise known as the Oinonaia. Pindar calls Aegina Oinona here (N.5.16); perhaps, because he has just outlined the aetiology of the Oinonaia. But he does use Oinona of the mythical Aegina elsewhere (N.4.46; Ν.8.7; Ι.5.34).

\(^{41}\) Aiakos in the underworld: e.g. Plato Apol. 41a, Gorgias 523e; Isoc. 9.15. His role as arbiter of human disputes is implicit in καὶ at 1.8.25 (καὶ δαμόμενοι δίχας ἐπειράω); Carey, 5 Odes 193; see above, p.22ff).
of Telamon pleading his case to his father, who listens and then considers his son guilty (Paus.2.29.10), does demonstrate Aiakos' probity.

In sum: the story of the death of Phokos is the only story of which we know that can furnish the Aeginetans with mythical material involving second generation Aiakids in action on Aegina. As one would therefore expect, it is aetiologically rich: it explains Phokos' tomb and the stone discus which caps it; and the earthwork in the Secret Harbour. It confirms Aiakos' probity. It is a reasonable hypothesis that it was, altogether, a foundation myth for the Aiakeia. It may have been invoked as an aetiology for the discus or the pentathlon. It explains why the Aiakids, the Aeginetan heroes, left Aegina in the second generation.

I turn to Pindar's poem. There is no other record of the scene of the three brothers praying to Zeus Hellenios. It cannot be understood as a tableau of the prayer which averted the Hellenic drought: simply, the prayer is for virtue and maritime prosperity, and not for release from famine. For the same reason, it cannot be taken as a description of a scene from the Aiakeion relief, which, Pausanias tells us, showed the ambassadors to Aiakos (Paus.2.29.7). And so the scene has been ascribed to Pindar's invention. But no satisfactory explanation for the invention has been given. Dissen suggested that the exploits of both Peleus and

42 Σ.H.5.17b; Müller, Aegineticorum 19.
43 cf Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 52.
44 Gärtner, Siegeslieder 33 n.23.
the victor, which occupy the rest of the poem, were the fulfillment of the prayer; but failed to confront the central difficulty of Phokos' troublesome presence. Van der Kolf sees the scene of fraternal amity as an oblique denial of Phokos' murder, that suggests instead that it was accidental homicide. But the dominant explanation sees the scene as a contrast to the murder which follows. Gärtner argues that the juxtaposition echoes the topography of Aegina, with Aiakos' altar next to the grave of Phokos, hinting at the two contrasting episodes - the lifting of the panhellenic drought and Phokos' death - in the history of the Aiakids. But this is a different altar: the altar of Zeus Hellenios which was the scene of Aiakos' prayer, is on Mt. Oros. The only reminder of the lifting of the drought in the enclosure in the city is the relief on the Aiakeion - which shows not the prayer, but the ambassadors. Secondly, Gärtner argues that the prayer scene rules out the fraternal enmity, fanned by Endeis, which was one motive for the murder. And so neither Aiakos' relationship with Psamatheia nor Peleus' with her sister Thetis is soured.

45 On N.5.7-8 (2.2.394f).
46 Quaeritur 53.
47 Siegeslieder 33.n.23. The topography: τοῦ περιβόλου [sc. the Aiakeion] δὲ οὕτως ἔλαται περὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὃς δὲ καὶ μνήμα οὗτος δ ἐν αἰῃ Αἰακοῦ, λεγόμενον ἐστιν ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ. παρὰ δὲ τῷ Αἰάκειον ἔκαστος τάφος χῶμα ἔστι... (Paus. 2.29.8f)
48 Welter, Aegina fig. 36 (p.39).
49 Welter, Aegina 91f.
This is not convincing — and in any case, Pindar does name both mothers, which, if anything, suggests the jealousy motive.

There is no discernible reason why Pindar should have innovated here. Amidst this wealth of local mythical material, it is far more plausible to suggest that the scene was traditional. If Zeus Hellenios was originally a god of the Hellenes of the *Iliad*, we might expect not only his introduction into Aegina, but also his maintenance there, to be mythically ascribed to Aiakids.49

I turn to Pindar's treatment of the death of Phokos. The allusiveness of 12-16 demonstrates first, and most importantly, that the story was well known amongst the first audience,50 and secondly, that Telamon's involvement, and thus kinship, was also familiar to them.51 I suspect that Pindar, with the clear mention of the two mothers, is alluding to the version in which Peleus acted in obedience to Endeis.52

The break-off at 14ff is a notorious crux. How are we to explain the deliberate allusion to a story, juxtaposed with the statement that such stories are best not told?

Before Bundy's demonstration of the profusion of rhetorical poses in Pindar's work, critics seemed happy to see this

49 Farnell, *Cults* 1.63.

50 Gärtner, *Siegeslieder* 34.

51 As we should expect from the evidence above, which shows that Telamon's incorporation into the Aiakids antedates Pindar's explicit testimony of it. Fehr, *Mythen* 48.

52 Which suggests that this was the version known to the Aeginetans. With the explanation of the Nereids' presence here, contrast Robbins, *Nereids* 31.
passage as a product of Pindar's stream of consciousness, spontaneous outpourings which first run one way, and then, another. Reference to the concerns of the patron brought a more sophisticated view: Pindar is not leaping back in genuine outrage; this is "more a matter of tact than of conscience". But this does not answer the question - for "he might have shown even greater delicacy by not mentioning the story in the first place." The way to a solution seems to be indicated by the formal description of the break-off as transitional: it is, here, simply a device to take us from mythical Aegina to the present. Pindar focusses on an unpropitious aspect of his subject so that he can exploit that as an excuse to move on.

But this formal explanation begs the question: why this type of break-off here, rather than any other? (Why a break-off at all, and not an easy transition from the past to the present?) The explanation must lie in the subject matter, which therefore has priority: given that this unpropitious

53 Farnell, Works 1.188; Finley, Pindar and Aeschylus 47; Norwood, Pindar 80f. (For another excess, see Wilamowitz, Pindaros 171.)

54 Bowra, Pindar 68 (for the moral view, see Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 51ff).

55 Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 45. A similar difficulty is presented by the treatment of Bellerophon's death by prae- teritio at 0.13.91 - διασωπάσαναι οi μόρον δύσ - especially when compared to its explicit treatment at 1.7.47ff. It cannot be that in the first case, written for a Corinthian athlete, Pindar tactfully passes over the hero's end (so Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 137), for the praeteritio draws attention to it (Slater, Doubts 205 n.64). See below, p.79 n.67.

56 Bundy, SP 2.74 with n.100; cf SP 1.10.

57 Young, PC 87; cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 2f.
matter is the subject, Pindar takes advantage of that aspect to move on.  

Why, then, this mention of the murder of Phokos? There is no escaping the fact that it is presented as a misdeed: it must be, if the terms of the break-off (16-18) are to be comprehensible. The most promising line is that the allusion counterpoints, and so highlights, the felicity of Peleus’ other achievements. "Dieser "Olbos" hebt sich natürlich vor dem dunklen Hintergrund der Phokosermordung stark ab." 

But this answer simply delays the problem. The question is now: why this dark foil? An answer seems to be offered by the pleasant symmetry of the fact that the dark foil is a misdeed perpetrated by the very same hero who finds olbos later in the ode. But this is a mirage. It does not make the contrast clearer, but blurs it. In an implicit realization of this, critics have become embroiled in a morass of paradox in the attempt to capture the relation.

58 Lefkowitz, TO KAI EΓΩ 201; Carey, 3 Myths 153 n.43.
59 cf Carey, 3 Myths 153 n.43 with Miller, Digressive Leisure 206 n.18; Komornicka, AAAΩEIA 246 n.38. Carnes’ hypothesis that the killing is totemic, and that Pindar’s treatment of it reflects the paradoxical emotions of guilt and celebration (Autochthony 258 n.12), is theoretically attractive, but unevi­denced and inappropriate.
60 Gärtner, Siegeslieder 34.
61 See e.g. J. Stern, "The structure of Pindar’s Nemean 5", CPhil 66 (1971), 169-73, here 170f, who is forced to argue that Peleus’ crime is criminal, but less criminal than his virtue is virtuous, so it may counterpoint it whilst simultaneously re­maining subordinate; Robbins, Nereids 32.
What is needed is a positive reason for the mention of the murder, which complements the use of its negative aspects in the break-off, and answers the question: why mention it at all? The problem is: how can we extract a positive slant from this briefest of allusions, which is made even as Pindar is turning from the story?

The positive reason lies, I suggest, outside the poem, in the importance for the Aeginetans of the story of the murder. We have already seen, and shall go on seeing, that Pindar's practice is to relate mythical material which is familiar to his primary audience. We should imagine that the story of Phokos' death, filled with various points of interest and explanation for the Aeginetans, consists of such material. That it was well known to them is confirmed by the brevity of the allusion which recalls it. The story would seem, then, an ideal candidate for inclusion in an epinician for an Aeginetan victor.

But it is also the story of the fratricide of one of Aiakos' sons by the other two. As such, it has disastrous implications in the context of a victory ode. How could Peleus' later achievements be the product of his divinely endorsed innate virtue, if he has his brother's skeleton in his closet? The dynamics of the break-off, which must be comprehensible, confirm that this is a real problem: the death is unsuitable material for epinician.

63 cf Carey, J Myths 153 n.43, 155.
64 As Bowra hinted (Pindar 68); cf Farnell, Works 2.275f.
65 contra Robbins, Hereids 32.
So, although the Aeginetan mythological tradition strongly suggests the use of this story, qua Aeginetan aetiology, it is intractable material, qua Peleus' fratricide. This is the paradox that explains the conjunction of the allusion and the declaration that such stories are best not told. Pindar reflects the story, allusively, back at his audience, and then shies away from it (exploiting its negative aspects to highlight the virtue he is about to explore).

Understanding Pindar's treatment of myth in this ode means accepting the fact that he here welcomes a traditional story which is singularly inappropriate for an epinician. The critic cannot argue that a positive aspect of the death of Phokos emerges through a deliberately weighted development of the story, because the story is not told. The positive aspect must be found in the mere fact of the mention alone: Phokos' very appearance is valuable in an epinician for an Aeginetan. We have already seen that Pindar uses traditional material in his epinicians. W.5 is key evidence for its intrinsic importance.

66 In chapter 8, I shall examine three similar cruces: the myth of 0.1, 0.9.29ff, and P.3.27ff. In each case, the problem is much the same.

67 Just as Bellerophon's is important in an ode for a Corinthian. His death is traditional, and so appears in 0.13 (91), which features local traditional material (Hubbard, Pegasus' Bridle 28-32). And yet his death also exemplifies the transgression of limits appropriate to a mortal - limits central to Pindar's conception of achievement (e.g. Ν.11 fin.; I.5.14). Narrated at length, it could only be a negative exemplum - as it is at I.7.44ff. And so it appears fleetingly here (note that a tricolon descendens produces a decrescendo before the praeteritio (87-90; Miller apud Race, Style and Rhetoric 40 n.49). See Gentili, Poetry and Public 135 (although he also appeals to the argument from tact).

68 See p.216 below.
Peleus, Hippolyta and Akastos

The fullest account of Peleus' adventures before his marriage to Thetis is given by Apollodorus.¹

For his birth, see above, p.62.
(Apolllodorus continues with Peleus’ marriages to Polydora and Thetis; Achilles’ birth and Thetis’ departure; and Chiron’s tutorship of Achilles.)

We know from the scholiast at Σ.Β.ΙΙ.6.164 (= [Hes. ] fr.208), who compares the story with that of Anteia’s calumnies against Bellerophon, that "Hesiod" narrated this tale of adulterous intrigue διά μαχρῶν. Schwartz has shown that Apollodorus’ account, up to the retrieval of the knife, is a reflection of the version of the Catalogue. His argument centres on [Hes.] fr.209:

ταύτα δὲ ἰστοροῦσα πολλοὶ μέν, ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ

2 Something is awry here. At 3.13.1, Apollodorus called Polydora not Peleus’ wife, but his daughter; and this is the normal relationship (e.g. ΙΙ.16.175; [Hes.] fr.213); see Severyns, CE 249-52. Nor is Peleus’ delay in razing Iolkos likely. This is the sign that Apollodorus is at this point not following a single source; and that explains the doublet of the fathering of, and marriage to, Polydora. Cf Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 394; Carrière and Massonie, Apollodore 240f.

3 ΙΙ.6.155-195: Proitos’ wife, Anteia, attempts to seduce his guest, Bellerophon. Bellerophon is unmoved; and so Anteia accuses him of an attempt on her. Proitos sends Bellerophon off to his father to be killed; he is despatched on three supposedly hopeless tasks, each of which he accomplishes. Proitos has, on some accounts, purified Bellerophon for an accidental killing, just as Akastos purified Peleus (Apoll.2.3.1; Σ.Α.ΙΙ.6.155 Dindorf).

Schwartz argues that the opportunity to hide the knife is explained by Apollodorus' detail that Peleus is asleep; and Akastos' reluctance directly to lay hands on Peleus (line 1 indicates deliberation) by the fact that he has purified Peleus after his accidental killing of Eurytion, his companion on the hunt for the Calydonian Boar. Further, Apollodorus describes how Peleus is saved from Centaurs by Chiron, who finds the knife that Akastos has hidden. In the Hesiodic fragment, also, the knife is hidden and the danger that of Centaurs.  

It seems clear that Apollodorus is following the Catalogue here. But it is at least possible that this story, in some form, was also told elsewhere in the corpus of epic – in the Cypria or in the Alcaeanids – as well, perhaps, as in the Stesichorean. But we know almost nothing of

5 Contrast the version given by a scholiast to Aristophanes: ἐξβάλλει δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ Πήλιον, ὡς ὑπὸ θηρῶν βρωθεὶν. οἱ δὲ θεοὶ διὰ τὴν σωφροσύνην δεδώκασιν αὐτῷ μάχαιραν πρὸς τὸ ἀπαλέξειν τὰ θηρία.
(S.B.Ar.Nub.1063a)

Cf Σ.Α.Ρ.1.224a.

6 Cypria: the incident exemplifies Peleus' sophrosune, for which he is rewarded with Thetis (fr. 2 B = EGF F 2). Alcaeanids: it may have followed the death of Phokos (fr. 1 B = EGF F 1); but see Huxley, GEP 53. Games for Pelias: we know almost nothing of this poem (PMG 178-80; Davison, From Archilochus to Pindar 77f; Davies, Stesichorus 1ff). But consider Σ.Α.Ρ.Νυ.1063c:
the relevant parts of these poems; most of what we know of the episode may be ascribed to the Catalogue.7

Its character is primarily folkloric.8 The core of the episode is the Märchen motif of Potiphar’s wife.9 Pindar gives Peleus three consecutive tasks in N.3.33-5; and has him take Iolkos alone.10 He goes on to wrestle with the shape-shifting Nereid Thetis.11 In this context, Akastos’ plan in the Catalogue to hide the knife ἄδοκτη (fr. 209.2) anticipates its later concealment in the dung, an ingenious hiding place.12

But why should Peleus win a prize at the games for his sophrosune? Lesky suggests that ἅπαξ λέγοντας  is Motivkontamination from the story of his intrigue with Hippolyta (RE s.v. Peleus 278); then the divine origin of the knife is emblematic of its value (cf L. Gernet, "'Value' in Greek Myth", in R. L. Gordon (ed.), Myth, Religion and Society (Cambridge, 1981), 111-46, here 113, 119f). But is it not possible that this is a reference to Stesichorus’ poem, and that it testifies that the story given by the other scholia to this line appeared there? But we do not know whether the poem covered this ground: Davies (Stesichorus 8-11) thinks it did not.

7 It is hopeless to try to separate the various elements – as e.g. does Reitzenstein (Die Hochzeit), who differentiates between the Ehoeae, Cypria and a putative Peleus-Lied. Study of this episode confirms Stoneman’s dictum about the next, the wedding itself: "Though the tales are different in character, there is no reason why they should not have been combined in a single poem" (Mythological Tradition 59).

8 Rhys Carpenter, Folk Tale 71-73, (also 173 on Bellerophon); cf West, Hesiodic Catalogue 137f.

9 Grant, Folktale 95f.

10 Grant, Folktale 12. On trebling, see Propp, Morphology 74; cf ll.6.179-186: Bellerophon’s three tasks before he can marry the princess and win half the kingdom (192f).

11 Frazer, Apollodorus App. 10; J. C. Lawson, Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion. A Study in Survivals (Cambridge, 1910), 136f.

12 For the use of ingenuity as a hallmark of folktale, see Kirk,
The involvement of the Centaurs in the story, on the other hand, appears to be a genuinely mythic element. Centaurs are typically uncivilized; when they intrude upon human society, the results are disastrous.\(^1\)\(^3\) Stories of an unruly centaur attempting the rape of the wife or daughter of his host are common. This was the starting point of the battle of the Centaurs and Lapiths.\(^1\)\(^4\) The story of Peleus rejecting his host's wife turns out to reveal a similar, but inverted, structure.\(^1\)\(^5\)

Finally, we must consider the appearance of Peleus' divine knife. In other accounts, it is given to him by the gods while he is defenceless on the mountainside. Akastos abandons his guest, saying,

"εἰ δίκαιος εἰς οὐδῆν. ως δὲ ἔμελλεν ὑπὸ τῶν

---

Myth 38. Apollodorus' story of Peleus' cutting off the animals' tongues also seems to be folkloric (Frazer, Apollodorus 2.65 n.1; cf Grant, Folklore 33). But it is hard to see how it could fit into the hunt on Pelion in the Catalogue. Schwartz is sure that it did not (Ps-Hesiodeia 394).


\(^1\)\(^4\) Eurytion, invited to the wedding of Peirithoos and Hippodameia on Mt. Pelion, drinks too much wine (he is, of course, unused to it) and attempts to carry off the bride (Od.21.293-304).

\(^1\)\(^5\) The guest behaves perfectly, despite the uncivilized behaviour of his hostess and host: seduction, lies and finally abandonment amongst Centaurs - the epitome of un-civilization. He is saved by the culture hero Chiron, and punishes the wrong-doers. Eurytion, on the other hand, gets drunk and seizes the bride; and he is punished for this by another culture hero, Herakles. It is interesting that two of the names for Akastos' wife - Hippolyta (N.4.57; N.5.26) and Astydameia (Apoll.3.13.3) - are shared by victims of the centaurs: Hippodameia in the Iliad (II.2.742); Deidameia in Plutarch (Theseus 30.3); Deianeira (Hyg. fab.31.33; cf Bacch. fr.44); Mnesimache at Apoll.2.5.5; and Hippolyta at Diod. Sic.4.33.1.
But in the Catalogue, the divine knife is the knife which Peleus already has, and which Akastos hides before leaving Peleus ([Hes.] fr.209). This oddity prompts the questions: in the version of the Catalogue, when, and why, did Peleus get the divine knife? Another Aristophanic scholium may suggest that the occasion was the funeral games for Pelias; but it is hard to see what the reason for the award was.  

Certainly, Peleus’ sophrosyne explains why he deserved the knife, but only on the mountainside is there a plausible scenario for its presentation. However the Catalogue poet solved this problem (if it was confronted at all), I suggest that this difficulty was the small price he paid for including the motifs both of Chiron’s help, and of the gods’ respect for Peleus - originally alternative means of escape for the hero. For both are valuable, because they look forward to his winning of Thetis: Chiron is introduced as Peleus’ helper, and Peleus is shown to be the gods’ favourite.  

The resolution of this episode in the

---

16 Σ.Νυ.1063c; see above, p.82 n.6.

17 [Ητ.] ἐπεὶ οὖ διὰ τὸ αἰφρονεύτων τῇ πόλει εἴδες ἢδη ἄγαθόν τι γενόμενον; φράσου, καὶ μ’ ἐξέλεγχεν εἰπών.  
Κρ. πολλοῖς. ὣ γοῦν Πηλεὺς ἔλαβε διὰ τοῦτο τὴν μάχαιραν.  
(Αρ.Νυ.1061-3)

18 Κρ. καὶ τὴν θέτου γ’ ἐγκε με διὰ τὸ αἰφρονεύτων δ’ Πηλεὺς.  
(Αρ.Νυ.1067)

Cfr Cypria fr. 2 B = EGF F 2; N.5.34-6; I.8.42-4. Chiron will help by giving Peleus instructions for the wrestling match, and hosting the wedding (see below, pp.131, 135).
Catalogue, then, does not at all resemble unself-conscious folklore: it is rather a sophisticated narrative device in the construction of a longer poem from discrete stories.\footnote{cf Braswell, \textit{Mythological Innovation} 24. We have already seen that the alternative explanation of the gift of the knife seems to be the product of narrative necessity. On the artistry of the \textit{Catalogue} poet, see West, \textit{Hesiodic Catalogue}.}

This brief survey should confirm the important point that the account of the \textit{Catalogue} cannot be set in opposition to putative folkloric, mythic or epic accounts. For it contains elements of all three.

I turn to Pindar's accounts. He describes Peleus' adventures before his marriage to Thetis at length in \textit{N.5}:

\begin{quote}
25 a\i d\e p\ro\tilde{\kappa}t\i\tilde{s}t\o\tilde{n} \m\u\tilde{m} \v\i\tilde{n}h\i\tilde{n}h-
\v\a\s\i\tilde{n} \d\i\d\o\s \d\r\x\tilde{k}\o\m\e\n\v\a\i \s\e\m\u\d\a\n \x\e\t\i\n
\textit{P}\i\l\l\e\a \x, \v\i\s \t\e \m\u\i \d\r\b\r\a

K\r\e\t\e\l\i\c \x \I\p\o\l\u\t\a \d\o\l\w \p\e\d\d\s\a\i

\x\d\e\l\e \x\u\v\a\n \m\a\g\n\h\t\o\w \a\x\o\p\o\w

p\e\i\s\a\i\c \a\x\o\l\t\a\n \p\o\i\k\i\l\o\i\c \b\o\u\l\e\\u\m\a\s\i\n\v, \p\w\e\s\t\a\n d\e \p\o\i\h\t\o\u \a\w\n\e\p\a\x\e \l\o\g\o, \\
\v\i\s \h\r\a \n\u\m\f\e\\i\a\c \e\p\e\i\r\a

\k\e\i\n\o\c \e\n \l\e\x\t\r\o\i\c \x\a\x\a\o\t\o

e\m\u\d\i\c : \t\o \x \e\n\a\u\n\i\t\i\o\n \x\a\k\e\u\v

p\o\l\l\a \h\a\p \m\i \p\a\n\t\i

\x\h\i\m\i\u \p\a\r\f\a\m\e\n \l\i\t\\a\n\v\e\n
\t\o\i\o \x \d\r\g\a\n \k\n\i\z\o\n \a\l\p\e\i\n\o \l\o\g\o, \\
e\m\u\d\i\c \x \d\a\p\a\n\a\n\a \n\u\m\f\a\u, \\
\e\x\n\i\o\n \p\a\t\r\o\c \x\h\o\l\o

d\e\i\o\a\i\c : \x \d\e \f\r\\a\s\h \k\a\t\e\n\e\n-\a\e\n \t\e \a\i \d\a\r\i\n\e\f\i\c \d\e \o\u\r\a\n\o\u
30 Ze\i\c \x\d\a\n\a\t\a\t\o\w \b\a\s\i\l\e\o\c, \h\o\t \e\n t\a\k\e\i

p\o\u\t\i\a\n \x\r\u\s\a\l\a\k\a\t\a\t\o\w \t\i\n\a \N\h- \r\e\i\o\w \p\r\a\x\e\i \a\x\o\l\t\i\n.

\textit{(N.5.25-36)}
\end{quote}
This account is complemented by N.4:

55 Παλίου δὲ πάρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἴασκολὼν
πολέμις χερὶ προστατῶν
Πηλεύς παρέδωκεν Αἰμονέσσαιν
δόματος Ὅππολύτας Ὅκαστοι δολίας
tékhnai chrósmenos:
τῇ Δαίδαλῳ δὲ μαχαίρα φύτευε οἱ θάνατοι
ἀκ λόχον Πελίαο παῖς ἀλοκε δὲ Χίρων,
καὶ τὸ μόραμον Δίδων πεπρωμένου ἐξεφευν.

(*N.4.54-61*)

Finally, he alludes to the story in N.3 and I.8:

55 παλαιαίς δὲ ἐν ὀρεσίκι
γέγασεν Πηλεύς ᾠνάξ, ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών
ἐς καὶ Ὅιασκόλο εἶλε μόνος ᾠνύν στρατιάς...

(*N.3.32-34*)

The two principal accounts, in N.4 and N.5, meld together easily. No contradictions are thrown up in any of Pindar’s treatments of the episode. We note, too, that N.4, in particular, is incomprehensible without knowledge of the mythological landscape, which must, therefore, have been known to the first audience.21

Peleus must have been Akastos’ guest, because he rejects Hippolyta’s advances ξειώδους πατρὸς χόλου δείσις (N.5.33f).22

---

20 This line is a glance at the pious repulsion of Hippolyta’s advances; see van der Kolf, Quaeritur 61; Carey, 5 Odes, ad loc.

21 Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 59.

22 Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 60.
Akastos' wife is Hippolyta. She too warmly receives her husband's guest:

πολλὰ γάρ νῦν παντὶ θυμῷ

παραφαιμένα λιτάνευεν.

τότε δ' ὥργαν νῦν ἔστινοι λόγοι·

ἐδώς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν.

(N.5.31-33)

πολλά, as it is at N.8.8 and 0.2.8, is simply intensitive.24 παραφαιμένα is not neutral, but implies leading off, rather than on to, the right course.25 It is especially appropriate for a seduction. Aphrodite describes her wonderful girdle:

ἐνθ' ἐνι μὲν φιλότητι, ἐν δ' ἡμερος, ἐν δ' ἀριστίς πάρφασις, η τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ προεδρία.

(II.14.216f)

It is even more suitable here, to describe an adulterous seduction.26

23 Σ.Α.Ρ.1.224 names her Kretheis or Hippolyta. (Hyg. astr.2.20 recounts another version of the Potiphar's wife story in which Cretheus is the husband and Demodice or Biadice the wife.) This is, I think a misunderstanding of Pindar's Κρηθέης 'Ιππολύτα (N.5.26), which must have had some kind of patronymic force (cf I.8.42f; P.3.87). There is no evidence that Hippolyta was Kretheus' daughter (his family tree may be reconstructed from Od.11.235-9; [Hes.] frr.7; 30.29f; P.4.138; 142-44, and is conveniently given by West, Hesiodic Catalogue 175); but a faint trace that she was his grand-daughter, daughter of Aison and Alkimede: commenting upon Alkimede’s lament on the departure of Jason, her only child (A.R. 1.287), the scholiast ad loc. agrees that Jason was her only son, but adds that he did, according to Ibycus, have a sister, Hippolyta. Kretheus' wife was Tyro, who had previously borne Pelias, Akastos' father, to Poseidon. The notion of Akastos marrying his second cousin is a happy one. For the patronymic referring to a grandfather cf Αἰολίδα βασιλεύ, to Bellerophon, at 0.13.67, and Αἰακίδας passim.

24 cf LSJ s.v. πολύς IIIa. See above, 17f, on N.8.8.

25 cf P.9.43; 0.7.65f; N.8.32. Miller, Phthonos 116-18.

26 Köhnken, Meilichos Orga 90f.
32 must refer to Peleus' anger at Hippolyta's advances, and does not mean that she succeeded in arousing his passion.\(^{27}\) Although ὀργά may in Pindar refer to any feelings, αἰματοιοι, though unparalleled, is plainly pejorative, unlikely if her advances are to any degree successful.\(^{28}\)

A vexed passage in \textit{N.4} may also refer to Hippolyta's attempt to seduce Peleus. I refer to Hippolyta's δολίαι τεχναί at 57f. These words have been explained as the false accusations levelled at Peleus; or as her advice to Akastos on how to kill Peleus.\(^{29}\)

But its meaning cannot be established outside of the context, which is troubled.\(^{30}\) Snell-Maehler read:

\begin{quote}
Ποιίου δὲ πάρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκόν
πολεμίζῃ ξερὶ προστρατῶν
Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν λειμόνοςοιν
δάμαρτος 'Ιππολύτας 'Ἀκάστου δολίας τέχναις ἥρεσαμενος.
τῇ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρᾳ φύτευε οἱ δάνατοι
ἐκ λόχοι Πελίου παῖς.
\end{quote}

This follows the MSS, which give Ἀκάστου. But how can Peleus be said to be δολίαις τεχναίς ἥρεσαμενος? \textit{LSJ} s.v. χρώμ Κ III 1 give "having experienced", referring to Hippolyta's attempted

\(^{27}\) As J. Stern, "The Structure of Pindar's \textit{Nemean} 5", \textit{CPhil} 66 (1971), 169-73, here 171 with n.17, holds.

\(^{28}\) Bury paraphrases "with shameful directness" (ad loc.). Potiphur's wife's attempt to seduce Joseph is shamefully direct — just two words in Hebrew (\textit{Genesis} 39.7). On ὀργά, see Köhnken, \textit{Meilichos Orga} 89f with n.50.

\(^{29}\) The former was given by Schroeder. Farnell follows the latter, paraphrasing δολίαι τεχναί as "treacherous advice" (\textit{Works} 2.269).

\(^{30}\) See Köhnken, \textit{Funktion} 200-203 for a full discussion.
seduction; but there are no good parallels for this use.\textsuperscript{31} Σ.92c, followed by Wilamowitz, suggests that Peleus was using her wiles εἰς πρόφασιν τιμωρίας; but this cannot be understood without a word for "reason".\textsuperscript{32} Schroeder, understanding a reference to the false accusation, changed ἀκάστου to ἀκαστος, and δὲ to τε, and punctuated not after χρησάμενος, but after ἀιμόνεσαι. Köhnken agrees that ἀκάστου and χρησάμενος must agree: "er führt den hinterlistigen Anschlag aus, den seine Frau Hippolyta ihm suggeriert hat", but emends χρησάμενος to Χρησάμενον, to give a genitive absolute, so retaining both the stop after χρησάμενον and δὲ in 59.\textsuperscript{33}

But the problem remains: in what sense does Akastos use δόλιαις τέχναις? The only possible explanation is that Hippolyta is the originator of the plan for the murder. Here, Köhnken follows Farnell, who suggests references, in Pindar's other account in N.5, to the "crafty counsels that Hippolyta gave her husband to bring about the death of Peleus" (N.5.26, 28).\textsuperscript{34} This element he sees as Pindar's innovation in the story; for we know from [Hes.] fr.209.1 that the Catalogue poet described Akastos working out the device of hiding Peleus' knife himself: ἢδε δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή.

\textsuperscript{31} Bury ad loc.; see below. But Willcock translates as "after he had experienced the crooked tricks of Hippolyta..." ("Second Reading of Pindar; the fourth Nemean", G&R 29 (1982), 1-10, here 5).

\textsuperscript{32} Wilamowitz, Pindaros 175f n.3; criticized by Farnell, Works 2.269.

\textsuperscript{33} Funktion 201.

\textsuperscript{34} Works 2.277, cf 2.269. Köhnken, Funktion 201f n.48.
But ἑοικὸς βουλεύμασιν in N.5.28 are most naturally understood in that context as the means by which Hippolyta persuaded Akastos, not as the plan itself. It is a simple instrumental dative. These means are then explained by 29-31, introduced by an explanatory δέ. Only δόλῳ πεδάσα (26) refers to the plan for the murder. But it does not mean that Hippolyta works out the details of the trick with the knife. It refers only to her scheme of deceiving her husband, explained in 28ff, in order that some repercussion will fall on Peleus. The phrase, an epic cliché, suggests misleading (rather than bafflement) and connotes ingenuity. She "wished to snare him [sc. Peleus] by a trick; By elaborate craft she won the help of her lord..." N.5, then, gives no corroborative evidence for a version in which it is Hippolyta's scheme to hide Peleus' knife, whether it be Pindar's invention or not. Without that (or any other) evidence for such a version, one may doubt whether Köhnken's emended text is intelligible.

35 As, in fact, Farnell translates (Works 1.184).
36 cf Slater Lexicon s.v. δέ h (although he does not note this passage); Denniston 169.
37 On πεδάσα, see Σ.Ν.5.46a; fr. 135.
38 It is used of Proteus' ability to metamorphose into various animals at Od.4.455, and of the conception of Aigisthos' treacherous entertainment of Agamemnon at Od.4.529. It is used repeatedly in the Theogony to describe Prometheus outwitting Zeus to keep the best part of an animal for mankind (Theog. 540, 547, 555, 560); and of similar trickery - Hermes leading cattle backwards to produce confusing tracks - at Hom. h.Herm. 76. See also 11.23.585.
39 Bowra's translation.
So, can the transmitted text at N. 4. 54-60 be sensibly interpreted? Bury objected to the translation of χρησθαι (58) as "experience" on the grounds that the parallels cited by Dissen (χρησθαι with e.g. τύχη, συμφοράς), are not in fact parallel: these datives "describe a state of the person experiencing, not the objective cause of an experience." The phrase cannot mean "having experienced her guiles".

But the phrase may be thought to be less objectionable if Hippolyta's technai could be associated more closely with the effect that they have on Peleus' inner state. This would ease the difficulty of the genitive Ἰππολύτας. One possible interpretation is that they are tricks of magic: Peleus experienced enchantment. His inner state is thus directly the product of her actions: it is her work. That Hippolyta should resort to magic in her attempt to seduce Peleus is entirely plausible. δολίοι and τέχναι may both be used of magic. If the audience already knew a story of enchantment here, they could be taken so.

Two pieces of circumstantial evidence support this hypothesis. First, we note that at 35ff, Pindar uses the imagery of defixioi. Magic and revival. may both be used of magic. If the audience already knew a story of enchantment here, they could be taken so.

---

40 Bury ad loc.

41 δόλιος: cf P. 2. 39; P. Lond. 121, discussed by A. Abt, Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei (Gießen, 1908), 56:

διάσωσιν με πάντοτε εἰς τὸν σιωπάντα ἀπὸ φαρμάκων και δολίων καὶ βασανοδούντης πάσης καὶ γλωττῶν ποιήμων...

téχνη: P. 4. 249; Abt, op. cit. 31.

42 On the τύχη, see A. S. Gow, "ΙΤΥΧΕ, ΡΟΜΒΟΣ, RHOMBUS, TURBO", JHS 54 (1934), 1-20, here 3-5. J. M. Bell, "God, Man and Animal in Pindar's Second Pythian", in D. E. Gerber (ed.),
enchantment are to the forefront of the audience’s—and, one might infer, the poet’s—mind. Secondly, according to Apollodorus, the final incident in Peleus’ subsequent attack on Iolkos was a strange and bloody act:

\[ \text{Ἀντιδύναμαν τὴν Ἀχάτου γυναικα φωνεύει, καὶ διελών μεληδον διήγαγε δι' αὐτῆς τὸν στρατὸν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.} \]

(Apoll.3.13.7)

Versnel has convincingly described the dynamics of this ritual. He argues that it combines aspects of retribution and purification. It is the former which motivates the dichotomy, which is a reflecting punishment: any kind of treason, including adultery, is frequently punished by the splitting of the culprit. But what is the importance of the purificatory aspect? Why does it occur here? I suggest that it reflects

---

Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in honour of Leonard Hood-bury (Chico, 1984), 1-31, here 11, with n.33, notes that at P.4.214, Pindar calls the bird ποικίλος. We recall Hippolyta’s ποικίλο βουλεύματα in N.5.

43 Why did Pindar think of this metaphor to express the driving force of the poem? Because he had in mind the myth that was to come?


45 The classical parallels (Plutarch, QR 111; Livy XL.6.1-3, 5; Quintus Curtius, Life of Alexander 10.9.11ff) all describe the passage of an army between the parts of a dismembered dog as a purification after the slaughter of battle. See J. G. Frazer, The Folk-lore of the Old Testament (Macmillan, 1919), 1.391ff, for a pot-pourri of more or less parallel instances.

46 Versnel does not confront this problem, but stresses that such rituals are not simply standard practice after a battle (op. cit. 103f).
the malign influence from which Peleus wants to release himself: the purification undoes Hippolyta's spells. 47

This interpretation is simply hypothesis. It still does some violence to 'Iππολύτας... ὀσιάς τέχναισι χρησάμενος. But it is, at least, comprehensible, and it uses the reading of the MSS. 48 The ξυνάε at 35, and the story of the dichotomy of Hippolyta, offer faint corroborative evidence.

Finally, I consider ξυνάε (N.5.28). There are two plausible alternatives here. Dissen interprets the word as referring to Akastos' relationship with Peleus: Hippolyta persuaded her husband, his companion. The double betrayal - wife of husband, and then host of guest - is emphasized. Alternatively, one might translate ξυνάε... πείσαμε as πείσαμε ἵστη κοινωνὸν εἴναι. 49 This makes rather better sense, for it gives content to πείσαμε; but Farnell rejected it on linguistic grounds. 50 In fact, neither interpretation can be ruled out. The word is thoroughly ambiguous. Such ambiguity is common in Pindar, and frequently significant. 51 One might observe that the ambiguity here highlights Akastos' shifting role: whose ξυνάε is he really? 52

47 On the equation of bewitchment and pollution, see Parker, Miasma 222.

48 The scholiast must have read 'Ακατού and χρησάμενος: hence the explanation of using Hippolyta's advances as a pretext (Farnell, Works 2.269).

49 So Bury and Puech, following Schroeder.

50 Farnell, Works 2.277 (but cf PV 559). His own alternative - that ξυνάε describes οἰκοπόν - gives weak sense.

51 See Renehan, Conscious Ambiguity, Lozza Ambiguità.

52 cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 105f.
So, Peleus has rejected Hippolyta's advances (and, perhaps, resisted enchantment). She has told her husband that she was the victim of the attempted seduction, knowing that he will take action. Indeed, Akastos now makes his attempt on Peleus.

Snell-Maehler read:

τὰ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρα φύτευς οἱ θάνατον
ἐκ λόχου Πελεία παῖς.

(N.4.59f)

Now, in what sense is the knife "of Daidalos"? Wherever the knife with which we have seen Peleus equipped is specially made, it is made by Hephaistos; and the genitive should, in any case, mean that it was possessed by Daidalos, and not made by him.53 Is this an otherwise unknown version of the story in which Akastos attacks Peleus with a different weapon - a knife of Daidalos?54 It seems on the face of it unlikely: there is no trace whatsoever of Peleus either winning or stealing Daidalos' knife, or even a knife made by Daidalos, anywhere.

φύτευς might confirm that these lines do, after all, look towards the familiar story. Köhnken flattens it, and translates as "vorbereitet", comparing Halitherses' prophesy of Odysseus' nearness to home: ἐγγὺς ἦσθαν τοῖς ἑαυτῷ φόνου καὶ μῆρα φυτεύς / πάντεσοιν (Od.2.165f).55 But, if we retain a hint of the literal meaning of φύτευς and translate as "plant",56 there

53 Schroeder ad loc.
54 See Wilamowitz, Pindaros 175 n.3; cf. Carey, 5 Odes 34.
55 Funktion 203; cf the scholiast's ἐμπρακτάτῳ... θάνατον (Σ.Ν.4.95a).
56 As Bowra, alone, does.
is a light allusion to the folkloric incident which Apollodorus describes:

ἀπολιπὼν Ἀκάστος καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν ἐν τῇ τῶν βοῶν
κόπρῳ κρύσας ἐπαυερχεται.

(Apoll.3.13.3)

Akastos plants the knife in a pile of dung. With the knife, he sows the seeds of Peleus' death by ambush.

So, the story is the familiar one, and Δαιδάλου remains a problem. The easy correction, first made by Didymus, is to δαίδαλω. It is less common than δαίδαλεος, but securely attested. But why is Peleus' knife so described? Δαίδαλεος "indica... il prodotto artisticamente elaborato". It is typically applied to worked metal. Knowing that Peleus had a

57 For the use of dung as manure, see e.g. Plato, Protagoras 334a. P. Decharme, "Les Scholies d'Aristophane et la Bibliothèque d'Apollo dore", R.Phil. 8 (1884), 129-32, here 130f, argues that κόπρος means "cowshed" here (LSJ s.v., II). But the locale is specifically the uplands of Pelion (Apoll. 3.13.3); and in any case, "dung" is the predominant meaning, even in epic (Lfgre s.v., B).

58 We rule out the scholiast's suggestion (Σ.95α) that it is a metaphorical knife of Daidalos, meaning treachery.

59 Σ.Ν. 4.95b.

60 At Aesch. Eu. 635; see Bond on Eur. Herakles 471; Braswell on P.4.296 (b).

61 G. A. Privitera, La Rete di Afrodite (Palermo, 1974), 33, comparing the word with ποιηλός, which is more particularly the work of an agent. But this is a fine distinction; the two words are usually equivalent (loc. cit. n.4).

62 "On pourrait ainsi poser à l'origine de la notion de daidalon une qualification appliquée à un travail du métal" (Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux, Dédale (Paris, 1975) 51; she surveys the occurrences of the word at 45ff. The fact that neither Homer nor Hesiod apply the adjective to any offensive weapon, but only to defensive armour, need not trouble us here. On the notion of a δαίδαλον εἴφος at Theocritus 24.42, Gow suggests that the epithet refers to the engraved hilt.
knife made for him by Hephaistos, we immediately think of the work of Hephaistos: the arms of Achilles are δαιδαλα πάλτα (II.19.13, 19); his shield has δαιδαλα πολλα (18.482; cf 479); his helmet is a χόρυσσο δαιδαλένυ (18.611f). 63

If the lines suggest that Akastos hides Peleus' Hephaistean knife, Pindar is, as we might expect, following the Catalogue:

εἰς δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀριστη φαίνετο βουλή: αὐτὸν μὲν σχέσθαι, κρύψαι δὲ ἀδόξητα μάχαιραν χαλήν, ἢν οἱ ἔτεινε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγνής,
(Hes. fr. 209.1-3) 64

So δαιδαλὼ, a small change, is entirely satisfactory in context. The corruption of δαιδαλῷ to δαιδάλον is intelligible in the immediate context of the difficult line. I would read δαιδάλῷ. 65

We have seen that the accounts of N.4 and 5 are only intelligible when viewed against a known mythological landscape. We should assume that that background was the Catalogue, which, we may infer from [Hes.] fr. 209, contained the surprising combinations of the hiding in dung (ἀδόξητα) of the divine knife; and the concealment of the knife and the danger of (and so presumably restraint of) Centaurs. Pindar shares

63 So too Σ.Ν.4.92c.

64 Hesiod calls Peleus' μάχαιρα χαλή; Homer calls Achilles' helmet χαλήν δαιδαλένυ (II.18.612).

65 The alternative is the possibility that δαιδάλον might mean Ἡρωίστου; just as Enyalios may stand for Ares. See Bury ad loc.; Wilamowitz, Pindaros 175f n.3. This, too, would reproduce the conflation of the Catalogue. But I find it intrinsically deeply implausible; such a synonymity would depend on familiarity, which is plainly not the case here. The evidence is even more slender, when we realize, with Farnell (Works 2.270), that Eur. Herak.471 is irrelevant.
these particulars (N.4.59f). This confirms that he is following the Catalogue, and that it is the text at which his allusions glance.

After Akastos has hidden the knife in the dung, ἀλλαξε Χίρων death from Peleus (N.4.60). We have seen how the poet of the Catalogue ([Hes.] fr. 205.5) and Apollodorus (3.13.3) seem to have used the motifs of the hidden knife and Chiron's restraint of the other Centaurs. We should expect this to be Pindar's account also; and so it seems: at the very least, he uses the motifs of the knife and Chiron's help. ἀλλαξε alludes to Chiron's restraint of the Centaurs.

After his escape, Peleus returned and attacked Iolkos; ²⁶

Παλὺον δὲ πάρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰολκῶν
πολέμια χερὶ προστρατῶν
Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν ἀλμυρότατιν.

(N.4.54-6) ²⁷

The difficulty here is in προστρατῶν, which elsewhere connotes supplication. Köhnken's is the only explanation which does not evade this: the oxymoron of πολέμια χερὶ προστρατῶν recalls Peleus' first approach to Iolkos, as a suppliant, after accidentally killing Eurytion. ²⁸

There is also brief allusion to the attack on Iolkos at N.3.34: καὶ Ἰολκῶν εἰλε μόνος ἀνευ στρατιᾶς. This runs

²⁶ March has suggested that the attack on Iolkos took place after Peleus' wedding to Thetis: she joins [Hes.] frr. 211 to 212b (Creative Poet 15-20). But this is hopeless: even the relevant part of her summary - "after the wedding Peleus took his revenge on Akastos and his wife by sacking Iolkos" is more explicit than the single line - [Hes.] fr. 212b.7 - which she suggests is Hesiod's description of the sack.

²⁷ On ἀλμυρότατιν (i.e. Thessalians), see Strabo 9.5.23.

²⁸ Funktion 202 n.50.
counter both to Pherecydes (FGrH 3 F 62), who wrote that the Dioskouroi and Jason accompanied him, and to Apollodorus:

Πηλέας δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα σὺν Ἰάσων καὶ Διοσκοῦροις ἐπόρθησεν Ἰωλχοῦν, καὶ Ἀστυδάμειον τὴν Ἀκάστου γυναικα φονεύει, καὶ διελὼν μεληθὸν διήγαγε δι' αὐτής τὸν στρατὸν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

(Apoll. 3.13.7)

But Apollodorus' version does not necessarily mean that the Catalogue, also, described the attack of an army. We recall that Apollodorus could only be shown to have followed the Catalogue up to the retrieval of the knife; it is tempting to imagine that he is here following Pherecydes.

Two fragments of the Catalogue mention the sack of Iolkos (211, 212b); but neither indicates the presence of an army, nor rules it out. But it is likely that there was another, fuller, treatment of the sack in the Catalogue, as part of the narrative in which fr.209 occurred. On the other hand, had there been such a treatment, and had it specified an army, or no army, one would have expected the Pindar scholia to refer to it.

The scholiast to Apollonius reports that Peleus took his revenge on his own:

dεξάμενος τὸν Πηλέα ὡς ἐπὶ θήραν εἰς τὸ Πήλιον κατέλειψεν ἄσσπολον. ἦν ὡς ὑπὸ θηρίων διαφθαρῆ ἐπιστάς δὲ Ἐρμής ἦ, ὡς τίνες, Χείρων ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ

69 Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodoeia 394; see above p.81 n.2.

70 Robert, Bibliotheca 67; cf Severyns, CE 251f, who argues that Pherecydes appears to be following the Alcmaeonis (but we do not even know whether this incident happened in that poem).

71 Fr.211 is set after the marriage of Peleus and Thetis; and 212b may well be concerned with the death of Patroklos; see West's review of P.OXY. XXX (CR 16 (1966), 21-4, here 22).
The main narrative here is neither that of the Catalogue nor of Pindar. The simplicity of Peleus’ revenge smacks of folklore.\textsuperscript{72}

Three explanations have been offered for Pindar’s departure from the tradition represented by Pherecydes and Apollodorus at N.3.34. Most popular is that his new version enhances Peleus and so gratifies his patron.\textsuperscript{73} Robertson suggested that the emphatic μόνος ἀνευ στρατιάς implicitly contradicts the story told by Apollodorus: there was no army, and so no unpleasant parade through the dismembered Hippolyta.\textsuperscript{74} Finally Privitera, following Bury, appeals to tensions within the poem, and notes the correspondence between Peleus’ single-handed exploit and Herakles’ at 24.\textsuperscript{75}

But Privitera refuses to be committed on the question of innovation as opposed to selection.\textsuperscript{76} The concentration on Peleus’ self-reliance might as well be a matter of emphasis, rather than invention. This, of course, goes for the other

\textsuperscript{72} M. L. West, "The Rise of the Greek Epic", \textit{JHS} 108 (1988), 151-72, here 160; cf Stith Thompson, \textit{Motif Index} H 1135. Farnell, \textit{Works} 2.257 and West, loc cit. n.66, even suggest that the story may ultimately reflect a historical event.

\textsuperscript{73} Σ.Ν.3.57; followed by Van der Kolf, \textit{Quaeritur} 63f; Fehr, \textit{Mythen} 52; Bowra, Pindar 286.

\textsuperscript{74} D. S. Robertson, "Pindarica", \textit{CR} 37 (1923), 5-7, followed by Huxley, \textit{Pindar’s Vision} 18f: "the lightest touch serves to restore a tale to morality and truth."

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Eracle} 255.

\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Eracle} 253-55.
arguments also. The testimony of the scholiast on Apollonius suggests that the story was not Pindar's invention. 77

What is interesting here is the question of whether there really is a hit at the rival version; or whether ἀνευ στρατιάς is simply a Pindaric negative restatement of the positive μόνος. 78 The closest parallels occur during Pindar's descriptions of the death of Memnon, whose fame spread οὐκ ἀπονοοστήσομεν (N.6.50), and who Achilles resolved ὑπω... μὴ... πάλιν οὖχαδε... μόλις (N.3.62f). 79 I shall argue that this circumlocution for death, which Pindar uses nowhere else, is a hit at the tradition that, when Achilles killed Memnon, Memnon did go home - carried home to immortality. 80

In that case, there is evidence for the existence of competing mythological traditions about Memnon's end. If N.7.34 is truly parallel, as it seems to be, my conclusions about that episode suggests that there was a similar confusion about Pindar's attack on Iolkos, and that Pindar is lending his authority to one side of the controversy while glancing at the other.

This suggests the further question: why should Pindar, instead of simply presenting his chosen version, go out of his

77 Nor can we be sure that Pindar is not still following the Catalogue here. If Apollodorus has abandoned the Catalogue at this point, it may be because it does not include this memorable detail, which he wants to mention.
78 cf P.12.28f, N.4.77: Race, Negative Expressions 111.
79 cf also, perhaps, Ἀβαστὶ (N.8.9); see above, p.21 n.17.
80 See below, p.241ff.
way to recall the version he is contradicting? None of the explanations offered above reveal why he bothered. The most economical explanation for the glance at the rival is that it is a judgement on this conflict of traditions. Hence the explicit rejection of the army: Pindar shows that he has confronted the issue. As for the motive for his preference, it may be that the criterion for Pindar's judgement between the two versions was no more than their relative popularity on Aegina. And one reason for the audience's predilection for the version of the story that Pindar does narrate might well have been the fact that it better celebrated their hero Peleus. But that fact certainly does not entail that the story was Pindar's invention.

The Marriage of Peleus and Thetis

In Nemean 3 and 4, Peleus' marriage to Thetis is the sequel to his adventure at Iolkos (N.3.34-6; N.4.54-65); and, in particular in N.5, she is Zeus' gift, Peleus' reward for his spurning of Hippolyta, and reverence for Zeus Xenios (N.5.33-6; cf. P.3.95f). But in I.8, although Peleus' sophrosune is again stressed (26, 40), Thetis is married off to him at Themis' suggestion, as an escape for Zeus and Poseidon, who were quarrelling over her until Themis revealed that she would bear

---

81 cf Robertson, Food of Achilles 179.
82 We shall see parallels. Why are the audience led to expect the appearance of the raven in P.3, or that Pelops has been eaten in 0.1?
83 cf p.11 n.47.
a son stronger than — and so able to overthrow — his father.

Further, the wrestling with Thetis, through which Peleus wins her, described in N.3.35f and N.4.62-4, is at odds with the formal wedding implied in I.8.44ff and celebrated at P.3.93.

It would seem that, at the very least, Pindar uses one version of the story in the Nemeans, and another in I.8. Scholars have argued speculatively over the identification and reconstruction of these versions, and suggested the existence of earlier, otherwise unknown, epics as the sources, alongside the known candidates of the Cypria and Catalogue. Further, there is no explicit evidence of a source for the version of I.8; and so Pindarists have debated whether Pindar has invented here; and if so, how much.

On the first head, a good deal of speculation has emanated from the premise that any source work must have had a simple unity. And so, for example, Peleus’ wrestling with Thetis has been seen as inconsistent with his marriage to her on Pelion — and so, it is argued, the two incidents must come from different poems. But although the two incidents may have been in origin discrete, there is no reason why they should not have both been included in the same poem. Now, this kind of argument needs to be used with care. For there must come a point when the critic who can imagine originally discrete episodes

---

1 Graef, Peleus und Thetis 196-200; cf Wilamowitz, Pindaros 178, who argued that the wrestling was incompatible with the Themis-variante.

2 Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 59. Hubbard, Aiakos 10 n.17, suggests that the wrestling might have been presented as "a preliminary trial of Peleus’ suitability" — but even this is unnecessary rationalization. I see no objection to the subjugated Thetis then participating in a formal wedding.
dovetailed into a single story must decide that alternative versions are too contrary to be cobbled together. The danger is that his argument, and not the possible logic of the situation, may determine where that point comes.3

Everywhere, Peleus is a mortal hero, and Thetis, a nymph.4 And so there was a need for an explanation of their union, which transcends class divisions. Peleus was elevated to approach Thetis - this is familiar from the Nemeans, in which he behaves extraordinarily well - and Thetis was, for the purposes of marriage, rejected from the company of divinities.5 It is important to realize that already the Iliad reports that Thetis has married below her status. She asks:

```
"'Ἡφαιστ', ἂν ἢ ὅ τις, δοσὶ θεαὶ εἰσι ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, τοοοόδ' ἐνε φρεσὶ δέιν ἀνέεχετο ξῆδεα λυγρά, δοσὶ ἐμοὶ ἐξ πασέων Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀληθεὶς ἔδωκεν; ἐξ μὲν μ' ἀλλὰς ἀλλὰς ἀνδρὶ δάμασκεν, Ἀιακίδη Πηληί. καὶ ἔτην ἀνέρος εὐνήν πολλὰ μόλις οὔξ ἐθέλουσα.
```

(I.18.429-34)6

Equally, Peleus already περὶ ἀνθρώπινος φύλος ῥέειν' ἀθανάτωσι (I.24.61). In other words, the mismatch was a feature of the story as early as the Iliad.7

---

3 See e.g. Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 60.
4 Whatever unknown primitive data lie behind their characters: Robert, Heldensage 66-9; cf RE s.v. Peleus 271f (Lesky); Jouan, Euripide 71.
5 Séchan, Noces 278.
6 cf 18.84-87; 24.90-92.
7 Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 182f.
The earliest explicit explanation for Thetis' exclusion from marriage with a divinity is given by the *Cypria*:

δ ὀ τίλα Ἐκυπρία γράφας τῇ Ὑποδήλωσιν ὑπεύχειν αὐτῆς (sc. θέτιν) τοῦ γόμον Δίους, τοῦ δ' ἐκμόριοι χαλαίδεντα διότι θηνήζω συνοικίσαι καὶ παρ' Ὑποδήλῳ (fr. 210) δὲ κατιτα ταῦτα τὸ παραπληθείον

(*Cypria fr. 2 (I) B = EGF F 2*)

But we can also see a trace of this in the *Iliad*. Hera points out the superiority of Achilles' pedigree to Hektor's:

But why should Thetis have been concerned for Hera in the first place? 59f explains: Hera raised Thetis. This detail is mythologically bizarre; it must have once been an *ad hoc* explanation of Thetis' care, which is reproduced here.9

8 *cf* Apollodorus 3.13.5: τινὲς δὲ λέγουσι θέτιν μὴ βουληθοτ, Αἰακος τραφάσαι. "The Homeric allusion almost certainly relies on the same tradition and would seem to indicate a common archetype in pre-Homeric oral epic" (Hubbard, *Aiakos* 11). The alternative model is Graef's (*Peleus und Thetis* 199f): the author of the *Cypria* developed the hints of the *Iliad* into a story of Thetis' rejection of Zeus out of care for her foster parent. But why should Hera bring up Thetis? See next note.

9 *cf* Braswell, *Mythological Innovation* 24f, who suggests that the claim to have reared Thetis here is "an invention to explain Hera's interest in the goddess and her son" - in other words, that it is *ad hoc* in the present context. But no
Now, Cypria fr.2 claims καὶ πάντες ἔδειξεν τὸ παραπλήσιον. Quite what this refers to is unclear; for what of the Catalogue remains does not closely resemble the events of the Cypria fragment. The fragments of the Catalogue stress Peleus’ piety, and Thetis as Zeus’ reward to Peleus for that piety. So:

Πηλεὺς Ἀιακήδης, φίλος Ἀθανάτοιοι θεοῖοι, λαοῖοι δὲ θεοῖοι ἄγαλμα θυμὸς ἄπασιν, δει τὸ πόλιν ἀλάπασεν ἔως τὴν ἐτέλεσεν [μερόν]τα γέγονα, καὶ τούτ᾿ ἔπος εἶπαν ἄπαντες· "τρίς μάχαρ Αἰακήδη καὶ τετράχις ἀξίες Πηλεύ, ἵνα ἔστω Μέδεια ὁ Ωλύμπιος ἐδρύσα φεῖς καὶ ὁ Ἁρκελάως θεοὶ ἐξετελέσαν·

The wedding seems to have been Zeus’ gift (8, 11). Now, this seems inconsistent with the idea of Zeus’ angry rejection of...

motivation is necessary here, beyond Hera’s implacable enmity toward Troy.

10 And so παραπλήσιον has not been given much weight: van der Kolf assumed that it must have applied to whatever followed, and cannot have been relevant to this issue (Quaeritur 57); Schwartz refers it only to the fact that Hesiod treated the cause of the marriage (Ps-Hesiodeia 395); Jouan saw here only a reference to Zeus’ decisive role in each account (Euripide 74). It is worth pointing out that Cypria fr.2 outlines the story of the rejection of advances, and the subsequent revenge of the scorned suitor. This is the story of Astydameia, also, which was told in the Catalogue.

11 Jouan, Euripide 65.

12 See Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 395f.

13 One can read little into 9; for the same phrase is used of the marriage of Menelaos’ daughter Hermione to Neoptolemos at Od.4.6f — where the gods have no interest in the matter.
Thetis. But it is not impossible that the Catalogue poet did manage to cobble the two together.

What is clear, however, is that the motifs of Thetis as Zeus' reward to Peleus and Zeus' vow that she should marry a mortal do not form an organic unity. Peleus is the best mortal - the best consolation; and the scorned Zeus has no reason to console Thetis.

Thetis as Zeus' gift does, however, sit neatly with Peleus' sophrosune - his reverence towards Zeus Xenios (N.5.33f). This is the feature which elevates Peleus above the run of mortal man and makes him approach the divine; it explains why he deserves a goddess.

But this is only half the story: it does not explain why he deserves this goddess; why she should marry a mortal. One explanation - Zeus' anger - may have been at least part of the answer to this question in the Catalogue. But it cannot originally have been the only reason - for then Zeus would have no cause to give Thetis the consolation of the best mortal. We need an alternative explanation for Thetis' debarment from a

Schwartz suggests that Zeus' gift to Peleus is his reward for the destruction of Akastos and his city and for his chastity (Ps-Hesiodeia 396). But why should Peleus be rewarded in such a grand fashion for the destruction of Iolkos?

14 Lesky, Epos 406f.

15 As, if Σ.ΤV ΙΙ.13.350 can be believed, the dithyrambic poet Melanippides did:

Ἐαυτῷ θέου μελανιππίδης κύνουσαν ἄνδρα δίδων θέτων ἐκδοθήμεναι Πηλεῖ διὰ τὰ θησεύτα ὑπὸ προμηθέως ἦτοι θέμιδος.

(PMG 765)
divine marriage, which does not preclude Zeus' award of her, in consolation, to the best of mortals.

The obvious candidate for this alternative reason is a φέρτερον πατέρος prophecy along the lines of the version of I.8:

εἶπε δ' εὐθυλος ἐν μέσωι θέμις,
εὔνεκεν πεπρωμένου ἣν, φέρτερον πατέρος
ἀνακτα γόνον τεχεῖν
ποιτίαν θεῶν, ἐς κεραυ-

νοῦ τε κρέασιν ἄλλο βέλος
diωξει χερί τριόδου-

tός τ' ἀμαιμακέτου, Ζηνὶ μισχομένων

η Δίὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν.

(I.8.31-35a)

On this model, Zeus has no reason to feel enmity for Thetis; and every reason to attempt to pacify her with the best marriage that will not endanger his rule. I would suggest that Zeus' award of Thetis to Peleus, which appears in the Catalogue, must originally have gone hand in hand with this explanation of her marriage to a mortal.

Now, this story, in I.8, has been perceived as an ad hoc reworking of the archetypical succession myth. This sophistication obscures the intuition that, when a mortal man marries a goddess, the issue is a son stronger than the father. The story explains the marvellous Achilles.

Is there any evidence which might confirm the existence of this story before Pindar? First, there is the interest of the gods in the wedding: their presence and their presents. Both are securely attested in the Iliad. Hera reminds the gods of

16 As at Theog.886ff: Köhnken, Gods and Descendants 34 n.19.
their attendance (24.62f). Peleus’ armour and his spear are both named as wedding gifts. Now, the gods’ participation sits far more happily with the story of their narrow escape from a son mightier than Zeus than with that of Thetis’ refusal of Zeus and her condemnation to a mortal marriage. This point is an embarrassment to those who suggest that the prophecy is Pindar’s invention.

Secondly, a puzzling line in the Iliad may provide oblique testimony for the existence of the story. When Achilles asks his mother to ask Zeus temporarily to help the Trojans, he reminds her of the past services she has done the god. In particular, of the occasion on which, when Zeus’ rule was threatened by Hera, Poseidon and Athena, Thetis enlisted the hekatoncheir Briareos/Aigaion to help him:

\[
\text{ἀλλὰ οὐ τὸν γ’ ἔλθοις, θεά, ὑπελύσασαι θεοῖς,}
\text{ἐχ’ ἑκατόχειρον καλέσοσαι ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλύμπου,}
\text{ἐν Βριαρεῶν καλέουσαι θεοῖς, ἄνδρες δὲ τε πάντες}
\text{Ἀγαίων’— δὲ γὰρ αὕτη βίην οὗ πατρὸς ἀμείνων—}
\text{ἐς βα παρὰ Κρονίων καθέζετο κύδει γαίω.}
\]

(II.1.401-5)

The puzzling line here is 404, which must—because of γὰρ—explain something that has gone before; but, what?

---

17 17.195f, 18.83-5; 16.144, 19.390f. (On the spear, see below, p.116f.)

18 Lesky, Epos 402ff.

19 contra Lesky’s thesis that the Themisvariante is pre-Homeric, March writes: “In an ideally logical world this might indeed be so. But myths do not as a rule develop in such a perfectly rational manner; and the fact remains that the first we hear about this Themis-variant is in Pindar. It must be counted very rash indeed to insist that it must in fact be two or three hundred years older than this” (Creative Poet 10).
One possibility is that it explains why Thetis called in Briareos. For this interpretation, we must assume that Briareos/Aigaion's father was Poseidon. This has a certain specious attractiveness. First, it is testified by Σ. AD. II. 1. 399 and Σ. Townl. II. 1. 404. Secondly, Aigaion or Aigaios may have been a cult name of Poseidon, who was certainly worshipped at Aegae. Thirdly, Aigaion is an ἐνάλιος δαίμων ὁ τις καὶ η ὁ σύγχροις λαμβανομένη πρὸς τὸν Ποσειδώνα λόγου έξει (Σ. A. II. 1. 404a).

I shall consider the last two points, which certainly suggest some link between Aigaion and Poseidon, below. On the first head, one would be more inclined to believe this genealogy if it appeared elsewhere than in explanation of this line. A much more plausible genealogy for Briareos is given by Hesiod: he is son of Gaie and Ouranos (Theog. 147–9), and for (Briareos/)Aigaion, in the Titanomachia:

τὸν δὲ Αἰγαίων "Ἡλιοδός (Theog. 149) φησι Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Γῆς. Βριάρεως δὲ καὶ Αἰγαίων καὶ Γύγης δ ἀδότος λέγεται συμβιβασμός. Εὔμηλος δὲ ἐν τῇ Τιτανομαχίᾳ τὸν Αἰγαίων Γῆς καὶ Πόντου φησὶ παιδα, κατοικίσατο δὲ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τοῖς Τιτάσι συμμαχεῖν (Titanomachia EGF F 3 = fr. 3 B)

Both these genealogies send Briareos/Aigaion back where he belongs, before the settled rule of the Olympians. The

---

21 e.g. Call. fr. 59.6; Vian, Geants de la Mer 108 n.5. For the moment, I skirt the difficulty of the double name.
22 cf Eust ad 403f (124.42).
genealogy by which he is Poseidon's son now resembles a scholarly invention to solve the problem of line 404.

The second line of interpretation is that the parenthesis explains the name Aigaion. One approach is to understand the thought of the line as: "men call him Aigaion, after his father, Poseidon - for he is stronger than his father." This is open to the same objections as the interpretation above, and more, besides. And so it has been argued that the explanation of the name is an etymologizing one: the name, ultimately from the same stem as $\delta \varepsilon \zeta (="creature which moves nimbly"), means "the swifter one." Whatever the merits of this etymology, it seems implausible that Homer should say "men call him the Swifter one, because he was stronger than his father".

This is a real puzzle. The uncontroversial variant in Zenodotus' text - ὅ γὰρ σὺν θυμῷ ἔπειτα ἔτοιμον, ἀλλὰ δὲν ἔστησε, ναὶ εἰπάτω, ὅπο τὰρταρον ἑπάξεται - may well reflect the fact that he could see no solution.

An attractive solution is offered by Willcock, who suggests that Homer is here adapting traditional material, but that line 404 is a scrap of that traditional material which intrudes without being assimilated. His model is the story of Niobe in Iliad 24 (601-19). Achilles tells Priam the story to encourage him to end his fast and eat: even Niobe, who had lost twelve children, ate in the end (613). Traditionally, however,

23 There is no comparative force in the name - which might well not be a patronymic anyway: Kirk on 403f.
she did not, but was turned to stone. And petrifaction does occur in Achilles' story, but in an unprecedented and unmotivated place: λαοῦς λίθους ποίησε Κρονίων (611). So, Homer has adapted the traditional myth to make his point; and included this detail, the motif of petrifaction, although it no longer has a place in the new narrative.²⁶

The Iliad 1 passage is broadly similar. Here, the narrative is not strictly a paradigm of behaviour, but a reminder that Zeus owes Thetis a great favour. This, Braswell has shown, is a typically Homeric technique: if an individual wants a favour, he or she must point to reciprocal services.²⁷ That the story of the revolt is an invention of the poet seems indicated by the identity of the three gods who staged it — the three gods who now support the Greeks, and who must therefore be balked if Zeus does what Thetis wants.²⁸ The argument neatly shows that Thetis is Zeus' traditional ally against Hera, Athena and Poseidon; that Zeus owes her a favour, and has an opportunity to pay them something back, to boot.

On this model, line 404, irrelevant in its new context, resembles 24.611, the detail that the people turned to stone. Like that, it must have functioned happily in its old context. So the inference naturally follows that the source material from which Homer produced the narrative of 393-407 was the

²⁶ Willcock, Mythological Paradeigma 141f; see also M. L. Lang, "Reverberation and Mythology in the Iliad", in C. Rubino and S. Shelmerdine (eds.), Approaches to Homer (Austin, 1983), 140-64, here 144.

²⁷ Braswell, Mythological Innovation 18f and passim.

²⁸ Willcock, Mythological Paradeigma 143.
prophecy story, which featured, as well as the motif of the child stronger than his father, Thetis' assistance in averting a threat to Zeus' rule.\textsuperscript{29} This argument is, I think, persuasive. I add only a suggestion on the double name of Briareos/Aigaion, which accounts for the apparent connexion between Aigaion and Poseidon that has suggested their genealogical relation. Willcock argues that Briareos is named here, because he is traditionally a helper of Zeus, having fought with him against the Titans.\textsuperscript{30} But, by the same token, he is also a helper of Poseidon and, indeed, marries his daughter at Theog. 816-8. Aigaion appears here, I suggest, because he is traditionally an enemy of Poseidon, who kills him in the gigantomachy:

\begin{quote}
Κινεῖσθαι δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἡρακλείᾳ φησὶν ὅτι Αἰγαίων καταγωγικός ὤποι Ποσειδώνος καταγεννήθη εἰς τὸν νῦν λεγόμενον ὤποι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὥριον Αἰγαίωνος, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ βριαρέων καλῶν.
\end{quote}

(Cinaetho Heracleia fr. 7 B = ECF Heracl. s.v. Cinaetho)\textsuperscript{31}

The composite figure, then, is exactly suitable for the role of Zeus' ally against Poseidon. Whatever the causality, their antagonism is another expression of the relation which others have seen as consanguinity.\textsuperscript{32}

Together with the circumstantial evidence of the gods' participation in the wedding feast, this analysis of II.1.404

\begin{itemize}
\item Willcock, Mythological Paradeigma 143.
\item Mythological Paradeigma 147: Theog. 617ff.
\item (See also FGrH 26 F 2) cf Callim. fr. 459; A.R. 1.1165.
\item Vian, Géants de la Mer 234.
\item Vian, Géants de la Mer 108-10.
\end{itemize}
powerfully suggests that the prophecy version existed long before Pindar.

So what happened to the Themis-variant between its adaptation by Homer to provide the paradeigma in *Iliad* 1 and its reappearance in *I.8*? We cannot be sure that it did not appear in the *Cypria*, or in the *Catalogue*. But it probably did not. There is neither evidence nor logical necessity for it to have appeared in either work. Later versions of the prophecy use Pindar as their source.33

33 That there is a causal connexion between *I.8* and the *Prometheus Bound* is indubitable. *PV* 768 recalls *I.8*.31-4; 922, *I.8*.34; and the introduction of Poseidon, who plays no part in the plot of the play, at *PV* 924f is explicable by appeal to his role in the poem. The easiest explanation is that the author of the *PV* knew *I.8* (Farnell, *Works* 2.380; Köhnken, *Gods and Descendants* 33f n.19). This is confirmed by a comparison of the descriptions of the eruption of Etna at *PV* 352-369 and *P.1*.15-30, where, again, the dramatist seems to have followed Pindar (M. Griffith, "Aeschylus, Sicily and Prometheus", in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle and P. E. Easterling (eds.), *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by former pupils, presented to Sir Denys Page* (Cambridge, 1978), 105-139, here 118-120). *P.1* is firmly dated to 470 (Σ. init); and so if its priority is established, that of *I.8*, which must have been written shortly after the Persian Wars (Carey, 5 *Odes* 184), follows. (The view that the author of the *PV* and Pindar shared a source has been revived by L. M. Slatkin, *The Power of Thetis* (Berkeley, 1991), 74 n.23.)

Apollonius, who uses both scorned god and prophecy motifs (4.790-809), appears to have switched source for the latter, to Pindar (799; Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit* 76; Hubbard, *Aiakos* 12, who points out the similarity of A.R.4.801 - πέρωται ἀμείνονα πατρὸς ἄοτο παῖδα τέκειν - and *I.8*.36).

Finally, Apollodorus’ account reveals the contraposition of the versions of Pindar, the *Prometheus Bound*, and the *Cypria* (Stoneman, *Mythological Tradition* 59-61):

αὕθες δὲ γαμεῖς Θέτιν τὴν Ίηνέως, περὶ ἢς τοῦ γάμου Ζεύς καὶ Ποσειδών ἤρεσεν, θέμισε δὲ θεσπισθούσης ἔσειεται τὸν ἐκ ταύτης γεννηθέντα κρέατον τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπέσχοτο. ἦσεν δὲ φασὶ, Δίδω δριμύτως ἐπὶ τὴν ταύτης αὐλοῦ, εἰρεχέναι Προμηθέα τὸν ἐκ ταύτης αὐτῇ γεννηθέντα οὐρανοῦ δυναστεύειν. τινὲς δὲ λέγοντι Θέτιν μὴ βουληθήσαι Δίι συνελθεῖν
But the Themis variant was somehow preserved for Pindar to use. Must we, then, posit an otherwise unknown epic – a Themis poem, or a Peleus poem? Safer, I think, to appeal only to informal folkloric tradition, which endured amongst those who would wish to celebrate Peleus.  

There is some evidence that Pindar knew the Aeginetan folklore which treated this episode, but which did not penetrate the accounts of the cyclic epics. He describes Peleus:

παλαιὸς δ’ ἐν ἀρεταῖς

γέγαθε Πηλέως ἄναξ, ὑπέραλλον αἴχμα ταῦτ’.

(N.3.32f)

Peleus did have a famous spear, but did not cut it himself:

κατὰ γὰρ τὸν Πηλέως καὶ θέτιδος γάμον οἱ θεοὶ

συμβηκήντοι εἰς τὸ Πηλίου ἐπ’ εὔωχία ἐκόμιζον

Πηλεῖ δώρα, χείρων δὲ μελίαν εὐθαλῆ τεμών εἰς δόρυ

παρέσχεν. φαίοι μὲν Ἀθηνᾶν ἔδεικε αὐτό, ὡς ἤφαιαν

δὲ κατασκεύαζαι. τοῦτο δὲ τῷ δόρατι καὶ Πηλεὺς ἐν

ταῖς μάχαις ἱροτευεὶ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς. ἡ

ιστορία παρὰ τῷ τὰ Κύρης ποιῆματι.

(Cypria fr.3 B = EGF F 3)

34 This version of the myth better celebrates Peleus and Achilles than that in which Peleus’ bride is awarded by Hera. Thetis is not a cast-off, but a goddess who must be mollified with the best possible mortal. (And so it has been explained as Pindar’s innovation – as if Aegina’s interest could only be expressed by him (Pini, Correzioni 334).) Lesky held that the influence of the Themis variant on later accounts must indicate that it was a poem (Epos 402). But all these later accounts look to Pindar: it is he who institutes the variant into the canon.

35 Lesky suggested (RE s.v. Peleus 306f) that the spear was Chiron’s gift before the wedding; but there is no evidence for this (Jouan, Euripide 85 n.3).
This spear is a datum in the Iliad:

\[
\text{ἐξ δὲ ἄρα οὐρίγγος πατρῶ' ἔσπάσατ' ἔγχος,}
\]

\[
\text{βρυθ' μέγα στιβαρόν τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλος Ἀχαῖ' πάλλειν, ὀλλὰ μιν οἷς ἐπίστατο πῆλαι Ἀκιλλεύς,}
\]

\[
\text{Πηλίάδα μελίνη, τὴν πατρί φίλῳ πόρε Χείρων}
\]

\[
\text{Πηλίου ἐξ κορυφῆς, φόνου ἐχθρεῖαν ἤρώεσαν.}
\]

\[(II.19.387-91)\]

Severyns argued that the ability to wield the spear was then adapted by the Little Iliad: it became a knack, rather than a matter of strength, taught by Chiron to Peleus and then to Achilles. Two scholia give the information:

\[
\text{οἱ δὲ πλάττονται λέγοντες ὡς Πηλεὺς μὲν παρὰ Χείρωνος ἔμαθε τὴν χρήσιν αὐτῆς, Ἀκιλλεύς δὲ παρὰ Πηλέως, ὅ δὲ οὐδένα ἐδιδαξεν. καὶ δὲ τῆς μικρᾶς 'Ἰλιάδος ποιητῆς:}
\]

\[
\text{ἀμφὶ δὲ πόρης χρύσεος ἀστράπτει καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δίκροος αἰχμή (Σ.Τ.II.16.142)}
\]

\[
\text{('ἔγχος ἐξ θανότοιο): οὐκ ἔχει παραδομῆς δὲ θάνατον εἶπε τὸ βόρυ τοῦ Ἀκιλλέως.... ἄλλῳ ἔτι ἐδιδάσκετε παρὰ τὰ ἄλλα κατακεύσατο. δίκροον γὰρ, ὡστε δύο ἀκμὰς ἔχειν καὶ μεῖζον βολὴν διὰ τὰ τραύματα ἀπεργάζεσθαι...}
\]

\[(Σ. Ν.6.55)
\]

\[(Ilias Parva EGF F 5 = fr. 5 B)\]

But it may be that the more bizarre characteristics of the spear are in fact prior to the Iliadic account of it. Paton suggested that the spear is one of three magical gifts presented to Peleus (the others are his horses and armour). The

\[36\text{ cf II.16.140ff; 21.162; 22.133.} \]

\[37\text{ CE 338-42.} \]

\[38\text{ W. R. Paton, "The Armour of Achilles", CR 26 (1912), 1-4, here 2f.} \]
magic spear never missed, and returned to its thrower. Homer rationalizes this, as we should expect: when thrown, it is returned, but only by divine intervention. 39

Pindar goes even further, ruling out the possibility of the magic spear by denying that Chiron supplied it. This is a typical rejection of the association of the supernatural with the human. 40 It is a sufficient explanation for this apparent mythological oddity; but in fact Pindar’s readiness to write of an alternative source of the spear indicates that he had authority for that alternative source. 41 I would suggest that an informal Aeginetan story told of Peleus making his own spear, but that it has been utterly obscured – apart from N.3.33 – by the epic version.

There is no explicit evidence, but a suggestive parallel is provided by the case of Herakles and his club. There were two aetiologies for the club: one, which made the club extraordinary (e.g. made of bronze: [Pisander] fr. 13 B); and one which stressed Herakles’ autarkeia, in which he cut it himself

39 Il.20.322ff, 22.276ff; see Janko on 16.130-54.
40 Grant, Folk tale 32f.
41 These considerations considerably weaken the case of the critic who sees here innovative mythology that benefits the poem. Hubbard argues that the spear is an implement, and thus the product of techne, superimposed on Peleus’ physis (32) – which functions in the web of opposition of the two which recurs through the poem (Pindaric Mind 39-41). Carey sees self-reliance, which is exemplified by the making of the spear, as central (3 Myths 157-160). There is something in both explanations; but I should use them to explain the choice of myth and details recounted.
from a tree (e.g. Apoll. 2.4.11). I am suggesting a similarly bifid tradition about Peleus' spear.

The presence of otherwise unknown traditional material at N.3.33, for which it is not unreasonable to posit an Aeginetan source, strengthens the possibility that the prophecy too was known in local folklore. It suggests the existence of material known to Pindar and otherwise unknown to us, which dealt with the adventures of Peleus. That it was material preserved in Aeginetan folklore is suggested also by the favourable depiction of Peleus in both the prophecy version (Thetis is not a cast-off, but the award of Zeus) and the story of his self-sufficient arming.

In sum: the most persuasive reason for believing that the prophecy version was earlier than Pindar is Willcock's interpretation of Il.1.404. The interest of the gods in the wedding is circumstantial evidence. The necessity of an explanation of the wedding between mortal and goddess impinges even upon the Iliad, and there is a hint even there of the confusion of two explanations, in the data of Peleus' excellence, and Hera's fostering of Thetis. Certainly, if the Catalogue used the motif of Zeus scorned, it combined it with Peleus' excellence –

42 Wilamowitz on Herakles 471.

43 Note also the confused tradition about Achilles' first set of armour. In the Iliad, it is that which the gods gave Peleus at his wedding (e.g. 18.82-5); but elsewhere, it is a new set which Thetis presents to Achilles in Phthia (Eur. Il.442ff; Edwards, Neoanalysis 317-9; S. G. Miller, "Eros and the Arms of Achilles", AJA 90 (1986), 159-70, here 161-3. Is the implication that, on this tradition, Peleus has no divine armour to pass on to his son?
which combination seems artificial. Hypothesizing the early
existence of the prophecy version explains these anomalies.

That, then, is a possible model of the history of the
prophecy version. But critics have almost unanimously argued
that the story is Pindar's invention; or, at least, that parts
of it (the rivalry of Zeus and Poseidon, or the role of Themis)
are. I shall consider Kñochnen's arguments as representative.

First, he shows that there is no evidence for the roles of
either Themis or Poseidon in earlier versions.

Themis is a favourite figure with Pindar (0.9.15; 0.8.22); and elaborate prophecies are a favourite device (e.g.
Medea's in P.4). In Pindar's other treatments of the story,
Peleus is selected by Zeus; but in I.8, the marriage is pre­
sented as Themis' suggestion.

Against this, Themis appeared before the wedding of Peleus
and Thetis at the beginning of the Cypria:

Zευς θεός, θεός ἡ θεότης ἄνθρωπος θεότης, παραγωγή
καὶ ἀναγορά λόγου. Εἰς ἐν τοῖς ἑδωκοείων των

44 Σ.Ι.Β.37b; Farnell, Works 2.379f; Kñochnen, Gods and Descend­
ants 33f n.19; Hubbard, Aïakos 10-16. One exception is
Stoneman, who attempts to show that the Cypria contained the
substance of the story (Mythological Tradition 59-62). But it
is an impossible task. An entirely different kind of argument
leads L. M. Slatkin, The Power of Thetis (Berkeley, 1991) to
conclude that Pindar's account is highly traditional (76f
n.26).

45 Zeus and Poseidon: Norwood, Pindar 146f; Themis' role: Van
der Kolf, Quaeritur 62. The prophecy but not the quarrel
between Zeus and Poseidon: Fehr, Mythen 44-50.

46 Gods and Descendants 33f n.19, implicitly endorsed by Carey,
5 Odes 195. Stoneman ignores Kñochnen.

47 Or, with van der Kolf, Quaeritur 62, the Aeginetans.
There is nothing surprising about the appearance here of Themis, who "prêside à la justice, a dans la poême un rôle allégorique comme Nêmêsis, la déesse qui reprime les excès humains. Elle est d’autant plus à sa place qu’elle est elle-même fille de la Terre, qu’elle est à l’origine un doublet de Gaïa et que son rôle prophétique est bien connu." 49

In the context of the events of the cycle, Themis and Zeus are discussing Zeus’ plan for the earth’s depopulation. But it is a golden opportunity for any one who wants to give Zeus a prophecy to explain the marriage of Peleus to Thetis. We need not posit that it was Pindar, who likes Themis. And, in the scholium which supplies the Cypria fragment, is faint evidence of the introduction of the topic into the discussion of depopulation:

[Zeus] συμμετέχω τῇ Μόμοις χρησάμενος, ἂν Δίας βουλὴν ὁμοράς φησιν - ἐπειδὴ οἶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἢ καταχλυσμοίς πάντας διαφθείρειν, ὡς τοῖς Μόμοις κυλύσαντος, ὁποθεμένου δὲ αὐτῷ γνώμαις δύο, τὴν Θέτιδος θυητογάμισαν καὶ θυγατρῶς καλὴν γένναν, ἐς ἐν ἀμφότερων πόλεμος Ἐλληνός τε καὶ βαρβάρως ἐγένετο, ὥς οὐ συνέβη κουφισθῆναι τὴν Γῆν, πολλῶν

48 Θέτιδος, not Θέμιδος, is the MS reading. But see Jouan, Euripide 46f. That the latter is right is confirmed by Plato, Republic 379e, who writes of δεῖν ἔριν τε καὶ κρίσιν διὰ Θέμιδος τε καὶ Δίος. The immediately subsequent mention of the marriage of Peleus explains the easy scribal slip (which occurs also in some MSS of Apoll. 3.13.5, which describes the same incident).

49 Jouan, Euripide 47; Davies, Epic Cycle 35; cf J. E. Harrison, Themis² (Cambridge, 1927), 480ff, on Themis’ prophetic powers.
Whether Momos figured in the Cypria, or whether the wedding was seen as a means of depopulation in that poem, is unimportant for my purpose. I doubt that either was the case. But the scholium does show that discussion of the necessity of Thetis marrying Peleus was at some point introduced into the traditional discussion about depopulation. This discussion is elsewhere the province of Themis and Zeus; and so it is not implausible to posit that Themis told Zeus of the φέρταρον πατέρος prophecy.

But we must see Pindar's own hand in the length and scope of the prophecy. An excellent parallel is provided by the Muses' song in N.5, which is begun at 26, but nowhere clearly ended. It is a similar narrative device at work in I.8, where, although Themis' prophecy is formally closed (45), its closing section (41-5) exceeds any likely content. Themis' speech is, to this extent, a narrative device.

The case for the novelty in I.8 of Poseidon's appearance in the story is reinforced by the appeal to the demands of the occasion or of the poem which explain his introduction. Köhnken explains his prominence: "it is a poetical device to

---

50 See Jouan, Euripide 46-50; and Davies, Epic Cycle 35 for a crisp judgement.
51 Robbins, Nereids 29.
52 Van der Kolf also sees the improbability of 41ff being prophetic, and solves the problem by claiming that they simply give Themis' opinion (τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν...(38)). I shall return to this question (below, p.134).
honour the god of the Isthmus who is responsible for Kle-andros'... Isthmian success." Bowra writes of the exag​geration of the danger facing the gods: there are now two problems which must be solved - the prophecy and this rivalry between Zeus and Poseidon (I.8.42f). 54

Köhnken's explanation goes no way towards establishing what he must for his argument: that Poseidon's role in this ode is Pindar's invention. And Bowra's explanation would not simply apply to Pindar's narrative, but any telling of this story. It will always be in the narrator's interest to exaggerate the height of the precipice at the brink of which the Olympians teeter, and from which they are pulled back by Peleus' marriage to Thetis. Why should any narrator choose Poseidon, and not some other god? Because Poseidon is of almost equal power to Zeus, and because he is Zeus' rival in the Iliad, in his opposition to Zeus' support of the Trojans. 55

Corroborative evidence for Poseidon's role in the story prior to I.8 may be given by a line of N.5, in which he appears. Köhnken has satisfactorily explained the encomiastic motivation behind this appearance: he is mentioned because Isthmian victories are celebrated. But as they are not of

53 Gods and Descendants 28.

54 Pindar 308f, endorsed by Carey, 5 Odes 195. Hubbard ingeniously creates a parallel between the enmity between Thebes and Aegina and Zeus and Poseidon; but it is too subtle (Aiakos 14-16).

55 Severyns, CE 249. He is one of the three who, according to Achilles, sought to overthrow Zeus (II.1.400). And so he is mentioned in the paradigmatic use of the traditional material of this story. Might he already have had a role in the story, which Homer redefined for his purpose?
central importance (contrast I.8), his role is slight. So Poseidon's introduction into the narration of the myth is a bridge to the Isthmus.\(^5^6\) Now, he is described as Thetis' γαμβρός:

\[
\text{δ} \text{ δ' εἰς φράσθη κατένευσεν τέ οι δραστεφθεὶς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς, ὦτ' ἐν τάχει ποιήσαι χρυσαλακότων τινὰ Νη-}
\text{ρείδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν, γαμβρὸν Ποσειδώνων πείσας, ὃς Ἀιγέθεν ποτὶ κλει-}
\text{τὰν θρόνα νίσεται Ἡθομόν Δωρίαν.}
\]

(N.5.34-37)

In the main, critics translate γαμβρὸν as "relation by marriage"; and accept that this is a reflection of the datum of Poseidon's marriage to Amphitrite, a Nereid.\(^5^7\) But why, as a matter of mythology, should Zeus need to persuade Poseidon, the Nereids' kinsman?\(^5^8\)

An attractive solution is to translate γαμβρός not as "relation by marriage", but "suitor". Servius noted that

---

\(^{56}\) Gods and Descendants 28; cf Carey, Two Transitions 293.

\(^{57}\) So Hubbard, Aiakos 10f: N.5 "simply identifies the latter [sc. Poseidon] as the brother in law of the Nereids, persuaded by Zeus to consent to Thetis' marriage with Peleus." Equally, neither Gärtner, Siegeslieder 35f, nor Carey, Two Transitions 290-5 questions Poseidon's role.

\(^{58}\) Farnell claims that Poseidon is "naturally [Thetis'] guardian who can settle her in marriage" (Works 2.277). "Ihr ἄρπος ist ihr Vater Nereus; daß Poseidon ihre Schwester Amphitrite zur Frau hat, gibt ihm kein recht" (Wilamowitz, Pindaros 175).

Foglemark saw the problem, but reacted perversely, concluding that it "will only make sense as a proleptic predicative, pace Farnell" (KAI KEINOIZ 76 n.16). Robbins, too, sees the problem and claims that the surprising mention "surely emphasizes Lampon's relationship to Euthymenes, who will be the victor of the catalogue" (Nereids 27). This does not convince.
Pindar ἐν τοῖς παιδικοί παιδικοί and Sappho used generum... pro marito. 59

In fact, Sappho and Theocritus use γαμβρός for "bridegroom". 60

Slater gives the sense "betrothed" for two occasions in Pindar. In 0.7.4, the meaning "connexion by marriage" might be better: the groom is handed the bowl by his new father-in-law. P.9.116 is a better example: Danaos made arrangements for his forty-eight daughters,

(σὸν δ' ἄδελφος ἐξέλευεν διακριναί παῖδιν,
ἀντεις σχῆσα τις ἦρω- 

σὸν, δοίοι γαμβρόι σφυν ἥλθον. )

(Ρ.9.115f)

γαμβρόι σφυν must, here, capture the relation between suitor and bride.

If the meaning "suitor" is allowed, γαμβρόν Ποσειδώνα πείδος in N.5 makes sense: Zeus persuades Thetis' suitor Poseidon to leave her alone. 61 Given that N.5 predates I.8, 62 the conclusion is that the story in which Poseidon is Zeus' rival for Thetis must also have been earlier.

March notes that the iconography shows only Zeus, and never Zeus and Poseidon pursuing Thetis. 63 But this is consistent with their rivalry being a part of the prophecy version, and so outside the main stream of the development of the story.

59 ad Georg.1.31; cf Pollux Onomasticon 3.31, who distinguishes γαμβρός and παιδικός but adds that poets change the usage: Σαπφώ (fr. 116 L-P) μέντοι καὶ τῶν ἄνδρα συντόν γαμβρόν καλεῖ.

60 fr. 99, 111 L-P; index s.v.; Theoc. 15.129; see Gow ad loc.

61 As Fehr translates: "nachdem er ihren Bräutigam Poseidon überredet hatte..." (Mythen, 48f).

62 It is dated to 483 by H. Maehler, Die Lieder des Bakchylides (Leiden, 1982), 2.250f.

63 Creative Poet 10 n.47.
Köhnken's second argument for the invention of the prophecy version by Pindar is that we may discern his sources in other stories. The implication is that, if he had these remote sources in mind, he was not following some closer version.

But the similarity between Pindar's story and the story of Metis in the Theogony shows only that they are both developments of similar motifs. There are certainly verbal similarities between Pindar and [Hesiod] here. Pindar's κρέσανο τε κρέσιν άλλο βέλος (I.8.37) recalls part of an alternative description of the birth of Athena: Zeus swallows Metis,

Δείδας μὴ τέξῃ κρατερότερον άλλο κρέσανον

([Hes.] fr.343.8)

But there are echoes of the Hesiodic corpus throughout Pindar's work. If the echo is especially significant here, it may still be explained. I have suggested that the prophecy version, although likely to be familiar in Aeginetan folklore, was not incorporated within the canon of mythology previously to I.8. Then Pindar will need to find literary language to express it; and I shall argue that he must also attempt securely to canonize it. Both these demands suggest the appropriation of literary language used elsewhere in similar contexts.

Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 181-91. The Metis story as narrated in the Theogony is certainly not an Ur-form of the myth: see West on 886-900.

Further, Pindar's description of Zeus' assent to Themis' suggestion (I.8.45af), resembles an Iliadic model:

"Η καὶ κυμάνθησιν ἐπ' ἀφρότιθ' ἔνθε φρατικών
ἀμφόροις δ' ἔδρα χαίται ἐπεπέρωσεντο ἀνακτος
κρατός ἐπ' ἀθανάτοιον"

(II.1.528-30)

Farnell, Works 2.382.
Finally, Köhnken argues that the basic features of the Zeus-Peleus-Thetis-Achilles myth are constant elsewhere in Pindar, and that they accord with the accounts in Hesiod and Homer. 66

But this argument, too, can be turned. What features of 1.8 are actually at odds with features elsewhere? Only, I think, the prominent role of Themis, which I have described above. And even this does not disqualify Thetis from being the gift of Zeus, as she is at N.5.34ff. 67 At I.8.38-40, Themis describes Thetis as a γέρας θεόμορφη, for the εὐσεβεστάτου Peleus. Her suggested plan is still endorsed by Zeus.

Peleus' piety, central in the Nemeans, cannot, as I have said, be the whole story. It does not explain why he deserves this goddess. The absence of the prophecy motif from those poems (apart from the hint at N.5.37) is simply a matter of focus. 68

In sum, there is a deal which might be said once the innovation of the myth of 1.8 had been demonstrated; but nothing which goes any way towards the demonstration itself; and nothing which counters the suggestions of its antiquity which I advanced above.

---

66 I concentrate on the difference between the 1.8 story and the treatment in the other odes.

67 As Köhnken says: "The essential fact is that the marriage of Thetis in Isthmian 8 is presented as being conferred upon Peleus as a divine favour" ("Two Notes on Pindar", BICS 25 (1978), 92-6, here 94.

68 As Köhnken suggests, but seems to ignore (Gods and Descendants 27).
I consider that the prophecy motif was of pre-Iliadic antiquity, but lay relatively unknown, in the shadow of the scorned god motif, until recovered from Aeginetan folklore and published by Pindar. Negative evidence suggests that the prophecy motif was used in neither the Catalogue nor the Cypria; but it did leave some trace of its existence in the former in the notion of Thetis as Zeus' reward; and in the latter in the interest of the gods in the wedding. The words τὸ παραπλησίον ([Hes.] fr. 210 = Cypria fr. 2 (I) B = EGF F 2) suggest that the scorned god motif figured in both Catalogue and Cypria.69

We have seen how Pindar follows the Catalogue through Peleus' adventures in Iolkos. But then he incorporates local Aeginetan material into the motivation for the marriage; and, presumably, uses the Cypria for the wedding. We cannot tell what elements of his accounts came from which source; but, by comparing N.3, 4, 5; P.3 and I.8, we can reconstruct a complete narrative, which is neither inconsistent nor illogical.

Pindar places the wrestling match with Thetis after the sack of Iolkos:

[Peleus] Ἄιολχόν εἶλε μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς,
καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν
ἐγχοιτῆς.

(N.3.34-6)

This must have been the order of the Catalogue.70

69 But I do not think that the Catalogue dwelt at length upon the episode of the marriage; the Cypria must have been the definitive account. So Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 396, contra Wilamowitz, Pindaros 174-7. But certainty is impossible.

70 Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 395f; I have mentioned March's alternative reconstruction (Creative Poet 19f) above (p.98 n.66).
It is Peleus' behaviour at Iolkos which moves Zeus to reward him:

εὖθυς δ' ἀπανάματο νύμφαν,
 εὐμίπον πατρὸς χόλου
 δείσας: δ' δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευ-
 σέν τε οἱ δραστεφθείς ἐξ οὐδανοῦ
 Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς, ὥστ' εὖ τάχει
 ποιήσαι χρυσαλαχάτων τινὰ Ἡ-
 ρείδων πράξειν ἀκοιτίν.

(N.S.33-36)

There is nothing here to contradict the account of I.8, where, implicitly, it is Peleus' behaviour at Iolkos which establishes him as worthy of Thetis (and so the best consolation for her, forbidden to marry an immortal):

τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν, Πηλέω τέρας θεόμορον
 ὑπάσσαι γάμον Αἰαξίδη,
 δὲν τ' εὐσεβεστάτατον φάτις
 'Ἰαολωῦ τράφειν πεδίου'

..................

..................δίς φάτο Κρονίδας
 ἐνυπόκοιτα θεά: τοῖ δ' ἐπὶ γλεφάροις
 νεώταυν ἀθανάτοισιν: ἐπέων δὲ καρπάς
 οὗ κατέφθειε.

(I.8.38-40, 45-46a)

Nor is there any difficulty in the contraposition of either passage with N.4.61 (on which see below); or P.3.95, which describes Peleus' good luck in his marriage as Διὸς χάριν.

Themis suggests that Chiron be told of her scheme (I.8.41). We know that he trained Peleus for his wrestling match with Thetis (see below); so it is tempting to presume

71 "Peleus won Thetis because he respected Zeus Xenios; this is the essence of the tale" (Bury, Nemeans 82).
that he was the gods' intermediary in the whole business; and that it was he who told Peleus of his bride.\textsuperscript{72}

It may be that the next part of the story is mentioned in a difficult line in I.8:

\[\text{δς φάτο Κρονίδας έννεποιος θεός τοι δ' επι γλεψάρας μενούν διαμάτωνιν επέων δὲ χαρπός οὗ κατέθεινε. φαντί μὴ εὖν \'ἀλέγειν και γάμον Θεός ά-\nμακτα, και νεαρὸν \'ἐδείξαν σοφῶν στόματ' \'ἀπείροισιν \'αρετὰν ΄Αχιλέος'}\]

(I.8.45-8)

There are two textual difficulties here. Snell-Maehler read Hermann's \(\varepsilon \upsilon \nu\) \'ἀλέγειν rather than the unmetrical \(\sigmaυ\alphaλέγειν\) of the MSS, which Carey has, however, defended.\textsuperscript{73} \(\sigmaυ\alphaκτα\) BD (47), retained by Snell-Maehler, poses a problem of identity. The best emendation satisfying sense and metre is to the dual, \(\sigmaυ\alphaκτε\) (Triclinius).\textsuperscript{74}

Little confidence is possible here. It would seem tautologous to have any god (\(\sigmaυ\alphaκτα = \text{Zeus}, \text{or} \; \sigmaυ\alphaκτε = \text{Zeus and Poseidon}\) as the subject of \(\varepsilon \upsilon \nu\) \'ἀλέγειν or \(\sigmaυ\alphaλέγειν\); but Carey argues that this is artifice.\textsuperscript{75} For the point is that they contributed even \(καὶ\) to the marriage - "from which they had every right to stand aloof under the circumstances."\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{72} March, \textit{Creative Poet} 12.

\textsuperscript{73} S \textit{Odes} ad loc, with Maas §128.

\textsuperscript{74} Bergk's \(\sigmaυ\alphaκτας\) has an unwelcome long last syllable (Köhnken, "Two Notes on Pindar", \textit{BICS} 25 (1978), 92-96, here 93 with n.17.

\textsuperscript{75} Pindarica 35.

\textsuperscript{76} Carey, S \textit{Odes} on 47.
Translating ωκι as "even" means that we read συναλέγειν, or translate ξυμά adverbially. But did Zeus and Poseidon "honour together", or "contribute together" to, the wedding in any significant way?

If, on the other hand, we understand ἁμαρτα as Peleus, the line does explain how Themis' words bore fruit. The notion of togetherness disappears, leaving ξυμά as substantival: "the common good" - common, that is, to Peleus and the gods. ξυμά may very easily be appositive. The sudden jump to Peleus to which Carey objects is in fact symptomatic of the slide out of this narrative into the catalogue of Achilles' greatnesses (note αμετι). Indeed, Peleus' appearance facilitates this move.

If this interpretation is right, 46αβ notes Peleus' acquiescence to his marriage.

Now, according to Apollodorus, Chiron gave Peleus instructions for the tussle:

Χείρωνος οὖν ὑποθεμένου Πηλείς συλλαβεῖν καὶ ψηλαθεῖν αὐτήν μεταμορφουμένην. ἐπιτηρήσας συναρπάζει, γυμνόμενη δὲ ὅτε μὲν πῦρ ὅτε δὲ ἕξωρ ὅτε δὲ ὕπερον οὐ πρῶτον ἀνήκε πρὶν Ἡ τῆν ἄρχαίαν μορφήν εἶδεν ἀπολαβοῦσαν.

(Apoll.3.13.5)


78 Slater, Lexicon s.v. καὶ 3a. On καὶ turned the second of Köhnen's objections to von der Mühl's interpretation; the first, involved γὰρ: see above (Köhnen, op. cit. 93).

79 He also appears in the background in the iconography of the scene (March, Creative Poet 12, and Plate 12). If March is right in the identification of P.Hamb. 123 as a Hesiodic fragment, from the Catalogue, then Chiron had this role in that work.
There may be a light allusion to this at N.4.61:

\[\text{άλαλκε δὲ Χίρων <sc. οἱ θάνατοι>, καὶ τὸ μόραμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένου ἀκυρεῖν: πῦρ δὲ παγχρατές θρασυμαχάνων τε λεοντῖν ἀμφοτέρως ἐμεθάνειν καὶ δεινοτάτων σχάσαις ὀδόντως ἔγαμεν ὑψηθρώνυμι μίαν Νηρείδαν.}\]

(N.4.60-65)

tὸ μοραμόν Διόθεν πεπρωμένου must be Peleus' marriage to Thetis. Chiron brought it about (ἀκυρεῖν), by coaching Peleus in his wrestling, which Pindar goes on to describe. This transitive sense of ἀκυρεῖν is paralleled by its appearance at Soph. BC 1424 - exactly so, if we emend ἀκυρέω (middle) there to ἀκυρέως (active). Köhnken, arguing that Chiron had no part in the wrestling, understood ἀκυρέω as intransitive, and paraphrased "Chiron wehrte den Mordversuch des Akastos an Peleus ab, und das von Zeus festgelegte Schicksal erfüllte sich: nach heftigem Kampf errang sich Peleus die Thetis." This intransitive sense is paralleled by ἀκυρέω at Soph. Trach.824. Although Chiron does have a role in the wrestling, this interpretation cannot be ruled out.

The wrestling match between Peleus and Thetis itself is a genuine folkloric element. Thetis' shape-shifting is typical

---

80 Not his escape from Akastos (Bury, Nemeans 94); Dissen ad loc.
81 As do Lloyd-Jones and Wilson.
82 Funktion 205; he discusses this line at length (204f).
83 See Davies ad loc.
84 Frazer, Apollodorus Appendix X; Rhys Carpenter, Folk Tale 71f; Grant, Folktale 44.
of a water spirit. But its folkloric origin is, of course, no reason for it not to have been part of the account of the Cypria (or of the Catalogue). The metamorphoses and the formal marriage are not incompatible. The transformations into fire and lion are confirmed by Soph. fr. 150 R, which gives λέων δράκων τε, πύρ, ὕδωρ. That the encounter was a wrestling match is suggested by παγχρατές, as it is by έγχωντι in N.3: καὶ ποιήσθη θετίν κατέμαρψεν έγχωντι (35f).

Pindar follows the wrestling immediately with the formal wedding:

65 cf Proteus (Od.4.455f); Nereus (Apoll. 2.7.5); and Achelous (loc. cit.; Soph. Trach.9f). Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 173f; cf 179.

66 This hare was started by the scholiast on N.3.60:

δὴ δὲ τῷ διαφόρῳ τῆς μορφῆς ἡ θετίς ὑπέκλειτε τοὺς πρὸς τὸν Πηλέα γάμους, δημιύδης δ λογος.

That the metamorphoses were not in the Cypria was argued by Graef, Peleus und Thetis 199f; and countered by Severyns, CE 252f, arguing from the prevalence of the theme in art from the sixth century, which suggests a literary source. Cf Jouan, Euripide 73f; Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 59. I see no reason why it should not have been in the Cypria.

67 Jouan, Euripide 73f; Hubbard, Aiakos 10 n.17; and, further, Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 181-3.

68 cf Apoll.13.13.5, quoted above. The Kypselos chest (first half of the sixth century) showed a snake (Paus. 5.18.5). See Brommer, Vasenlisten 321ff. Did Alcman describe Thetis' transformations? It has been persuasively argued that P.Oxy.2390 (= PMG fr.5.2) is an allegorical interpretation of his description of the scene; G. W. Most, "Alcman's 'Cosmogonic' Fragment (fr.5 Page, 81 Calame)", CQ 37 (1987), 1-19, here 10f.

69 Farnell suggests that κατέμαρψεν indicates Peleus had to chase Thetis; but Pindar uses the word at 1.3/4.52 and 0.6.14, with no hint of pursuit. Sophocles puns similarly, writing of Peleus:
And this combination echoes Jouan's reconstruction of the Cypria: "Chiron recevait l’ordre d’aider Péée à maîtriser la Néréide malgré sa résistance et ses métamorphoses. La célébration solennelle des noces sur le Péliion apaisait la rancune de la Néréide et marquait l’exécution du dessein de Zeus."  

In I.8, Themis appears to suggest that the wedding take place at a certain time:

\[
\text{ἐν διχομηνίδεσιν δὲ ἔσπερας ἐρατόν λύοι κεν χαλινοῦ ὑφ' ἦρωι παρθενίας.}
\]

(I.8.44f)

The full moon has been explained as a fortunate time for the wedding; but the happiness of the wedding is an odd thing for Themis to stipulate. So Carey sees the force of the phrase as the necessity for speed: Thetis must be married within 8.

See Pearson 2.255f.

90 Euripide 74.

91 So Farnell, Works 2.382, citing Eur. I.A.717.
fortnight. But the phrase is more precise than this. I suggested above that Pindar has manipulated Themis' prophecy so that it encompasses material beyond its natural scope, as a narrative device. This phrase is the clearest example of the distortion that that shift produces. The timing of the wedding at the full moon is a detail from a source, in which it would have appeared, naturally, in straight narrative. But the shift from narrative to prophecy produces this unnatural emphasis on the timing, which now appears of arcane importance.

The words χάλιμυον παρθένιας have been unhappily received by critics, from the time of the scholiast on. But I see no reason why Thetis' zone (cf Od.11.245) should not be a bridle which has, as yet, held her virginity back. Now unbridled, it leaves her. Such a concept lies behind Sappho's bride's conversation with her maidenhood:

(νύμφη) παρθένια, παρθένια, ποτ' με λίπος' ἄκπολαίκη;
(παρθένια) τοιχέτι ήξω πρὸς σέ, οδότετι ήξω;

([Sappho] fr. 114 L-P)

---

92 5 Odes 198.
93 Also, perhaps, 41; cf Wilamowitz, Pindaros 199.
94 Most suggests that the mention of the moon in Alcman's poem (PMG fr.5.2 ii.26) might refer to Thetis' wedding celebrations (op. cit. 15f).
95 On this type of distortion, see W. F. Hansen, "Odysseus and the Oar: A Folkloric Approach", in L. Edmunds (ed.), Approaches to Greek Myth (John Hopkins, 1990), 241-72, and especially 246f, discussing Tiresias' prophecy to Odysseus at Od.11.121-9.
96 See Carey ad loc.
97 For a tentative emendation of the second line, see C. M. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry² (Oxford, 1961), 222 n.1.
If there is any difficulty in Pindar's vivid actualization of the wedding night, I would see the phrase as a reminiscence of early versions of the story, where there was no formal wedding; nor even any other encounter between Peleus and Thetis; and in which the raped Thetis retreats to the sea and only returns to land to bear Achilles.\textsuperscript{98}

Chiron hosts the wedding: \textsuperscript{99}

\begin{quote}
βαθυμήτα Χώρων τράφε λιθίνῳ
ʹΙδαον’ ἐνδον τέλει, καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀκαλαπίων,
tóu φαρμάκων δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον
νύμφευσε δ'αὐτίς αγλαόχολπον
Νηρέως θύγατρα...
\end{quote}

(N.3.53-57)

In such proximity to the name of the bride's father, νύμφευσε must be metaphorical. The earlier mention of the location - λιθίνῳ... ἐνδον τέλει - confirms that it is the hosting of the feast which is meant. Everywhere, the wedding does take place in Chiron's cave, on Pelion: \textsuperscript{100}

\begin{quote}
πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείμονις θείδ᾽ ἐν Παλίῳ
Μοισᾶν δ χαλλίστας χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις
φόρμιγγ’ Ἀπόλλων ἔπταγλωσσον
χρυσῇ πλάκτρῳ διώχων
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{98} Séchan, Noces 678-81, following Robert, Heldensage 66. Euripides uses this version (fr. inc. 1093); Jouan, Euripide 75.

\textsuperscript{99} I consider the whole question of his interest in Peleus and his family below, p.175 n.20.

\textsuperscript{100} e.g. Cypria fr. 3 B = EGF F 3; Alcaeus fr. 42 L-P. Everywhere, except Catullus, who locates it in Pharsalos (64.37). See Jouan, Euripide 79.
This brings us to the matter of the hymenaion. There are two difficulties here: who sang the song, and what it was about. Both have been considered more closely than the evidence will allow. Hera reminds Apollo that he sang at the wedding in the *Iliad* (24.62f); and Aesch. fr.350 tells that it was a mantic song: Thetis laments

\[\delta \deltaν \ ευδατείται τάς ἑμᾶς εὐπαιδίας νόσῳ τ' ἀπείρους καὶ μακραίνως βίου, ξύμπαυτά τ' εἰπὼν θεοφιλεῖς ἑμᾶς τύχας παιῶν' ἐπηφήμησαν εὐθυμῶν ἐμῶν.\]

καὶ ὑπὸ τὸ δοξοῦν θεῖον ᾠσευθὲς στόμα ἢλπιζον εἰναι ματτικῇ βρύου τέχνῃ: \[\delta \deltaν αὐτῶν ἐμῶν, αὐτῶς ἐν θοινή παρῶν, αὐτῶς τάδ' εἰπὼν, αὐτῶς ἔστιν ὁ κτανῶν τοῦ παῖδα τοῦ ἔμοι.\]

Reitzenstein suggested that the *Cypria* included a similar song. But, whence, then, does the chorus of Muses spring? They are shown on the sixth century François Vase at Peleus’ wedding, and appear there in Pindar:

[Peleus & Kadmos] λέγονται, μᾶν βροτῶν ὄλβου ὑπέρτατον αἱ σχεῖν, οἴτε καὶ χρυσοπίθεους μελπομενῶν ἐν ὅρει Ἔδεσι καὶ ἐν ἑπταπόλοις ἄλον θῆβαις, ὕπόθες Ἀρμονίαν γάμου βοῶν, ὃ δὲ Νιρέος εὐδοκοῦν θέτιν παῖδα κλωτάν.

(P. 3.88-92)\(^{103}\)

---

\(^{101}\) On καὶ κείμοις, see Fogelmark, ΚΛΙ ΚΕΙΝΟΙΣ.

\(^{102}\) *Die Hochzeit* 76f.

\(^{103}\) See Fogelmark, ΚΛΙ ΚΕΙΝΟΙΣ 78f for the similarities of the weddings of Kadmos and Peleus.
It has been argued that they originally appeared only at Kadmos' wedding, and thence trespassed onto Peleus' - but this is speculative.\(^{104}\)

The traditions cannot be separated. Simply because we know that the Muses sing at the wedding in one account, we cannot rule out that Apollo did also - and vice versa. Jouan suggests that Pindar is combining two traditions by having both Apollo and the Muses singing at \(N.5.23f\); but I would imagine that they had both sung at the wedding before Pindar, and that \(N.5\) simply reflects that.\(^{105}\)

But an obvious demarcation of role is possible: one would naturally ascribe the prophecy of Achilles' career to Apollo, and a more conventional \(hymenaios\) to the Muses.

The former is referred to in \(N.4\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἰδεν} & \quad \text{δέ εὐθυμλον ἔδραμεν}, \\
\text{τὰν οὐδραυὸν βασιλῆς πόντου τ' ἐφεξομενοι}
\end{align*}
\]
\(\delta\)ωρα καὶ \(κράτος \varepsilon\)\(\varepsilon\)\(\varepsilon\)\(φαναν \varepsilon\)\(γ\)\(γ\)\(ε\)\(νε\)\(ν\)\(ε\)\(ς \text{ αὐτῷ.}\)

\((N.4.65-68)^{106}\)

The gods reveal to Peleus his \(κράτος \varepsilon\)\(γ\)\(γ\)\(ε\)\(νε\)\(ν\)\(ε\)\(ς\), Achilles' prowess. \(67\) refers, lightly, to Zeus and Poseidon. If this is a glance at the version in which they quarrel, then the revelation of Achilles' stature at this point is the revelation that

\(^{104}\) Jouan, \textit{Euripide} 83 n.7.

\(^{105}\) Jouan, \textit{Euripide} 83.

\(^{106}\) \(\varepsilon\)\(γ\)\(γ\)\(ε\)\(νε\)\(ν\)\(ε\)\(ς\) from the scholiast's paraphrase, replacing \(\varepsilon\)\(ς \varepsilon\)\(γ\)\(ε\)\(νε\)\(ν\)\(ε\)\(ς\) of the MSS.
Peleus is to fulfil the destiny of fathering a son stronger than himself. This gives much greater force.

But we can deduce nothing about the subject of the Muses' *hymenaios*, in his sources, from Pindar's treatment of it. Pindar's Muses sing, in N.5, of Peleus' exploits at Iolkos (26ff). But their song seems to me simply a narrative device: an elegant "gleitend Übergang" into the matter of the myth. Once the story is under way, that it is formally the Muses' song is forgotten. And so I doubt that this subject matter can be adduced for an earlier poem.

As in the case of Peleus' adventures at Iolkos, we have seen that Pindar's various accounts of, and allusions to, the hero's marriage to Thetis, are not at odds with each other. On the central question of the possible novelty of Poseidon's role in I.8, there is no detail in any of Pindar's accounts of the wedding which disconfirms the suggestion that the prophecy version was known by Pindar's audience before that poem.

The other candidate for being Pindaric innovation was Themis' prominent role in I.8. But this, I have suggested, is the product not of a radical reshaping of the matter of the myth; but of the need for *poikilia*: she is used to prophesy what was in the source straight narrative - just as the Muses in N.5 sing what turns into straight narrative.

In his various accounts of the marriage, Pindar uses two streams of material: the main tradition, preserved by the

107 Illig, Erzählung 70 with n.3.
108 Robbins, Nereids 29.
109 See Jouan, Euripide 83.
Cypria and Catalogue, telling of Thetis' rejection of Zeus; and the lesser known tradition, submerged into Aeginetan folklore, of the prophecy. It is his shifting selection of details from this conflation, and highly focused use of them, which has given the impression of radical innovation.
We have already seen Telamon playing a role in two Aiakid legends. First, he helps Peleus to kill their half-brother Phokos. His role here is earliest attested in the *Alcmaeonis* (fr. 1 B = EGF F 1). In general, he seems to play second fiddle to his brother in the deed, and this must reflect his relatively late integration into the Aiakid clan.\(^1\)

I have suggested that Telamon's participation and dominant role in Herakles' attack on Troy reflect the fated necessity of an Aiakid for the sack of the city.\(^2\) It is this necessity which is explained by the myth of 0.8. I have argued that this story, although old, failed to survive in the panhellenic tradition, although it left various traces there.\(^3\) But the story was preserved down to 460, the date for 0.8. It seems obvious that it was maintained by the Aeginetans, for it stressed the indispensability of their forebears for the sack of Troy.\(^4\)

This hypothesis is corroborated by consideration of Pindar's allusive accounts of the attack on Troy and journey...

---

1 Above, p.67f.

2 I suggested that the few traces of Peleus' involvement on the expedition may hint at the fact that he was in this supplanted by his brother, who would otherwise be a rather featureless character.

3 The earliest is a fragment of Pisander's *Heracleia*, of the end of the seventh century, confirming that, in that epic, Telamon was preeminent during the sack (EGF F 8 = fr 11 B).

4 Above, p.40ff.
home. This examination, in turn, explains Telamon’s failure to remain in the limelight.

Telamon and Herakles; the Meropes and Alkyoneus

Two passages reflect the same sequence of events:

... Ἀλάντος Τελαμωνιάδα
καὶ πατρός τὸν χαλκοχήραν ἐς πόλεμου
ἀγε σὺν Τερμνθίοισιν πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς
Τροίαν, ήρωαι μόχθων,
Λαυμενωτίαν ὑπὲρ ἀμπλωκίαν
ἐν μανιν Ἄλκμηνας τέχως.
εἰσε δὲ Περσαμίαν, πέφυεν δὲ σὺν κείμῳ Μερόπων
ἐδοξε καὶ τὸν βουρόταν αὐρεὶ ἵον
ἐλέγατοι εὖρων Ἀλκυο-

η, οφεῖτέρας δ’ οὗ φείδατο
χεραῖν βαρυφθόγγοιο νευρᾶς
Ἡρακλῆς.

(I.6.26-35)

αὐτὸν [sc Herakles] ποτα Τροίαν χραταίδος Τελαμών
πόρθησε καὶ Μέροπας
καὶ τὸν μέγαν πολεμισταν ἐκπαγλου Ἀλκυοῆ,
οὗ τετραοίριας γε πρὶν διωδεκα πέτρῳ
ἡρόας τ’ ἐπεμβεβαῖτος ἰπποδάμους ἔλευ
δίς τόσους.

(H.4.25-30)

So, in both passages, Herakles and Telamon attack Troy, fight with the Meropes on Cos, and fight with the giant Alkyoneus. That the exploits occur in the same sequence in each passage suggests that the sequence of events is known.¹ There is no difficulty about Herakles’ arrival on Cos after he had sacked

¹ Farnell, Works 1.268 (he suggests at 2.360 that the source is Pisander’s Heracleia – but this cannot be (see below, p.166)).
Troy, which is attested in the *Iliad*. But the subsequent journey to Phlegra to fight Alkyoneus is problematic: it reflects neither any known stage in the evolution of the story of Alkyoneus; nor any obvious hypothetical middle stage.

First, I consider the fight on Cos. After Herakles’ sack of Troy, Hera wrecks his return to Argos. Zeus upbraids her, grieving for his son,

τοῦ αὐτὸν βορεῖν ἀνέμῳ πεπεσθοῦσα θυέλλας
πέμψας ἐπὶ ἀτρύγετον πόντον, κακὰ μητιόως,
καὶ μίν ἔπειτα Κόωνος ἐπὶ ναιομένην ἀπένεικας.
τοῦ μὲν ἔγγον ἐνεκὼ ῥυομένην καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτίς
Ἀργος ἐς ἵπποβοτον, καὶ πολλὰ περ ἀδηλῆαντα.

(*Il.15.26-30*)

Pherecydes gives more detail: Herakles was opposed by the king Eurypylus, son of Poseidon, and fathered a son, Thessalos, on his daughter:

Ἡρακλῆς ἀναχομίζομενος μετά τὸ πορθῆσαι Τροίαν
gενόμενος τε κατὰ τὸ Ἀλκαῖον πέλαγος, βουλῆσαι
Ἱρας αφοδρῷ συνεσχέθη χειμώνι. κατασυρείτις δὲ εἰς
κῑ ὑπὲρ Μεροπίδα ἐκώλυθη ἐπιβήμαι τῆς νῆσου ὑπὸ
Εὐρυπύλου τοῦ Ποσείδώνος βασιλεύοντος αὐτῆς.
βιασάμενος δὲ καὶ τοὺς παῖδας αὐτῶν, μιγεῖς δὲ τῇ
θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ Χαλκίσῃςε θεοσαλῶν ἐγένεται. ἡ
Ἰστορία παρὰ Θερεκύδη.

(*Σ.Π.14.255 = F3 78*)

---

2 cf *Il.14.250-6*.

3 cf the relevant entry in the Catalogue of the Ships:

ὅς δ᾽ ἐνα Νίκαρυν τ᾽ εἴχον Κράτασθι τε Κάσσον τε
καὶ Κῶν Ἑὐρυπύλου πόλιν νήσους τε Καλώδνας,
τῶν οὖν δείσιππος τε καὶ Ἁὐτίφος ἡγησάθην,
θεοσαλῶν υἱε δῖοι Ἡρακλείδαο ἀνακτος.

(*Il.2.676-9*)
This story seems to be outlined in the Hesiodic Catalogue, where Mestra is named as the mother of Eurypylos:

τοῦ δ’ μικῆς Χάλκων τε καὶ Ἀυταγόρας ἐγένομεν.

TOU Δ' METX ΧΑΛΚΩΝ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΕΓΕΝΟΜΕΝ.

This genealogy - apart from Mestra - appears in the scholia to Theocritus, which add that Eurypylos married Klytia, daughter of Merops:

Εὐρύπυλος δ’ Ποσειδίωνος μικῆς Κάμων βασιλεύων γῆμας

EÜRYPYLOU S δ’ POSEIDINOU S MIKHE’ ΚAMOU BASILEUOU S GHE’

κλυτίας τὴν Μέροπος Χάλκωνα καὶ Ἀυταγόραν ἔτεκεν.

KLYTIAΣ TΗN MEROPOS XALKWNAV KAI AU TAYOVAR ETEKEV.

ἀφ’ δὲ ὑπ’ ἐν Κώ εὐγενεῖς.

APH’ D’ HYP’ EN KOU EUGENEIES.

(S. Theoc. 7.5-9e)

4 West tentatively dates Mestra’s introduction to Cos to the age of the Catalogue poet himself, in the sixth century (Hesiodic Catalogue 143). Sherwin-White’s insistence on the antiquity of her association with Cos is misleading, and reflects an implicit failure to separate the poet of the Catalogue and Hesiod (Ancient Cos 306f).

5 The somewhat baffling δρχῆς ἀλήθης of 61 has been plausibly explained by appeal to Plutarch’s version (Lobel on P. Oxy. 2495 fr. 21). When he had left Troy, Herakles’ fleet was wrecked by a storm; he reached Cos in the one remaining ship. He met a shepherd, Antagoras, who told him that he could have a sheep if he won a wrestling bout.

καὶ συμπεδότους αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐκ χειράς οἱ

KAI SYMPEDOTOUS AU'TO TΟU HRAKLEOU S EK CHEIRAS OI

Μέροπες τῷ Αὐταγόρα παραβοληθοῦσες, οἱ δ’

MEROPES TTOU AU TAYOVAR PARA BOLOUSSITES, OI D’

Ἑλλήνες τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, μάχην χαρτεράν συνήθουσαν...

(06 58)

6 cf Σ.Σ., g ad loc.
Merops gives his name to the Meropes, the early inhabitants of Cos. He is either ὑγευὴς (Steph. Byz. s.v. Κως; Et. Mag. 507.55) or son of Triopas ([Hes.] fr.43a.3; Steph. Byz. s.v. Μέρως), who was king of Cos according to Σ. Theoc. 17.69. This second genealogy is linked to Mestra's presence in the stemma.

This is a faint but precisely etched genealogy. It reveals that it is not coincidental that Herakles should proceed from fighting the Meropes to confront Alkyoneus or other giants; for several of the members of the Meropid family are, or are associated with, giants.

Further, these giants are of a defined kind: Vian identified their true nature and called them "les génies des passes et des défilés"; "tous chargés de garder des passages périlleux pour le voyageur ou le marin: caps, détruits, défilés." His examples are Geraistos, Peloros, Aigaion, Polybotes, Rhoitos, Ephialtes, Skiron, Alkyoneus, Kerkyon and Sinis. They are to be distinguished from the true Giants, the warrior tribe who fight the Olympians, but they slowly become integrated to their

---

7 See Sherwin-White, Ancient Cos 48f; and 47 n.95 on the meaning of μέρονες; she concludes that it is "the ethnic for the early [i.e. pre-Dorian] settlers of Cos". Cf Dibbelt, Quaestiones 3.

8 This entry also makes Merops' daughter not Klytia, but an eponymous Cos. Her mother is Echemia. Cf Sherwin-White, Ancient Cos 332.

9 Génies des Passes 129 and passim. He first identified the group formally at GdG 231; and gave a preliminary account of them in Géants de la Mer. Criticism of the latter work by Lerat, in "Geraistos et les Geraistai", RA 25 (1946), 196-203, who demonstrated that these giants were not confined to the sea, induced the account given in Génies des Passes.
number. I shall capitalize true Giants, and retain the French génies for the giants who infest channels and passes, the places of which they are the spirits.

We have seen that Merops is, on one genealogy, γηγενής, and on another, grandson, through Triopas, of Poseidon. Both suggest that he was a génie. Peloros was one of the Sparti (Paus.9.5.3); Geraistos, a Cyclops (Apoll.3.15.8), and so Earthborn (Hes. Theog.139ff). Ephialtes was one of the Aloads, sons of Poseidon by Iphimeidea, daughter of Triopas (Od.11.305-320); Skiron, Sinis and Kerkyon were all his sons.

Dibbelt reconstructs a story which makes Merops act like a génie. There seems to be an allusion in the Greek Anthology to a story of Zeus nursed on Cos:

eις γῆρας δ' ὀτέ ἔβην. ἄνοιξας τοῦ Μερόπου, διότι δέντον ἐγηροτρόφειν.

(Anth. Pal. 7.418.3f)

This is complemented by a late scholiast’s explanation of why the eagle is dear to Zeus: some sources say

òτι Μέροψ δ' κόσας ἀπαύσως ἔπενθετ θην γυναῖκα·

έπενθετ δὲ τὴν Ῥέαν μετεβλήθη καὶ συμπάρεστιν αἰὲ

tῇ Διί.

(Σ. Townl.11.24.293)

On true Giants, see Mayer, Giganteng 3-14; Vian, GdG 185-189.

Skiron: Gel. noct. att.15.21; Apoll. Ep.1.2; Sinis: Hypoth. I (3.193.3 Drachmann); cf RE s.v., 238; Kerkyon: Choirilos fr 1 N. It was the connection of all of these génies with Poseidon that Vian stressed in Géants de la Mer, especially at 106-9.

Quaestiones 10f.

cf Eust. ad loc. (1351). Dibbelt satisfactory rejects the emendation of Ῥέαν to Ἀρναν, suggested by Robert, to bring this story in line with Hyginus astr. 2.16: it is Hyginus, and not our scholiast, who is confused here.
The combination of these two data reveals a story of Rhea lying in in Merops' care.

This is significant, as the same role dimly seems to be associated with other génies — especially with Geraistos. The nymphs who raised Zeus in Gortyn are Geraistiades. These nymphs are inseparable from Geraistos.

Merops' daughter also seems gigantic. She appears in puzzling guise in Euripides:

"Ἀρτεμίς ἐξεχορεύσατο
χρυσόκερατ' Ἐλαφον Μέροπας Τιτανίδα κούραν
καλλοσύνας ἐσχεν.
(Eur. Helen 380-83)"

We have seen that she is sometimes named Klytia. One might associate her directly with the little-known giant of the gigantomachy, Klytios. Or the two might be linked through Botes/Polybotes. Elsewhere, she is called Cos. There is a

14 More dimly, with Aigaion. Vian, Géants de la Mer 113, Génies des Passes 132.
15 Et. Mag. s.v. Γεραιστιάδες; cf Geraistion in Arcadia, which also claimed the honour of being Zeus' nursery (op. cit. s.v.).
16 Vian, Génies des Passes 132-42. His argument rests in good part on the recurrence of such doublets: Geraistos and Geraistiades / Geraistai; Peloros and Pelorias; Alkyoneus and Alkyone.
17 Surely, this is the Kerynitian hind; but this seems to have gone unrecognized (Dale ad loc.; Kannicht on 375-85; J. Diggle, "On the Helen of Euripides", in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle, P. E. Easterling (eds.), Dionysiaca, (Nine Studies in Greek Poetry presented to Sir Denys Page on his seventieth birthday), (Cambridge, 1978), 159-177, here 160). But see now Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 218f; and below, p.164 n.80.
18 Only known by Tzetzes (Theogony 96) and Apollodorus (1.6.2).
19 Dibbelt, Quaestiones 11-14; Vian, GdG 231f, giving more literature at 231 n.9.
20 Steph. Byz. s.v.
titan called Koios at Theog.134. He was later associated with the island Cos; and Dibbelt argues equivalence with Merops' daughter Cos. 21 West doubts that the association with the island is significant and sees Koios' importance only as father of Leto (Theog.404); 22 but we note that the hymn in which Pindar described Herakles' attack on Cos (fr.33a) next hails Delos, daughter of Leto (fr.33c,d) - who is called Koios (fr.33d.3). It seems unlikely that the juxtaposition is merely coincidence. 23

Polybotes himself is associated with Cos:

Πολυβώτης δὲ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διωχθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ποσειδώνος ἤκεν εἰς Κόσαν Ποσειδών δὲ τῆς υἱόος μέρος ἀπορρήτες ἐπέρριψεν αὐτῷ, τὸ λεγόμενον Νίσυρον.

(Apoll.1.6.2) 24

He is the génie of the strait between the two islands. 25

I suggest, then, that when Herakles was blown to Cos, he was thrown among giants. This is the reason that Hera chose Cos: Herakles could be guaranteed an unpleasant time there; and

21 Herodas 2.95; Tacitus Ann.12.61; Dibbelt, Quaestiones 17.
22 On Theog.134.
24 cf Strabo 9.5.16.
25 Dibbelt, Quaestiones 14; Vian, GdG 230. On the intimate relations between the two, see Sherwin-White, Ancient Cos 32, with notes. Pausanias refers to the fight between giant and Poseidon as the story περὶ τῆς ἄκρας τῆς Χελώνης (1.2.4); but exactly what he means is unclear, and the place otherwise unknown. It seems to have been the next cape to the east of Laketer (W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos (Oxford, 1891), xii n.2, cf Strabo 10.5.16; Sherwin-White seems to agree (Ancient Cos 60)).
this is the explanation of the extreme difficulties which he did in fact face there (Il.15.30, with Σ). Cos would have been an appropriate place for giants: it is prone to seismic activity, and enormous bones, frequently explained by appeal to the presence of giants, seem to have been found there. 26

There is some independent evidence, also, that the fight on Cos was a fight against giants.

We have fragments of what appears to be a sixth century Coan epic, the Meropis. 27 They describe Herakles' fight with Asteros, during his attack on the Meropes:

\[\text{εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἡ 'Αθήνα[ν] ἔλεγε τὸν μὲν 'Ἡρα[κλῆς] περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους γίνεσθαι Μέροποις, αὐτὴ δὲ τῷ 'Αστερῷ θυσιάσαται.}\]
\[\text{ἐνθεδ' μὲν ἐὰς τὴν ἐν τῷ Μερόπων κλεῖν' ἢ [δὲ δία]πρὸ αἰχμῆς στῆθος} \]

\[(\text{Meropis fr.4 B})\]

Athena comes to help Herakles in the nick of time (fr.3 B), after he has failed to make any impression on Asteros (fr.2 B). She kills him (fr.4 B); flays him (fr.5 B) and makes her aegis from his hide (fr.6 B).

Asteros is elsewhere unknown; but a fragment of Aristotle comments τὰ Παυσανίας ἐπὶ 'Αστέρι τῷ γίγαντι ὑπὸ 'Αθηνᾶς ἀναρρέουσι (fr.637 Rose). Equally, a fragment of Epicharmus ascribes the aegis to an unknown giant's hide, killed at

---

26 Paton and Hicks, op. cit. xli, xlv, citing Philostratus, Heroicus 8.14 for a story of bones found on Cos: τὰ τῶν γηγεμένων οὐτῶν ἀνάμειναι, Μερόπων, φαοί, τῶν πρῶτων. Huge bones also mark the site of e.g. Herakles' fight with Antaios (Plut. Sertorius 9.6f; Strabo 17.3.8).

27 Sherwin-White, Ancient Cos 48 n.96, suggested that it was a Hellenistic pastiche. Lloyd-Jones, The Meropis 145-50, definitively rebuts this challenge to the communis opinio.
Phlegra. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons comment "in Meropide leonem [Nemeae] cum gigante, pugnam Coam cum pugna Phlegraea commixtam reperimus." This seems confirmed by Henrichs' comparison of the Meropis fragments with Theocritus' and Callimachus' descriptions of Herakles' fight with the Nemean lion. The implication is that all three poets have used the same source - the poet of the Meropis altering it for his purpose; and the easiest identification of that source is Pisander's Heracleia.

Why should the Meropis poet describe a fight with a giant on Cos in terms alien to that fight? Because a giant was proper to the conflict on Cos; but nothing else remained: there were no known details of his fight with Herakles. The giant of the Meropis is the shadow of the giants to whom Hera blew Herakles in the Iliad. The faint genealogical traces which I have given - no one convincing, but together, highly suggestive - are also elements of the same shadow.

Further traces may be discerned in the fight itself, reported by Apollodorus and Plutarch. Although it has been transformed into a fight against men, it nevertheless contains details which, on reflection, appear more decorous to a fight against giants.

---

28 Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta in papyris reperta fr.85 a.
29 Suppl. Hell. p.407 ad 903A.
30 Zur Meropis. But on his translation (75) of πεδίλως (Meropis fr.6.4 B) as "feet", supposedly the product of the crass adaptation of material suitable for a lion, but not for a giant, see Lloyd-Jones The Meropis 148.
31 Lloyd-Jones, The Meropis 149.
32 In general, Odysseus' experience with the Laestrygonians is comparable (Od.10.80-132). They keep both sheep and cattle
Stones which prevent ships from landing are best thrown by giants. Plutarch's version suggests Cyclops (shepherd) and waylaying génie in equal measure:

"Ἡρακλῆς ταῖς ζῇ ναοὶν ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀνασκαίς ἐκείμασθη, καὶ τῶν νεῶν διαφθειραῖον μὲν μόνη πρὸς τὴν Κών ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐλαυνόμενος ἐξέπεσε κατὰ τὸν Ἀλκηθῆρα, ἀλλούμενον, οὐδὲν ἄλλο περισώσας ἢ τὰ ὀπλα καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας. ἐντυγχάνω δὲ προβάτων ἦτει κριὼν ένα παρὰ τοῦ νέμοντος; δὲ δ' ἀνθρωπος ἐξαλείπτο μὲν 'Ἀνταρρόφας, ἀχμάζων δὲ τῇ βοώῃ τοῦ

(85). Odysseus' men meet Antiphates' wife: εὖρον δοσμῦ τ' ὀρεος κατοφήν, κατὰ δ' έστησον αὐτήν (113). As the incident develops:

οἵ δ' ἀνανταχοι
φοίτων ζεβείας λαστρυγόνες ἀλλοθεν ἁλλοκ.,
μυρίοι, οἰκί ἀνθρεσιν ἀλλοκέτης, ἀλλά γυναῖν.
οἵ δ' ἀπὸ πετραύν ἀνθραχθειν μεταθαλοαί σὲ βάλλουν.

(118-22)

See Page, Folktales in the Odyssey ch.2.

33 Frazer prints Wagner's αὐτὴν μυκτὸς; but βιασάμενος τὴν ἅρην is the reading of M, recently examined by M. Paphathmopoulos, "Pour une Nouvelle Édition de la Bibliothèque d'Apolloïdore", Hellenika 26 (1973), 18-40, here 32.

34 Giants throw stones (Apoll.1.6.1: the Giants ἣκώντιζομ ἔς μίας οὐρανοῦ πέτρας καὶ ὀρὺς ἰμμένας); they represent volcanic and seismic activity (Vian, GdG 176, Genies des Passes 152); cf Alkyoneus); cf Odysseus' flight from the Cyclops (Od.9.480ff). On Cyclopes, see Page, Homeric Odyssey ch.1; Kirk, Myth, 162-171; Burkert, S&H 31-4. One should not lose sight of the fact that Herakles' adventure on Cos is a retardative adventure during his nostos from Troy.

35 Burkert points out that, although the focus of the story of Odysseus and the Cyclops is shifted, it ends with Odysseus' successful theft of the sheep (S&H 33).
Herakles lands on Cape Laketer; and this, we have seen (above, p. 147 n. 25), was near the site of Poseidon's fight with Polybotes. It is not the obvious place to land, coming from Troy — but it is the best place for a giant.

Both Apollodorus and Plutarch, then, give accounts of fights which were once between Herakles and the giant Meropes. The datum of their inhuman stature has disappeared; but, just as traces of it survive in the genealogies, they survive, too, in the fight.

All this encourages a fresh look at the account of the adventure at Cos in the Catalogue.

65 init. Merkelbach (cf. Apoll. 2. 7. 1): ὃπριστας] West. 37

([Hes.] fr. 43a 61-66)

---

36 Note the tension in this version between the single-handed wrestling match against the génie (for which cf e.g. Herakles' encounter with Eryx, son of Poseidon: having lost one of Geryon's cattle to him, Herakles was forced to wrestle with him to regain it (Apoll. 1. 2. 5. 10)), and the large scale battle for the soldiers on their return from Troy. Cf Polyphemus, and the other Cyclopes in the background (Page, Homeric Odyssey 6; Kirk, Myth 165).

37 The apparatus appeared thus in Merkelbach and West's first edition of the fragments, but West's suggested supplement has
Merkelbach's supplement has been universally accepted: "dans la lacune, mention probable des champs Phlégréens"; "je n'avais vu dans cette tradition [sc the Troy/Cos/Phlegra sequence] qu'un remaniement dû à l'historien du IVe siècle [sc Ephoros]. Erreur! On sait, depuis 1960, par un vers de l'Ehée de Mestra que les Catalogues hésiodiques la connaissaient déjà... On a ici l'une des allusions les plus anciennes à la Gigantomachie...".

Apollodorus is the warrant for the supplement. But this is demonstrably not one of the places where Apollodorus is closely following the account of the Catalogue. The Catalogue has Herakles fighting the sons (60), not the father; one of the sons is called Chalkon (61), not Chalkodon; they are the sons of Mestra (66), not Astypalaea; and finally the "small beginning" (61; see above, p.143 n.5) suggests Plutarch's version.

Certainly, at some stage the sequence Troy/Cos/Phlegra developed from the Iliad's Troy/Cos/Argos; and at a stage prior to the final version of the Catalogue. But there is no disappeared from subsequent editions.

38 Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 274.
39 Vian, Nouvelles Réflexions 2574.
41 cf Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 275.
justification for the intrusion of Phlegra into this line, other than it is exactly what one would look for in a Hesiodic treatment of Herakles’ return. But this is not a *Heracleia*. The jump to Phlegra is anomalous. If the giants are Meropes, 61-65 is a nice ring. Best to avoid a tendentious supplement, or have a neutral alternative, such as West’s ὁμολογών, and leave open the question of where the giants are. I would guess that the line is an ossified piece of Coan mythology originally referring to local giants on Cos, which might be misunderstood as referring to Phlegra even by most of the fifth century audience of the *Catalogue*.

Alkyoneus is a dark figure, a giant who is never thoroughly integrated with the other giants, of whom Pindar gives the earliest literary account. His elliptical allusions are partly illuminated, partly obfuscated, by four scholia:

—butos δ’ Ἀλκυονεύς εἰς τῶν Γιγάντων λέγεται περὶ τοῦ Ἰαθοῦ τῆς Κορίνθου συμβεβληκέναι Ἡρακλεί, οὐ τὰς δὲ Ἡρακλῆς ἐξ Ἑρωδείας παρῆλαμα καὶ τῆς μάχης αὐτὴ αὐτία ἐγένετο τῇ βουλῇ τοῦ Διός· πολέμιος γὰρ ἦν τοῖς Γίγασιν. (Σ.Ν.4.43b)

—butos δ’ Ἀλκυονεύς εἰς τῶν Γιγάντων λέγεται περὶ τοῦ Ἰαθοῦ τῆς Κορίνθου συμβεβληκέναι Ἡρακλεί, καὶ μετὰ τὸ συντρίψας αὐτὸν δώδεκα ἄρματα καὶ εἰκοσὶ τέσσαρας ἄνδρας λίθῳ μεγίστῳ, τὸ τελευταίου

---

42 Mayer, Giganten 160.

43 Schwartz suggested that 61-65 drew on a *Heracleia*, hence the focus is upon Herakles in those few lines (Ps-Hesiodes 275f). But if we keep the giants on Cos, there is no shift of focus.

44 Robert, *Alkyoneus*, is a good exposition. Cf Van der Kolf, *Quaeritur* 87 n.1, for a sad illustration of the darkness of the matter.
Alkyoneus was originally, I think, a génie of the isthmus of Corinth. 45 He is located there in Σ.Ν.4.43b and d. His name was preserved there by his rock on the isthmus; 46 by the Alkyonian Sea, the easternmost end of the gulf of Corinth; 47 and by the bottomless Alkyonian Lake, an entrance to Hades, near Lerna. 48 Each one of these spots is a passage, which fits Vian’s scheme. He is associated with Poseidon both through a list of legendary priest names from Halicarnassus and via his homonymous nymph, Alkyone, loved by the god. 49 His brigandish waylaying of Herakles is typical. 50

45 Vian, Génies des Passes 142-5.
46 Σ.Ν.4.43b.
47 Strabo 8.2.3; 9.1.8; 9.2.1.
48 Paus.2.37.5.
49 Priest-list: CIG 2655; I return to this below, p.163. Alkyone: Hellanicus FGrH F 19A; Aristotle fr.596 Rose; Apoll. 3.10.1; Paus.9.22.5, 2.30.8. The comparison of these two confirms the close association of génie and nymph.
50 Sinis (Plutarch Theseus 8.3); Skiron (10); and Kerkyon (11) are obvious parallels. Cf Vian, Génies des Passes 145-50.
Next, Alkyoneus becomes associated with cattle theft. Herakles' association with the theft of cattle is rich in mythological implications. On one level, the theme has been seen as the mythic figuring of the concern of a nomadic culture for its cattle: the hero of the culture overcomes the demon who steals them, and retrieves them. Or the cattle may be tokens of Indo-European culture; their capture by the culture hero - and the death of their previous keeper - is definitive of his culture's victory. Burkert concludes that Herakles' journey is a reflection of what was originally a shamanistic quest to counter a scarcity of prey (in this the shaman brings back the prey from a master of animals in the Beyond; the real animals naturally follow), adapted for the livestock-owning society: the hero kills the other owner, and in so doing establishes a perpetual control over the animals - which are now domesticated.

None of these interpretations is without merit. What I think is incontrovertible is that the theft and death of the other owner establishes a charter for the possession of the cattle, whether it be in despite of wild animals who come in

51 Burkert, S&H 83-5.
52 B. Lincoln, "The Indo-European Cattle Raiding Myth", History of Religions 16 (1976-7), 42-65. N. D. Brown, Hermes the Thief (University of Wisconsin Pr., 1947) 5, notes that the Sanskrit word for war means "desire for more cows".
53 Burkert, S&H 88-98. I pass over other explanations of the myth, of which the most important is that which sees the retrieval as a triumph over death, a harrowing of the underworld (Fontenrose, Python 334ff; Davies, Folk-tale Origins). (I am not happy with the equivalence of cattle and dead, which is the crux of the matter (see Davies, op. cit. 279-81)). For other interpretations, see Burkert, S&H 85f; Lincoln, op. cit. 60ff.
the night, or of a rival people, or of Nature itself, the domesticated animals' instinct to return to the wild.

One feature that should be emphasized is that the cattle are usually stolen by the rightful owner, who is only recovering them from a thief. This gives ethical weight to the charter. A shadow of this can be seen in versions where the livestock is made fair game. So Plutarch's Antagoras makes the ram the wrestling prize.

Herakles is the constant hero of this cattle theft. But the canonical Herakles is scarcely the ideal of a nomadic herdsman. The only occasion on which he owns cattle is when he has stolen them from Geryon. And so his return from Erytheia with the cattle is studded with adventures, sprung from local stories, in which he repeatedly loses and recovers the cattle.

It is easy to see how Alkyoneus became a worthy opponent for Herakles in the business of cattle theft. We recall Vian's definition of his type: génies are the spirits of defiles and channels - passages through which the traveller or sailor must go. In the culture of nomadic migration, these are

---

54 e.g. Alkyoneus, Eryx. This feature is emphasized by Lincoln, op. cit. 64, but is implicit in Burkert's model of nomadic concerns, and a relic of the temporary efficacy of the shaman's quest in the prototype of his deep model.

55 Encounters with Ialebion, Derkynos, Eryx, Cacus, and Alkyoneus; Burkert gives these and other adventures at S&H 84, with nn. 7-21, p. 180.

56 Robert concludes that Alkyoneus stole cattle from Acrocorinth before Herakles had any part in the story (Alkyoneus 484). This accords neatly with the more political interpretation of the myth: Alkyoneus' theft serves as a charter for the early inhabitants of the area, whose rights are appropriated by the Dorians; and so Alkyoneus' ownership of the cattle is forfeited to Herakles, the Dorian culture hero.
the areas of danger for the herdsman: where he is vulnerable to attack from other people, or where his animals are in danger from the difficulties of the place.

The bare bones of the encounter between Herakles and Alkyoneus are, then, that Herakles is driving cattle through the Isthmus of Corinth when he is attacked by Alkyoneus, génie of that passage. Alkyoneus steals the cattle. Herakles retaliates: kills the giant and recovers the herd.

The first flesh that can be put on this concerns Alkyoneus' attack. We have seen that Σ.Ν.4.43d tells how he lobbed a rock at Herakles' expedition, killing twenty-four men—explaining H.4.28-30—and then retrieved it for a second throw, only to have it batted back at him by Herakles. Robert sensibly saw this absurd story as the combination of Pindar's version and a version which the scholiast already knew. He suggested that the scholiast's version was simply the second throw, at Herakles alone. But if the story fits the pattern of loss and then retrieval, then Alkyoneus must win this first encounter. The iconography of the scene is constant: Herakles attacks a sleeping giant. This is plainly inconsistent with the batted boulder, but accords with the pattern: Alkyoneus, 

57 Alkyoneus 478.

58 Davies, Folk-tale Origins 287 n.58, defends the folkloric authenticity of the stone batted back, as the motif of the giant who can be killed only with his own weapon, and the decorum of Herakles attacking with rocks. Neither seems convincingly limiting; see n.33 above on giants throwing stones. But the Cyclops is attacked with his own club (Od.9.319ff).

59 Andreae, Herakles; cf Croissant, "Remarques sur la Métope de la Mort d'Alkyoneus a l'Héraion du Silarίs", BCH 89 (1965), 390-99, who shows that his metope is not a counter-example; LIMC 1.1 pp.558-64.
having stolen the cattle, falls asleep. This discrepancy might only suggest a variety of versions, but for the fact that Alkyoneus is shown asleep sprawled across a rock. The oldest example (*LIMC* 1.1 p.559 (no.3), earlier than 520) "montre déjà les éléments figuratifs essentiels: la scène se déroule en plein air; un arbre et un énorme rocher indiquent la rudesse de la demeure du géant..." Might not the rock be the one Alkyoneus threw?

I suggest, then, that the rock was the weapon with which Alkyoneus stole the herd. Perhaps it knocked Herakles out. Alkyoneus follows up the stone throw by stealing the cattle. Herakles comes round, searches for and finds the sleeping giant, and kills him.

Next, this story is rationalized with the detail that the cattle are Geryon’s, which Herakles is driving back from Erytheia (Σ.Ν.4.43b; Σ.Ι.6.47b). I have suggested, following

60 Olmos and Balmaseda, *LIMC* 1.1 p.562.

61 The remaining difficulty is the source of the story of Herakles bat­ting the rock back. But that might easily be the product of the combination of the data that the rock was thrown by Alkyoneus (old Corinthian aetiology) and that he was hit by his own rock (later story, in which Alkyoneus threw the rock, and crushed Herakles’ companions, and Herakles threw it back).

62 We know that this story was an aetiology for a large rock on the Isthmus (Σ.Ν.4.43d). If it seemed so out of place to require such a story, it was, presumably, a product of seismic activity. As it cannot simply have welled up out of the earth, one can presume that it was shaken from some high place, and rolled. The obvious candidate for the source is Acrocorinth. If one had to invent the aetiology, it would be this: Alkyoneus lay in wait, with his stone, on Acrocorinth, which he threw at travellers passing in its lee. I have mentioned the faint link between Alkyoneus and Acrocorinth (above, p.156 n.56).

63 cf Apoll.1.6.1: Alkyoneus τὰς Ἡλίου βόσκει Ἐρυτείας θάλασσας; Hdt.4.8.2; Davies, *Stesichorus* 109f. Vian, *GaD* 218-20, sorts out the confusion over this multiple rustling of "ces
Burkert, that the simplest explanation is that various local stories— all expressive of similar concerns—are grafted together into this long trek, as Herakles' exploits are canonised. This makes the questions of whether these exploits appeared in a Geryoneis, and whether they appeared in Stesichorus' Geryoneis in particular, rather hard. For the cattle of each discrete episode are labelled as Geryon's prior to the incorporation of that episode in an integral story of the cattle drive. This is counter to the intuition that, if one discovers a discrete episode in which there is a mention of Geryon's cattle (as, for example, Σ.Ν.4.43b), it must have been extracted from a putative integral work.

We have seen that there is an alternative location for Alkyoneus—on the isthmus of Pallene, in Chalcidice (I.6.33, malheureuses vaches" and suggests reading τάς Ἡλίου βόσκε (tāς) Ἑρωδέλας. This is more plausible than Robert's suggestion of Motivkontamination (Heldensage 513 n.1).

64 cf Vian, GdG 219. Davies rightly insists on the parallels between Geryon, Alkyoneus and Cacus (citing Wilamowitz, Herakles 45 n.74), to show how "an interpretation of Herakles' conquest of Geryon as a heroic triumph over death becomes clearer when we realize that Herakles' conquest of Cacus originally had the same significance" (Folk-tale Origins 287f). But the conclusion does not follow the parallelism.

65 This whole question is beside my point, as will become clear. Davies' parallels prove nothing (Folk-tale Origins). Robertson, "Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase Painters", CQ 19 (1969), 207-21, attempts to involve Alkyoneus in a speculative reconstruction. Page, "Stesichorus: The Geryoneis", JHS 93 (1973), 138-54, makes no mention of Alkyoneus, though his appearance would come under the umbrella of "diverse adventures" during the return (148). But we know nothing of these (Davies, Stesichorus 71 n.1). The beginning of the flowering of the iconography of Alkyoneus is dated to 520; of Geryon plausibly under the influence of Stesichorus' poem (Robertson, op. cit.), to the middle of the century. Apollodorus seems to be following Stesichorus at least until the return of the goblet of the Sun (Barrett ap Page, op. cit. 144f).
with Σ. ad loc (47a), quoted at p.154 above).66 He was presumably taken there by colonists from Corinth, which colonized Potidaea between 625-575.67 As an isthmus, it was a decorous place for him.68 As the gigantomachy became established (even earlier than Alkyoneus' import to Phlegra?), Pallene was a decorous place for any giant. The story is a neat charter for the establishment of the colony: the colonists' hero overcomes the spirit of the place.69

Presumably, in the earliest stages of Alkyoneus' presence in Pallene, his story was simply duplicated from the Corinthian original; merely the setting was changed. But it is hard to

66 Pallene and Phlegra are the same place:

67 Thuc.1.56; 4.120. Robert, Alkyoneus 480-5; RE Suppl.3.921f s.v. Herakles (Gruppe).

68 Vian, Génies des Passes 144. He notes that Alkyone comes too (Hagesandros, FHG IV p.422 fr.46).

69 There is faint evidence for celebration of Herakles in Potidaea: a fragment of a fourth century dedication to Herakles has been found (D. M. Robinson, "Inscriptions from Macedonia, 1938", TAPA 69 (1938), 43-76, here 64 n.45). The establishment of the colony was attributed to Euagoras, son of the Corinthian tyrant Periandros (Nikolaos of Damascus FGrH 90 F 59) (Alexander, op. cit. 14-16).
see how any cattle-drive — let alone the Geryonian cattle-drive — could make sense on Pallene. Whereas the Isthmus of Corinth connects the Peloponnese, embracing Tiryns, Herakles' journey's end, and the rest of the world, the isthmus of Pallene goes nowhere. If he is performing his proper function of policing the isthmus, Alkyoneus cannot waylay Herakles driving the cattle.\footnote{Neither Mayer nor Vian, plotting the route of the Geryonian cattle drive, confront this problem (Giganten 181f; GdG 220 — where Vian seems to suggest that Herakles never gets the cattle home, which cannot be right).}

To sum up the argument at this point. I have suggested that Herakles' encounter with the Meropes was originally a fight against giants. This encounter is the fight implied in Hera's diversion of Herakles to Cos in the \textit{Iliad}. But it seems to have all but disappeared from the tradition as early as the time of the \textit{Meropis}, in which only the gigantic nature of Herakles' adversary remains, couched in a deal of bogus detail. The true details, however, seem to have survived in anthropomorphic form, in the accounts of Apollodorus and Plutarch. Presumably, the Coans had civilized their own local history — and so ancestry.

Alkyoneus is a typical \textit{génie}, who polices the entrance to the Peloponnese. He fights Herakles in the context of cattle theft. But he is not essentially a cattle thief; and it seems hard to see how he could have maintained the role after his journey to Chalcidice, where he was taken by Corinthian settlers somewhere round the end of the seventh century.
There is no definitive explanation of how these two stories became grafted together. But they were, at some stage after Alkyoneus' establishment in Pallene, for Pindar to recall the story in I.6 in 480. And, even if we cannot explain the juxtaposition, we can see some rationale behind it.

First, I have suggested that Alkyoneus on Pallene must ambush Herakles on a journey; but that the traditional journey is no longer suitable. The best candidate for a journey which can be interrupted with a stop on Pallene is a return from Troy.

Polyaenus adds the explanation that the Trojan women they were taking home as slaves torched their boats. So Phlegra is a suitable place to stop on the return from Troy: and so it is during his return from Troy that Herakles stops at Phlegra.

Secondly, Herakles’ nostos from Troy is the right type of journey for the encounter with Alkyoneus. The pattern is the Odyssey. The fight on Cos originally fulfilled a need for an ambush by a supreme waylayer during this supreme journey; but evaporated. The fight with Alkyoneus fills the vacuum.

These data confirm the sequence Troy / Cos / Phlegra as not unreasonable. There is some evidence which can go a little further. It is too faint for confidence, but it does never-

71 7.47. Cf Strabo 7 fr.25. He tells a similar story about a settlement near Croton (6.1.12).
theless provide an answer to this important question. For it suggests that Herakles originally confronted Alkyoneus on Cos. When Alkyoneus moved to Phlegra, so did Herakles’ encounter with him.

A list of legendary priest names for the cult of Poseidon Isthmios at Halicarnassus gives the following genealogy:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poseidon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telamon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidios</td>
<td>Hyperes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Hyrieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nesiotes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(CIG 2655)

That this Alkyoneus is cognate with the génie Alkyoneus is suggested by the relation to Poseidon and the association with Poseidon Isthmios. The coincidence of the name Telamon in the stemma is striking.

Is it plausible that the génie Alkyoneus might travel from the Peloponnese to the eastern Aegean? On a general level, it is surprising how mobile génies are. They seem bound to a type of place, but not necessarily a unique example. We have seen...

---

72 CIG 2655:

έδοξε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὴν δῆμον... μεταγράφατε ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας στήλης τῆς παρεστώσες τοῦ βασιλείου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Ἰσθμίου τοῦ γενεσιολογούς ἀπὸ τῆς κτισμῆς κατὰ γένος ἰερείας τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ καταδρυθέντος ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἄνω ἀρχῶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσθμίου τῶν μεγάλων Ποσειδῶν καὶ Ἀπόλλων.

73 Anthas is the founder of Halicarnassus (Strabo 8.6.14). Elsewhere (Σ.Η.4.43b), he is son of Poseidon and Alkyone.

74 Vian, Génies des Passes 143.
one migration of Alkyoneus. Peloros is located both in the
Vale of Tempe and the northeast of Sicily. Traditionally, Cos
was colonized by Dorians from the Argolid.\textsuperscript{75} Coan mythology is
laced with similarities to Peloponnesian.\textsuperscript{76} Archaeological
evidence confirms.\textsuperscript{77} Two names from the Coan genealogy are
linked with Alkyone: she bears Elephenor to Chalkodon;\textsuperscript{78} or is
mother of Glaukos.\textsuperscript{79} All this suggests the possibility that
Alkyoneus might have been taken east, just as he was later
taken north.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{75} Hdt. 7.99.

\textsuperscript{76} This is the thrust of Dibbelt, \textit{Quaestiones} 3-17: "Hae omnes
sunt fere res quae demonstrant Coi insulae interfuisset olim cum
Arcadia Peloponnesique parte septentrionali haud exiguam
necessitudinem: reddunt igitur veri simillimum etiam Meropum
nationis Coam partem inde exiisse" (17).

\textsuperscript{77} Sherwin-White, \textit{Ancient Cos} 29.

\textsuperscript{78} Apoll. Ep. 3.11; cf West, \textit{Hesiodic Catalogue} 99.

\textsuperscript{79} Mnaseas, \textit{FHG} III 151.

\textsuperscript{80} The following might be evidence for his presence on Cos. The
Catalogue gives a list of Pleiades:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{T}η\textit{υγείη \iota \ερόεσσα καί \'Ηλέκτρη \κυανόπις
\'Αλκυόνη τε καί \'Αστερόπη δίη τε \Κελατωκ
\Μαλά τε καί \Μερόπη, τάς γείνατο φαίδιμος \'Ατλας
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{94f} (See West, \textit{Hesiodic Catalogue} 94ff). The names throw up a
bewildering sequence of reverberations. A Taygete dedicated
the Kerynitan hind (0.3.29f): the legend goes, that she had
metamorphosed into it to escape rape, and then when the danger
was past, changed back and dedicated the deer. I suggested
above (p.146 n.17) that Eur. \textit{Helen} 381ff is the story of the
hind, in which the girl who metamorphoses is not Merope's
sister, as Taygete is, but Merops' \textit{titanis} daughter. She is
elsewhere Kos, possibly related to the titan Koios. Asterope
might also suggest the \textit{altera ego} of a giant – of Asteros, whom
Herakles fought amongst the Meropes. If Merops himself was a
giant, then Merope might fulfil the same role (on her, see
Dibbelt, \textit{Quaestiones} 6f). She married Sisyphus and bore
Glaukos, who married Mestra – who stands at the head of one
version of the earliest Coan genealogy. In other words, three

\textsuperscript{164}
That his name crops up in Halicarnassus may suggest that the channel he patrolled was that between Cos and the mainland opposite. \textsuperscript{81} Alternatively, the area of Cos between Laketer and Chelone was called the Isthmus; and so that might be a plausible haunt. \textsuperscript{82} We have seen that there is the site of other gigantic activity.

I suggest that Alkyoneus moved from Corinth to Cos at an early date. He was killed by Herakles, who had been blown thither after the sack of Troy. When his story was taken to Pallene by Corinthian settlers, he became a combination of his two previous incarnations, located in Corinth and Cos, as all giants began to gravitate towards Phlegra. One of the features of the Coan story was the timing of the incident, to the return of Herakles and Telamon from Troy.

This story — Herakles' fight with an Alkyoneus who is an amalgam of the génie of Corinth and a génie from Cos — would date, then, to early in the sixth century. During the next

\textsuperscript{81} cf Polybotes, who turns up on both sides of the channel between Cos and Nisyros (Vian, \textit{GgG} 230f).

\textsuperscript{82} See W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, \textit{The Inscriptions of Cos} (Oxford, 1891), index II s.v.
hundred years, it became part of the version of Herakles' attack on Troy known by the Aeginetans. 83

This becomes more plausible when we consider the alternative, dominant tradition, as represented by Pisander's Heracleia, in which Telamon, after his heroics at Troy (EGF F 8 = fr 11 B), was simply forgotten: for it seems plausible that, in that epic, Herakles fought as the ally of the gods in the full scale gigantomachy. 84 Necessarily, he fights alone:

"Ετρώθη δὲ κατὰ τὴν μάχην Ἡρακλῆς ὑπὸ Χαλκώδοντος, καὶ Δίως ἐξαρπάσαντος αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ἔπαθε. πορθήσας δὲ καὶ ἤκε δὴ Ἀθηνᾶς εἰς ἔλεγχων, καὶ μετὰ δὲ θεῶν κατεπολέμησε γίγαντας."

(Apoll.2.7.1) 85

After the fight, his apotheosis. 86

The tradition of the full scale gigantomachy must have been evolving a little earlier than the story of Herakles' fight with Alkyoneus in Phlegra. 87 There is no reason to doubt that the same Phlegra was not always a strong candidate for the

83 cf Huxley, GEP ch.8 for an idea of the amount of poetic activity devoted to Herakles at this time.
84 Vian, Nouvelles Réflexions 255-259. Although his use of Hes. fr.43a.65 is unjustified, his reconstruction seems a good deal more plausible than that suggested at Gdg 220, which unfairly uses Σ.Ν.4.43b and Σ.Ι.6.47b to suggest the gigantomachy following the interruption of the Geryonian cattle-drive.
85 Ἀθηνᾶς, a correction of the Ἀθηνᾶν of the MSS, is guaranteed by 1.6.1: Zeus Ἡρακλέα... σύμμαχον δι' Ἀθηνᾶς ἔπεκαλέσατο.
86 Hes. Theog. 954ff, with West's note: Herakles is θλίβως, δὲ μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτους ἄνδρος μαίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήρας ἡματα πάντα.
(The lines are late (see West on 947-55).) Cf N.1.67-72; Slater, Victor's Return 257 n.96.
87 Vian, GdG 184.
location. Stories of the giants appear to have originated from the Euboeans; and they colonized all over the Chalcidicean peninsula as early as about 730.\textsuperscript{88} It is curious that, given his activity in the same area, Alkyoneus resisted incorporation into the posse; but he did.\textsuperscript{89} Perhaps the reason for his isolation is the story I have been reconstructing.

Pindar's accounts reflect the composite nature of his source. It is perhaps their variegated nature which has preserved them from over-attention by modern scholars.\textsuperscript{90} I shall now consider them as reflections of a lost narrative.

We can infer little—other than the victory was complete—of the attack on Cos from either πέφυεν δὲ σὺν καὶ ἱερόπων θέους (I.6.31f) or πόρθος καὶ Μέρτοπος (N.4.26). The attack described in the hymn (fr. 33a) would appear to reflect the type of sudden night attack given by Apollodorus, rather than the escalation of hostilities from the small beginning.

\textsuperscript{88} Vian, GdG 179. The claim of the other Phlegraean fields, near Naples, might easily be as ancient, although the first authority is Aristotle (Meteorol.2.8 (368b); Slater, Victor's Return 258 n.100). Colonization: J. Bérard, L'Expansion et la colonisation Grecques jusqu'aux guerres médiques (Aubier, Paris, 1960), 66-9. The exact date is uncertain (66).

\textsuperscript{89} Vian, GdG 217f; Nouvelles Réflexions 258; LIMC 1.1 p.564. Even when he finally became associated with the true Giants, he remained distinguished. So he is Γίγαντων πρεσβύτατος at PMG 985.13f.

\textsuperscript{90} Köhnken discusses N.4.25-30 at Funktion 196-8, contrasting it with the parallel treatment of the same actions in I.6. He emphasizes Telamon's priority in N.4, in contrast with his role as a parallel for Lampon, the victor's father, in I.6. Herakles emerges as his helper (cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 78, 140). N.4 also emphasizes the difficulty of the fight (27-30), leading to the gnome of 32 (cf Σ.50b; Carey, 3 Myths 146-51). I.6 simply stresses the heroes' effectiveness. Elsewhere, the passages feature simply as catalogues (e.g. Bowra, Pindar 297, as well as Bundy, SP 1.3 n.11; Hamilton, Epinikion 58f; Race, Style and Rhetoric 49f).
mentioned by Plutarch. Herakles' attack was *fulmini similis* (Quint. *instit.* 8.6.71). Nor is there mention of Plutarch's shipwreck:

(ἐν τοῖς ἐμνοις Πύνδαρος) οὐ μεθ᾽ Ἡρακλέους ἐκ Τροίας πλέοντες διὰ παρθένου Ἕλλας πορεύον, ἐπει τῇ Μυτέων συνήπαθαν, εἰς Κών ἐπαλιγμόμην Ζεφύρου ἀντιπυκνόομος.

(fr 33a)

The fight with Alkyoneus includes the known data of the rock (πέτρῳ; *N.4.28*) and Alkyoneus' label of βουθόταν (*I.6.32*). Perhaps the detail that he is *οὔραν* in that line is another echo from the same part of his history: his size will be most important when people can see the size of the rock he has thrown.

But the details of the combat would seem to have been relics of the Coan Alkyoneus. The men Alkyoneus kills are evidently two-man teams. They would have been using their chariots either to get close enough for the warrior to begin fighting, or to leave the front. Assuming that it was the former, the detail tells us that they were killed before they were close enough to fight the giant. Now, although the context is shifted to the seaboard, this is exactly the fashion

---

91 See above, p.143 n.5. But Plutarch's version does not describe the whole story (ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν Μερόπων αὐθεν κρατήσασ...). We cannot tell the nature of this second fight.


93 Or elements of the story about the new Pallenian one.

94 It is interesting that there are twenty-four of them, from twelve chariots. The Iliadic Herakles sailed with six ships (*I.5.641*); Diodorus reports a variant, in which he had eighteen (4.32.2). Six appears to be a decorous number for this expedition.
of the opening salvo in Apollodorus’ description of the fight on Cos: Herakles’ men cannot get close because stones are being thrown at them: the Coans βάλλουσι θίων προσπλείν ἐκώλυν (2.7.1). Presumably, the point originally was that each stone the giant threw was big enough to flatten a chariot team.

Once the fight has been moved to the plain of Pallene, and the giant is as much a descendant of the herdsman of Corinth as the Coan génie, the ships which cannot approach the shore become chariots. The stones were big enough to flatten a chariot; and so each one did. Finally, the shower of rocks becomes Alkyoneus’ one, huge boulder.

Whether the successful stone-throw meant a lull in the fighting, and that Alkyoneus was surprised later by Herakles and Telamon, we cannot tell. I suspect that this was the case. Herakles uses his bow (I.6.33f), as he does frequently in the iconography. This appears to be the scene on a late black figure vase, by the Campana painter, found in Tarquinia.

---

95 Robert, Alkyoneus 475, suggests that the stone throw is incompatible with an attack on the sleeping giant. I have suggested a scheme in which it is not.

96 Quite apart from the evidence of the iconography, the feature of the giant’s vulnerability – he cannot be alert all the time – accords with the tastes of archaic man.

97 But not quite as constantly as Olmos and Balmaseda seem to suggest (LIMC 1.1 p.563); contrast Andreae, Herakles.
and dated to about 500. The sleeping Alkyoneus (slumped on a rock) is attacked by Herakles (with bow) and another warrior. On the other side, two four-horse-chariots, and three bulls.

I have suggested, then, that Pindar's accounts are faithful reflections of a story of Herakles' adventures on his return from Troy, which can be dated to the sixth century. The story of the fight with Alkyoneus in Phlegra seems to be a combination of the fight with Alkyoneus near Corinth, and the fight against gigantic Meropes on Cos. As the Coans anthropomorphized their ancestors, their gigantic features - certain aspects of the fight with Herakles, details of genealogy - became submerged in their own history, and postponed to the next adventure on Herakles' trip. Perhaps this postponement was facilitated by Alkyoneus' appearance on Cos: as he was located in his rightful place in Phlegra, the details of his fight with Herakles accompanied him.

But Herakles' fight against a génie of Phlegra, which must have been important for the first Corinthian colonists (especially as they were surrounded by Euboeans), faded in comparison with the story of Herakles' fight at the side of the Olympians against the Giants. Just as Pallene, distant and volcanic, was a good place for Alkyoneus, so it was for the

98 ABV 654.11 = Andreae, Herakles 13 (figs. 34-8) = LIMC 1.1 p.560 (no.16). Andreae is confident that his vase shows the Pindaric form of the myth (184-6); but cf LIMC 1.1 p.563.

99 Also, perhaps, LIMC 1.1 p.562 (no.34) (Etruscan, mid sixth century), which Olmos and Balmaseda hesitate to identify as showing Alkyoneus. It is schematically similar to an identifiable hydra. It shows two warriors - Herakles and Telamon? - advancing with a lance towards a sitting giant, who has a rock in his hand.
posse of Giants. And if, as seems to be the case, this episode was the crown of the canon of Herakles' adventures, it is no surprise that Alkyoneus' story was forgotten. Only the Aeginetans would have cause to cherish it over the gigantomachy; for their hero Telamon fought at Herakles' side against Alkyoneus, but was not only forgotten in, but excluded from, the gigantomachy. And so, in N.4 and I.6, the version of the story already familiar to the audience is reassuringly reflected back to them.

This is a particularly valuable example of this typical phenomenon. For at N.1.67ff, Pindar follows the panhellenic-ally dominant story of the gigantomachy at Phlegra, which is irreconcilable with the fight against the lone Alkyoneus. From the discrepancy, critics might argue that Pindar is innovating in N.4 and I.6, in order to honour Telamon. But the fact that the same sequence of events occurs in both poems must suggest that it was traditional. The obvious explanation is that it was preserved locally, in despite of its panhellenic rival.
The issue of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and fulfillment of the φέρτερον πατέρος prophecy of I.8, was Achilles, the best of the Achaeans who went to Troy.  

Infancy

There are three strands of tradition concerning the events after Achilles' birth. Simplest is that implicit in those lines of the Iliad which speak of Peleus and Thetis living together — sending Achilles off to war and then waiting in vain for his return. It is clear there has been no catastrophic experiment with the infant Achilles, provoking Thetis' departure, for she has brought him up.

Second is the version of Apollodorus (3.13.6) and Apollonius: 

1 Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* ch. 2 and *passim*.
3 *Iliad* 16.574; 19.422; 16.222ff; 18.57-9; 18.89ff; 18.331ff.
4 *Iliad* 1.414; 18.55ff; 18.438.
The third version is similar; except that Peleus and Thetis have lived some time together, and Achilles is their seventh child. Six have already been killed by their mother, either by being plunged into boiling water ([Hes.] [Aegeimios] fr. 300), or by being burnt (Lycophron Alex. 178f), in attempts either to immortalize them, or to assay their immortality.5

It is in the main agreed that it was the second of these versions which featured in the Cypria.6 Aristarchus attributed the divorce to the Neoteroi;7 most informative is his comment on 11.16.222:

οὐ δωδεκατοῖον ἀπέλπις τῶν Ἀχιλλέα γεννήσας ἢ θέτοι, καθάπερ οἱ νεώτεροι ποιηταί, ἀλλὰ συνεβίου Πηλεῖς, ἔκπεμπτον γοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον Ἀχιλλέα...

(Σ.Α.Π.11.222b = Cypria fr. 35 dub II B)8

Severyns points out that this, along with the other scholia discussing the cyclic handling of the story, mentions only Achilles as their child, and so he suggests that in the Cycle Peleus and Thetis lived only a short time together. The

---

5 On the equivalence of the cauldron and the fire, see Jeanmaire, Courto 298.
6 Robert, Heldensage 67 n.4; Severyns, CE 254-8; Jouan, Euripide 90. Kullmann, Quellen 371 disagrees.
7 The term that he used for the authors of the cyclic poems other than the Iliad and Odyssey (Severyns, CE ch. 1, especially 45ff). It should, however, be treated with caution: its appearance in a scholium — even one which seems to be Aristarchan in origin — does not necessarily guarantee that the scholiast is referring to the Cycle (Severyns, CE loc. cit. 40-2); cf Davies, Prolegomena 109f).
8 See also on 16.574; 18.57, 60, 90, 332.
version in which Achilles was their seventh child is thus ruled out. The detail that Achilles was twelve days old also suggests the gradual process of burning and bathing. Apollonius' account may even reflect linguistic details from the Cypria. It has much in common with the account of the attempt to immortalize Demophon at Hom. h.Dem.237ff. They may both reflect a common source - most naturally, the tradition from which emerged the Cypria.

Thetis' abandonment of Peleus is a typical conclusion for the folktale of the doomed union of mortal and sea nymph. The attempt to immortalize Achilles fits perfectly: it dramatizes the heterogeneity of the couple, from which their divorce springs. It is also itself a typical folkloric motif.

It is sometimes said that Thetis' disappearance motivates Chiron's role as Achilles' foster-parent. This is an oversimplification, which has sprung from the fact that in the Iliad, on the whole (see below), neither happens: Thetis does not leave, and Chiron does not appear. Thetis' departure might

---

9 CE 257f.
10 cf Eustathius on Il.18.64 (1130.31).
11 See Richardson ad loc.
12 Robert, Heldensage 67. But see Richardson on h.Dem.237ff: Apollonius may have followed the hymn. Equally, the accounts in the hymn and the Cypria may well have been multiforms.
14 Frazer, Apollodorus App.1; Richardson, Hom. h.Dem. index s.v. Achilles; Stith Thompson, Motif-Index D 1851.1.
15 e.g. Jouan, Euripide 90; Janko on Il.16.220-32.
necessitate a wet nurse; but this is not an obvious job for a male centaur.16

Chiron's role is explicable without reference to the story of Thetis' desertion. Young princes frequently grow up away from home, even though both their parents are yet living. Their foster parents are often at the margins of society; and often related to the mother: either her brother, or her father.17 Chiron is quintessentially marginal: he is isolated from human society through his brutishness, and from the centaurs through his civilization.18 Further, on one genealogy he is Thetis' father, and so Achilles' maternal grandfather.19 We recall that he also instructed Peleus; and on another genealogy, he is Endeis' father, and so Peleus' maternal grandfather, also.20

16 pace Grant, Folktale 27, arguing that Chiron is behaving as the folkloric friendly animal, which often nurses a baby. But this does not address the problem of the centaur's sex.


18 Kirk, Myth 156-62; E. Robbins, "Cyrene and Chiron, the Myth of Pindar's Ninth Pythian", Phoenix 32 (1979), 91-104, here 96-8; cf B. K. Braswell, "Δαμασκς: a Lexicographical Note on Pindar", Glotta 57 (1979), 182-90, here 188f. The paradoxes in the notion of the centaur as culture hero mirror those in the fosterage of a royal child by an inferior (J. Bremmer, "Avunculate and Fosterage", Jnl. Indo-Eur.Stud. 4 (1976), 65-78, here 73f). Even if one believes the terminology of marginality unilluminating, it does attempt to capture the quality through which Chiron is, as he always is, a teacher (Titanomachy fr. 11 B = EGF F 6; Huxley GEP 25f).

19 Σ.Α.Ρ.1.558; Hyg. fab.14; Dict.Cret. 1.14, 6.7; Tzetz. ant. hom.180.

20 Σ.Η.5.12; Σ.Α.Ι.11.16.14. Chiron is interested in the Aiakids, then, not simply because he is related to them (Severyns CE 235f; March, Creative Poet 26), but because the
Certainly, Thetis' disappearance and Achilles' fosterage by Chiron may go hand in hand during a narrative of Achilles' childhood; her departure naturally draws attention to his upbringing in her absence. But Chiron's role is not dependent on Thetis'. Instead, it seems a traditional tale itself.  

If all this is so, then the treatment of this material in the *Iliad* becomes intelligible. We have seen that, in the main, Homer considers that nothing untoward happened during Achilles' childhood; that Thetis sent him to war, and waits for his return home. Equally, it is Phoenix, not Chiron, who brought him up (*Iliad* 9.478ff). This might mean that the version in which Chiron brought up the orphan Achilles, although redolent of antiquity, is in fact later. But it cannot be, for it surfaces occasionally through the *Iliad*: Thetis does live apart from her husband, in the sea; and Chiron did have a hand in bringing up their child. Thetis laments the humiliating inequality of her marriage. These appearances would be impossible on Aristarchus' model.

---

relationship is this particular, important one. And this is the reason for his concern and assistance for Peleus that I described in the last chapter.

22 So Aristarchus, as above, and March, *Creative Poet* 23–6.
25 Note Σ.Α.ΙΙ.1.396; cf Severyns, *CE* 256f.
The alternative is that the story of Achilles’ orphanage was early enough to have appeared in the Iliad, but does not. A simple reason for its absence presents itself: Homer’s preferred version eliminates the attempted immortalization and the fabulous Centaur. His rejection of the alternative is thus another example of his broad strategy of eliminating the magical. One may divine more specific explanations.

The folkloric version, generally ignored by Homer, was preserved by the Cypria, probably, and two poems of the Hesiodic corpus: it is the mainspring of the Precepts of Chiron (see below); and features in the Catalogue:

Χείρων δ’ ἐν Πηλίῳ διημεῖτι
Πηλείδην ἐκόμιζε πόδας ταχών, ἔξοχον ἄνδρῶν,
παῖδ’ ἔτ’ ἑόν[τ’].

([Hes.] fr.204.87-9)

This hypothesis of an early story of Chiron’s education of Achilles accords with the existence of other, early, evidence for his role as educator of other heroes. In the Iliad he has also instructed Asklepios in the use of pharmaka (4.219). In the Theogony he looks after Medea’s child:

---

26 Robert, Heldensage 69.

27 The faint traces of a story of Thetis giving Achilles armour in Phthia (Eur. El.442ff; I.A.1067ff; cf LIMC 1.1 p.69-72 (nos.186-205)) may suggest that Homer’s preferred version was also traditional (see Edwards, Neomana 316-21).

28 Griffin, Uniqueness 40 and passim; Janko on 16.220-32.

29 e.g. Braswell, Mythological Innovation 22f; Janko on 16.741-4.

30 Asklepios was son of Koronis, daughter of Phlegyas the Lapith, who lived on the Thessalian plain, under Pelion ([Hes.] fr.59; P.3.34). Again, as the centaur who lives at the margin of Lapith society, Chiron is perfectly placed to receive Asklepios into his charge (cf P.3 passim).
Medeios' father, Jason, has been added to the roster of his pupils by the time of the Catalogue (fr. 40; cf N.3.54; P.4.102f); and the list continues to grow. If I am right in suggesting that Achilles was originally Chiron's pupil through his maternal ancestry, then these other instances, in which there is no such relation, must be secondary.

These matters occur thrice in Pindar. Nowhere does he prefer the Homeric version to the Cyclic. Most important is the short narrative of Achilles' education by Chiron at N.3.43-58; but there are brief mentions at P.3.100f (τοῦ ἤμ. Πελεύς) δὲ παῖς, ὀμπερ μόνον ἄθανάτα / τίκτευ ἐν Ἕδει θέτει·)

and in P.6: Thrasyboulos remembers the precepts

 orc; Χείρωνος ὑποθήκας Ἡσιόδου ἀνατίθεσαν, δὲ μὴ ἀρχὴν
 ἐὰν μὲν τὸ ἔκαστα μετὰ προσεκ σεπικαμίας
 θέους αἴτιον πρῶτον μὲν, ἢτ᾿ ἐν ὅμοιον εἰςαφικήν
 ἔρθειν ἠπά χαλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενετέχνων

(Σ.Ρ.6.22 = [Hes] fr.283)

31 Once more, a child is born on the plain of Thessaly, here in Iolkos (Theog.997) and taken off to the hill above it.

32 Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 62.
The Precepts of Chiron was a poem of straightforward wisdom, traditionally attributed to Hesiod.\(^33\) It was formally addressed to Achilles.\(^34\) It was certainly well known in fifth century Athens; its popularity may go some way towards explaining the priority of the Cypria's account of Achilles' youth over the Iliadic.\(^35\)

"ἀφαινηκομένῳ at P. 6. 22 plainly points to the version in which Thetis has abandoned Achilles. Chiron is identified as Philyra's son (22). She is also named at N. 3.43: the young Achilles lives ζηλύρας ἐν ἀδύμοις. These appearances may reflect a role for her in the story - perhaps as Achilles' wet nurse.\(^36\) βαρύσσια is a hapax legomenon; ὀμείρεων is another, and smacks of the epic ἀμέρδων.\(^37\)

"ἀφαινηκομένῳ is a curious epithet to apply to a pupil learning that he must honour his parents. It introduces a poignancy unnecessary for the mechanics of the allusion. Equally, βίου πεπρωμένου is not otiose, but suggests the early death which Achilles courts by fighting at Troy.\(^38\)

\(^{33}\) Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 228-244: here 229-33 (attribution); 238-43 (subject matter).

\(^{34}\) Paus.9.31.5.

\(^{35}\) Jouan, Euripide 92 n.1.

\(^{36}\) So Braswell on P.4.103; cf Σ.Α.Ρ. 4.813a: τὴν Χαρικλῆ καὶ τὴν ζηλύραν, ὅφεὶ ἄνω ἐτράφη ὁ Ἀχιλλευς; Schwartz, Pseudo-Hesiodeia 235f.

\(^{37}\) e.g. Hom. h.Dem.312; cf [Hes.] fr.283.3.

\(^{38}\) e.g. ll.1.414-6; 9.410ff; 18.87ff.
This becomes even more important if, as I shall argue, Achilles' killing of Memnon clinches his own death. For Achilles is driven to kill Memnon in revenge for the death of Antilochos, which Pindar goes on to describe in P.6. That passage seems to be drawn from the Aethiopis. The place of the episode in the epic is shown by Proclus:

Now, τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα can only mean that Thetis told Achilles of the implications of fighting Memnon - how closely their fates were tied. Some confirmation for this is given by neoanalytic critics, who draw a parallel between the whole episode and the deaths of Patroklos and Hektor in the Iliad. In the parallel scene, in Iliad 18, Thetis tells Achilles that his fate is dependent on Hektor's:

αὐτίκα γὰρ τοι ἐπείτα μεθ’ Ἑκτόρα πότιμος ἐτοίμος.

αὐτίκα betrays the original context of this sentiment: Achilles' death follows immediately after he kills Memnon.

39 Below, pp.235-7; cf Kullmann, Quellen 311.


41 Vian, Recherches 31.

42 On neoanalysis, see below, pp.228-30.

43 Kullmann, Quellen 308ff, especially 311.
Now, in *Iliad* 18, Thetis and Achilles also discuss his birth and upbringing, and his doomed life, and this prompts the speculation that they spoke of the same matters in the parallel scene in the *Aethiopis*. These are the topics to which Pindar alludes with ὀρφανιζομένῳ and βίον πεπρωμένου. I suspect, then, that these touches spring from the interview with Thetis in the *Aethiopis*, just as the subsequent treatment of Antilochos’ death springs from the subsequent episode in the same poem. The allusion suggests Achilles’ concern for Antilochos, enhancing his worth, and that he did not die unavenged.

Whether or not this is so, these details — ὀρφανιζομένῳ, βίον πεπρωμένου — poignantly evoke Achilles’ situation, as it was known from the cyclic epics, with a force which goes beyond what is necessary for the functioning of the allusion, and which seems to be unresponsive to a centripetal examination of the poem.

An epic model is more obviously behind young Achilles’ eventual appearance in P.3.

εἰ δὲ λόγῳ ουνέμεν παρυφάν, Ἰέρων,
ὸρθῶν ἐπίστα, μακεδών οίδα προτέρων
ἐν παρ. ἐστὶν πήματα σύνδυο δαίσιται βροτοῖς
ἀθάνατοι.

(P.3.80-82)

Chief among the προτέρων is Homer, for the image springs from Zeus’ urns in *Iliad* 24:

44 *Iliad* 18. 52-62, 85-93.

45 For both would subvert the maxim. P.6 has resisted unifying analysis: S. L. Schein, "Unity and Meaning in Pindar’s Sixth Pythian Ode", *MHIT* 2 (1987), 235-47; in particular 239 n.15.
δοιοι γάρ τε πίθοι καταχείται εν Δίῳς οὔδει
doíoi gar te πίθois katakeítaei en Díōs oudei
δόρων οία δίδωσι, κακῶν. ἔτερος δὲ ἐδώμω
dórhoon oía didōsai, kakōn. étērous de edōmō
ὁ μὲν θ. διμείξες δόρη Ζεός τερπικέραμων,
ὁ μέν τε κακῷ ὦ γε κύρεται, ἀλλοτε δ' ἐσθίζει:
(II.24.527-30)

Critics have been distracted by the apparent change from two
urns to the equivalent of three.⁴⁶ So it seems to have been
ignored that both Homer’s Achilles and Pindar go on to use
Peleus as paradigmatic of the gnome.⁴⁷

We compare P.3:

We compare P.3:

αἰῶν δ’ ἀσφαλῆς
aiōn δ’ asphalēs
οὕς ἔγεντ’ οὕτ’ Αἰακίδα παρὰ Πηλεί
ōus égeni’ ou’ Aiakída para Pēlei
οὕτε παρ’ ἀντιθέως Κάθως’ λέγονται μᾶν βροτῶν
ōute para’ antiθéos Káthōs’ légontai mān brotōn
ὁλβου διήρτατον οἷς σχέτων, οὕτε καὶ χρυσαμπώων
holbou diērtaτon ois schéton, ou’te kai khrusamptōwōn
μελλομενων ἐν δρει Μοείδια καὶ ἐν ἑπταπόλοις
mellomenōn en drei Moeidía kai en épaptoloiç
οἷον θήβαις, ὡπόθ’ Ἀρμονίαν γάμεν βοῶπιν,
o de Nηρέωs euboúloθ thetín paída klytán,
καὶ θεοὶ διάουτο παρ’ ἀμφότεροις,
cai theoi diáouto para’ amphotérois,
καὶ Κρόνου παίδας βασιλῆς ἵδου χρυ-
cai Krónov paídaς basiliças hidou khrυ-
σέας ἐν ἔδραις, ἔδω τε
σέaς en édraiç, édō te
(II.24.534-40)

We compare P.3:
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o de Nηρέωs euboúloθ thetín paída klytán,
καὶ θεοὶ διάουτο παρ’ ἀμφότεροις,
cai theoi diáouto para’ amphotérois,
καὶ Κρόνου παίδας βασιλῆς ἵδου χρυ-
cai Krónov paídaς basiliças hidou khrυ-
σέας ἐν ἔδραις, ἔδω τε
σέaς en édraiç, édō te
(II.24.534-40)

⁴⁶ Σ.Ρ.3.141; Young, 3 Odes 51; MacLeod on Iliad 24.527-33. We
should not lose sight of the fact that Pindar does not mention
urns.

⁴⁷ Robbins notes it, and suggests that it confirms the reference
to Iliad 24.527f (Gifts of the Gods 313).
The passages run parallel, but for Kadmos' intrusion, and Pindar's elaborations: Homer's ἀγλαὴ ἡμέρα (534) are Pindar's ἀλὼν ὑπέρτατον (89); 24.537 becomes P.3.89-95; and παιδώριον (24.540), 101f. They then continue on broadly similar lines. Achilles notes that Priam was once prosperous, but is now beset with care; and urges him to endure, and not endlessly and pointlessly mourn his son (24.543-51). Pindar touches on the same themes, in general terms: he notes the precariousness of good fortune, and urges that one make the best of one's fortune (P.3.104-9). 48

If Iliad 24.534ff does lie behind P.3.86ff, then the precise nature of Peleus' disappointment in 100f becomes clear: his only son (μόνου) was not the marvellous progeny he might have expected from his divine bride (ἄθωνάτα) and was doomed: οὗτος ἐμὴ γένετο κρεῖνωτας. / ἄλλ' ἐνα παῖς τέχευ παίδωριον. 49

More broadly, the Homeric model enriches the close of the ode. P.3 is, I think, a consolatio; 50 so the consolation which

48 On δαίμων (109), see Rohde, Psyche 441 n.26.
49 cf Gildersleeve 269.
50 The poem might be at once an encomium and a consolatio (so e.g. W. J. Slater, "Pindar's Pythian 3: Structure and Purpose", QUCS NS 29 (1988), 51-61), but the only mention of a victory is at 73f, where ποτὲ suggests that it was not a recent win. Young, "Pindar Pythians 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτὲ and the Poetic Epistle", HSCP 87 (1983), 31-42 attempts to explain ποτὲ
Pindar offers Hieron in this ode is informed by Achilles' consolation of Priam. Pindar exploits the brilliance of Iliad 24 to buttress his own poem. Priam is a flattering analogue for Hieron. The pathos of his situation in Iliad 24 generates our sympathy for Hieron—for at least by the time of Aristotle, Priam is the pattern of good fortune turned to bad. He is a third paradeigma, alongside Peleus and Kadmos, generated only through allusion, exemplifying the frailty of human flourishing, and the preponderance of misfortune.

away (it is to be read from the perspective of the future audience); but see Lefkowitz, Victory Ode 163 n.42; Robbins, Gifts of the Gods 307-12. I find little celebration here, but consolation in the form of an epinician, which Pindar regrets that he cannot bring (72ff; cf Peliccia, Pindarus Homericus).


52 Compare his use of the Δίὸς ἀπάτη in P.9: Köhnken, Meilichos Orga 90f.

53 See e.g. Il.3.105ff; 20.183; RE s.v. Priamos 1848-50.

54 Eth.Nic. 1100a 5-9:

A little further on, he describes a man encountering Πριαμικὰς τύχας (1101a 8).

55 Compare the allusive citation of Semele, whose sins are analogous to Koronis', at 98f: Robbins, Gifts of the Gods 314f.
Finally, the shadow of *Iliad* 24 prepares us for the claims of the last epode of *P.* 3, formally guaranteed by the examples of Nestor and Sarpedon (112). The boast that poetry gives lasting value to human achievement - some sort of immortality - is a commonplace; but has been thought out of place in the context of an ode which insists on the impossibility of immortality.

But in the Homeric poems, the thought is not a boast, but a consolation. Alkinous wonders why Odysseus weeps:

(84x754)

But in the Homeric poems, the thought is not a boast, but a consolation. Alkinous wonders why Odysseus weeps:

εἰπὲ δ' ὃ τι κλαίεις καὶ διόρεως ἐνυδωθ᾽ θυμῷ Ἀργείων Δαυδῶν ἰδὲ Ἰλίου οἰτον ἄκούσων. 

τόν δὲ θεόν μὲν τεῦξαν, ἔπεκλῶσαυτὸ δὲ ὁλεθρον θυμώποις, ἰνα γὰρ καὶ ἐκομμένουσιν ἀοίδη.

(Od. 8.577-80)

The use of the Homeric model from *P.* 3.80ff suggests that the claim of the last lines has this melancholy colour; and this is confirmed by the otherwise curious choice of Nestor and Sarpedon as exemplars. They are ideal paradigms of the consolatory theme: all must die. For they both represent a

---

56 Bundy, *SP* 2.86ff.


59 So too Helen explains that Zeus has given her and Paris ἀνδρῶν, διὰ καὶ ὀπίσω ἀνθρώποι πελώμεθ' ἀπὸδειμον ἐκομμένοις (Ili. 6.357f); cf 22.303-5; Od. 5.309-12; 24.200f.

60 Young suggests that they are "deliberately random names" (3 *Odes* 62); Gildersleeve, that they were paradigmatic of mourning (269). Neither convinces.

61 Schantz, op. cit. 49; Lattimore, op. cit. 250-56. The *locus classicus* is Achilles' confrontation of his own mortality:
maximum: 62 even the oldest must die; 63 and even the most favoured. 64 The failure of each emphasizes the failure of the other to cheat death. 65 The force of the argument is: even Nestor and Sarpedon died; but they are at least celebrated in song. The application to Hieron is left implicit: even they

οδε γαρ οδε βης Ἡρακλῆς φύγε κῆρα,
ὅς περ φίλτατος έσακε Δι’ Κρονίωνι ἀνατι
ἀλλὰ ε’ μοῖρ’ ἐδάμασσε καὶ ἀργάλεος χόλος Ἡρης.
ὡς καὶ ἑγών, εἰ δὴ μοι ἰμοῖρα τέτυκται,
χεῖσομ’ ἐπεὶ κε θάνω νῦν δέ κλέος ἐσθαλὸν ἀροῖμην,

(I1.18.117-21)

62 See Carey, Pythian 4 150.

63 Nestor’s age: II.1.250ff; cf. 11.669ff; P.6.35; RE s.v. 119f. E. R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (trans., Princeton, 1973), 80-2 notes the use of the extremely old as consolatory material; and has good mediaeval examples. But his classical citation of Tithonus from Horace 1.28.8 is cavalier - for Tithonus is elsewhere known as a human who won immortality, but not eternal youth; and who desperately wanted to die, but could not. See H. J. Rose, “Tithonus or Orpheus?”, CR 61 (1947), 50, answering J. G. Griffith (CR 59 (1945), 44) and A. Y. Campbell (CR 60 (1946), 103-6). Nestor and Tithonus are associated in old age at e.g. Prop. 2.25.10 (cf RE s.v. Nestoros 120).

64 A late epitaph from Teos:

της ἐπ’ ἐμοι λύπης παραμύθιον ἐμ φρει’ θέσθε
toυτοῦ καὶ μακάρων παιδες ἐνερθέν ἐβαν.

(CF 298.74)

Cf Lattimore, op. cit. 254. Sarpedon is not simply the son of a god, but the dearest son of Zeus (II.16.432-61). Zeus’ dilemma over whether to save him dramatizes how near he came to defying his mortality.

65 Curtius argues that usual complement to an example of death in extreme old age is one of death in infancy (loc. cit.). The lesson is the universality of death. Little children die, their parents are told, because the gods love them: R. Kassel, “Untersuchungen zur Griechischen und Römischen Konsolationsliteratur”, Zetemata 18 (1958), 84. So was Sarpedon; but his death in the Iliad is so famously presented as a misfortune that it cannot represent this extreme (pace Dio.Chrys. 28.13f, a farrago of consolatory themes).
died, and so must you; but as they were celebrated in song, so shall you be. 66

The addressee of such remarks could only be in extremis. I suspect that the analogy between Hieron and Priam has an even more poignant dimension. Priam's particular grief is that he lived too long. 67 His case shows that the postponement of death does not simply controvert the natural order of things, but is not even desirable. μὴ φίλα ψυχά, βίου ἀδύνατον / σπεύδε: if no cure is possible, then death may be our physician. 68

I return to the young Achilles. Pindar describes his precocity at length in Ν. 3:

(Ν. 3. 43-53)

66 The application to Hieron is generated through the first person in ΝΙΙΙ: Young, 3 Odes 58f.

67 [Plut.] Consolatio ad Apollonium 113E: "μείου" γὰρ δυνα, "ἐξάρχουσαν Τρώιλος ἢ Πρίαμος," ικανος, εἰ προετελεύτησαν ἐπὶ ἀκμαζούσας αὐτοῦ τῆς βοσκείας καὶ τῆς τροσάτης τύχης...

Cicero Tusc. disp. 1.85; cf Juvenal 10.258; and cf II.24.244-6.

68 cf Aesch. fr.353 R; B. Lier, "Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum", Philologus NF 16 (1903), 445-77, 563-603; 17 (1904), 54-65, here 16 (1903), 596f.
It seems reasonable to ascribe these deeds of early hunting prowess to the Cypria. In particular, Achilles' prey remains reassuringly constant: Apollodorus notes that Achilles fed on ortXayavoLC; XCOUTCOU *at aixou aypCuv aC ap*Twv jJueXofq (3.13.6); a scholiast on the Iliad on marrows of lions and bears (Σ.Α.II.16.37); and Statius, that it was spissa leonum and viscera... lupae... medullae (Achilleid 2.99f). A seventh-century vase shows Chiron carrying lion, boar and wolf on his staff, confirming the antiquity of the details, and confirming that the Cypria is a plausible source.

Statius' Achilles declares that he non ullos ex more cibos hausisse nec almis uberibus satiasse famem, sed spissa leonum viscera semianimisque lupae traxisse medullas. (Achilleid 2.98-100)

Clearly, this diet accords with Achilles' fighting brilliance. It may even explain it; for the eater ingests the qualities of his food. Achilles also ate the marrow of deer: hence his speed. Semianismis is the most ferocious touch: the flesh is not simply raw and uncooked, but as good as alive.

69 Severyns, CE 261. The Precepts of Chiron also seems to have contained hunting instructions (Schwartz, Pseudo-Hesiodeia 240).
60 LIMC 1.1 p.45 (no.21); J. D. Beazley, The Development of Attic Black-Figure (Calif. U. Pr., 1951), 10f; cf Robert, Heldensage 80 n.3.
71 Frazer Apollodorus 2.70f n.2; 1.369ff n.4 on Tydeus gulping Melanippos' brains (3.6.8).
72 Robertson, Food of Achilles.
73 Philostratus Her.45.4; Et.Magn. s.v.  'Αχιλλευς.
74 cf Vermeule, Aspects of Death index s.v. cannibalism; 133; M. Detienne, "Between Beasts and Gods", in R. L. Gordon (ed.),
Robertson brilliantly argued that οὐκ ἃν ἔπαρ προάν
/ Κένταυρον δοθμαίνουσα ψώμιζεν (N.3.47) refers to the same
detail: "the beasts were still breathing because Achilles
wished to suck their living marrow in the cave." Pindar
alludes, then, to a detail from the epic, which Statius
resuscitates. The detail is certainly in the spirit of the
Cypria. Pindar's allusion is sure but unobtrusive, as befits
a detail so fascinating and disgusting.

There is, however, doubt as to whether οὐκ... δοθμαίνουσα is the right reading. Against this is the reading
οὐκαὶ (D), along with the paraphrase: τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐκαὶ
ἐνεργῶν ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς δοθμαίνοντος πλήρης... θήρας ἔφορει. This
suggests that one MS read δοθμαίνων, referring to Achilles,
with either οὐκαὶ or οὐκαὶ. So Bury, arguing that there was
little point in the beasts not yet being dead. But there is
point. Further, δοθμαίνων is indecorous for Achilles because

Myth, Religion and Society (Cambridge, 1981), 215-228,
especially 218f.
75 Food of Achilles, here 180.
76 On Statius' catholic use of sources, see Dilke, Achilleid
10-12; D. Vessey, Statius and the Thebaid (Cambridge, 1973),
67-71.
77 Griffin, Uniqueness 40.
78 Robertson goes on to argue that Pindar is bowdlerizing this
story, although, as is his wont, he has used a word "carefully
designed to recall the rejected story" (Food of Achilles 179;
cf Huxley, Pindar's Vision 19). But there is no rejection.
79 Σ. Η. 3.82.
80 H. van Herweden "Pindarica", JPh Suppl.13 (1894), 25;
"Pindarica", Mnes. NF 25 (1897), 51.
he is here contrasted with ψευδευμὸς ἐνήρ ἄλλος ἄλλα πνεύων (41). And Pindar uses the cognate θανάτος at N.10.74, to mean "death-rattle" (LSJ); there are no other instances. The allusion is, simply, nice and Pindaric: we should read ἀνέματα... ἄνεμαλλοντα.

Achilles' quarry is divided into two; Pindar makes a different point with each. Lions and boars are traditionally the game of adults; indeed, the successful hunt of a boar could be definitive of maturity. But Achilles is killing such prey from the age of six, by throwing weapons which are little more than toys. Hunting with nets, on the other hand, is the hunt proper to the young man; so here the point is not Achilles' precocity, but his speed (52). Köhnken points out that his failure to use dogs amazes Artemis, to use nets, Athena.

This differentiation between two styles of hunting cannot, however, provide a δέ to answer μέν in 43. The obvious contrast to Achilles' childhood is his adulthood, described at

81 cf Aesch. Eum.651 (although panting is itself not an undignified thing in Pindar, being a symptom of ponos).
82 Dissen compares Homeric usage, of the dead or wounded: II. 10.496; 13.399; 21.182.
84 One would not normally throw even heavier spears at lion or boar (cf e.g. Od.19.447ff). Hence τὸς τ' ἀνέμων (45).
85 Vidal-Naquet, loc. cit.
86 Apud Erbse, dritte nemeische 284 n.1.
87 That in 49 will certainly not do, pace Bury. For a survey of solutions, see Erbse, dritte nemeische 283.
59ff - but there is no δέ. Either, then, μέν is forgotten and goes unanswered (Dissen); or one must find a less conspicuous candidate. Erbse argued that λέγουμενον δέ τούτο προτέρων / ἐπος ἔχω referred only forward; and so provides the δέ. The contrast is thus between Achilles' sport and his education. But 52f must, in the absence of any good reason why not, refer to the whole account: it is a guarantee of the entire astonishing story. But the contrast between Achilles' play and spiritual development is a promising avenue: so inviting, perhaps, that the antithesis was not specifically marked.

Carey suggests that ποοσι γὰρ κράτεσο (52) contrasts with the man who knows by teaching only:

\[\psiφευνός \ \dot{\text{α}}\nu\nu\rho\]

\[\dot{\text{α}}\lambdaλος \ \dot{\text{α}}\lambdaλα \ \dot{\text{π}}\nu\\dot{\text{ω}}\nu \ \dot{\text{o}} \ \dot{\text{π}}\nu \ \dot{\text{α}}\dot{\text{τ}}\rho\dot{\text{ε}}\nu\epsilon\]

\[\dot{\text{κ}}\alpha\tau\epsilon\beta\alpha \ \dot{\text{π}}\nu\dot{\text{δ}}\iota\iota, \ \mu\nu\gammaι\\nu \ \dot{\text{δ}} \ \dot{\text{α}}\dot{\text{ρ}}\dot{\text{ε}}\dot{\text{τ}}\alpha\nu \ \dot{\text{ο}}\dot{\text{τ}}\epsilon\dot{\text{λ}}\varepsilon\nu \ \nu\nu\nu \ \dot{\text{γ}}\epsilon\dot{\text{υ}}\epsilon\dot{\text{τ}}\alpha\nu.
\]

\[\{N.3.41f\}\]

Equally, ψφευνός contrasts with the typical image of light for Aiakid glory (64). πνέων and γεύσεων, perhaps, are also juxtaposed with Achilles' experiences: his victims are panting; and he does not simply taste various excellences, but swallows them as the marrow and innards of his excellent quarry.

I have argued that each of the three occurrences of Achilles' infancy in Pindar is informed by an epic: the treatment in P.6, by the Aethiopis; in P.3, by the Iliad; and in N.3, by the Cypria. We shall see that this is the pattern for

88 Dritte nemeische 184f.
89 Privitera, Eracle 262f; cf Stinton, Si Credere 66.
90 3 Myths 159; cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 41f.
91 Privitera, Eracle 266f.
Pindar's handling of Achilles: entries in catalogues of exploits are marked by precise allusions to the cyclic epic which told of the incident. Nowhere does it emerge more plainly that Pindar's mythical material can be understood fully only when seen in the light of the tradition on which he drew.

Telephos

The story of the false start to the Trojan war of the ingenuous raid on Teuthrania was told in the Cypria. We know little of the details of the fighting; but the outline is clear. The barest bones are given by Proclus:

\[\text{The story of the false start to the Trojan war was told in the Cypria.} \]

An Iliadic scholium has the fullest account:

\[\text{An Iliadic scholium has the fullest account:} \]

(Chrest. 125-8)
There is no point of disagreement between these three; and numerous echoes of vocabulary – in particular between the last two. It is tempting to suggest that they both reflect the Cypria. Eustathius’ version also seems to look toward that work:

οἱ μὲν... φασὶ κρῶμενοι τῇ τῶν νεωτέρων ἱστορίᾳ τῇ λεγομένη, ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα ἐπιστρατεύοντες τῇ Τροίᾳ οἱ Ἑλλήνες ἦμαρτον τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ τὴν μηδὲν αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμωρίαν προσήκουσαν γῆν ἐληίζουσιν. Ὁ δὲ ἦν ὁ ὑπὸ τῆς Τήλεφος Μυσία. Ὅ δ’ ἦν Τήλεφος ἀντικαταστάς ἐποίησε τι κακοῦ καὶ ἔπαθε. πέπουσε μὲν τραύμα δεινὸν ὕπο Ἀχιλλέως ἀμέλειον ἔληκε συμποδιασθέντος αὐτῷ τὸν ἤπιον κατὰ Διονύσου πρόαυς καὶ πεδινός εἰς γῆν· ἐποίησε δὲ τὸ ἀπράκτους ὑποχωρῆσαι τοὺς Ἑλλήνας.

(Eust. ad II.1.59 (46.36-42))

There is no significant common vocabulary shared by this and the versions above; but it was Eustathius’ habit to recast scholia in his own words.¹ The only significant difference is

¹ Van der Valk, Text and Scholia 1.24 n.86.
the detail that it was Telephos' horse which tripped; but this, in a context in which there is some evidence that Eustathius is using diverse sources from memory, is, most likely, irrelevant to the Cypria. Further, that Telephos was wounded in the thigh, as he is everywhere, supports the version in which he is on foot (see below).

We should note immediately that Telephos is a significant hero. We have seen that he is Herakles' son. He has a place in cult in Pergamum, in Teuthrania.

Our picture of the Cypria account is easily given a little more detail. It seems that Telephos interrupted the Greeks' pillaging, killed Thersandros, and chased the Achaeans back to their ships. Thersandros was Polyneikes' son, and so one of the Epigonoi who took Thebes. Pindar salutes Theron through him:

\[
\text{λείψη δὲ θέραμματος ἐριπέντε Πολυ-} \\
\text{νείκης, νέοις ἐν δέθλοις} \\
\text{ἐν μάχαις τε πολέμου} \\
\text{τιμώμενος, Ἄδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἄρωγὸν δόμοις.}
\]

2 ibid. 1.24f.

3 cf Eur. fr. 696.4f N²; Dictys Cretensis: is namque Hercule genitus procerus corpore ac pollens viribus, divinis patriis virtutibus propriam gloriæque aequiperaverat (2.4).

4 Paus. 3.26.10; 5.13.5; Farnell, GHC 353.

5 Robert, Heldensage 1148f.

6 Perhaps he was, at first, not at hand. The Greeks τούς Νιους ἐληφαντο μετά τὴν τοῦ Τηλέφου ἀποδήμαν (Mant. Prov. 2.28 = Paroem. Gr. 2.762). Proclus (ἐξήκοσις) and Σ. Gen. II.1.59 (ἰδὼν τὴν χώραν λειτατουμένην, τοὺς Νιουσ ἀκοπλίσας) may suggest that this was a detail from the Cypria.

7 The other Epigonoi at Troy are Diomedes, Sthenelos and Euryalos; and these three are the leaders of the detachment from Argos (II.2.559-67).
He was the father of the Spartan hero Tisamenos. All this suggests that he was a hero from the very top of the second division - a significant victim for Telephos. And according to Pausanias, he was preeminent on the field until he met Telephos: 

The closest Homeric parallel for Telephos' advent in the battle is Patroklos'. His first victim is the Paionian leader Pyraichmes; and when they see him fall, the Paionians flee (Il.16.284-93). It is likely that Thersandros' death was similarly emblematic of the swing of fortunes in the battle in Mysia.

Telephos chases the Achaeans back to their ships; but is not victorious for long: 

One of Pindar's accounts suggests the details of the combat at this point: Patroklos

8 cf Σ. 0.2.63-7. On Thersandros' athletic success, cf Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 55f: Thersandros is "the most reputable figure" of Theron's ancestors.
9 Paus. 3.15.8; 9.5.15, 8.7.
10 See Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 13, 192f.
At first sight, this appears to indicate that Patroklos performed so well that Achilles decided that they should always fight together. But, in the Iliad, their inseparability springs from long before this time: Patroklos’ ghost chides Achilles:

\[ \text{μὴ ἕμα σῶν ἀπάνευθε τιθήμεναι δατέ', 'Ἀχιλλεῦ, ἄλλ' δομοῖ, ὡς τραφομένων ἐπὶ ἐν ὑμετέραις δόμοισιν, εὐτέτις μὲ τυσθῶν ἔστετα Μενοίτιος ἐς ὑπόενος ἤγαγεν ὑμετέρονδε... ἕνα μὲ δεξάμενος ἐν δόμαις ἶπποτα Πηλεύς ἔτραφε τ' ἐνυδακέως καὶ σοὺ θεράπουν' ἄναμμεν.} \]

(\textit{Il.} 23.83-6, \textit{89f})

And it is this type of relationship which seems to be implicit at 0.10.18f, where they are explicitly compared to trainer and athlete.

It is likely that their stand together in the Cypria is simply an illustration of their cooperation; of the relationship which is assumed throughout the Iliad. But if this is so, what is the force of 0.9.76ff?

Wilamowitz suggested that the 0.9 passage was the product of the combination of the Cypria description of their fight

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Σ.0.9.115b;} Van der Kolf, \textit{Quaeritur} 105, concluding \textit{maior eigitur Patroclus honore afficitur.}
\item cf [Hes.] fr. 212a, in which Patroklos becomes Achilles’ natural cousin, with West, \textit{Hesiodic Catalogue} 163, 141.
\item Kullmann, \textit{Quellen} 193f.
\end{enumerate}
against Telephos and Achilles’ warning to Patroklos as he prepares to arm himself in the Iliad:

\[\text{μὴ σὺ γ' ἐμελεθεὶν ἐμεῖο λιθασθῆται πολεμίζειν}
\]
\[\text{Τρωὶ φιλοπολέμοισιν ἀτιμότερον δὲ μὲ θῆκας.} \]

\[(\text{Il.16.89f})^{14}\]

But it is more helpful to note Achilles’ lament after Patroklos has fallen:

\[\text{"ἀὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐρ' ἐμελλὼν ἐταίρῳ}
\]
\[\text{κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμώσαι: ὡ μὲν μάλα τηλῶθι πάρτησιν}
\]
\[\text{ἐφείτ', ἐμεῖο δὲ δῆκεν ἀρῆς ἀλκήρα γενέσθαι."} \]

\[(\text{Il.18.98-100})^{15}\]

For this puts a rather different slant on the depiction of the fight with Telephos at 0.9.76-9: the lines describe an occasion on which Achilles was near to save his friend.\(^{16}\)

There is some evidence that Patroklos was wounded by Telephos.\(^{17}\) The incident depicted on a red-figure cup by the Sosias painter of Achilles bandaging him up has been reasonably ascribed to the Cypria.\(^{18}\) The detail might explain why Achilles leaves Telephos wounded, and not killed: once he has chased him off, he dashes back to his friend. Perhaps this fragment from Euripides’ Telephus describes the incident:

---

\(^{14}\) Wilamowitz, Pindaros 351f, after Σ.0.9.115d, 118c.

\(^{15}\) Anticipated by Hektor’s taunt to the dying Patroklos at 16.827f.

\(^{16}\) This implies a causal connexion between Il.18.98ff and the story narrated in the Cypria. The direction of the causality is irrelevant to my purpose. See Kullmann, Quellen 189-201 with Severyns’ review (AC 30 (1961), 541-4, especially 543), and Davies, Epic Cycle 44.

\(^{17}\) RE s.v. Kyklos (Kyпria) 2388.

\(^{18}\) ARV² 21.1; Roscher, s.v. Patroklos 1693; but see Robert, Heldensage 1153 n.1.
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Now the dynamics of the story told in the 0.9 passage fall into place, illuminated by what appears to have been the account of the Cypria. Achilles and Patroklos are the only two to stand firm against the onrush of the Mysians, led by Telephos. So Patroklos demonstrated his fixity of intent (74f). [Patroklos was wounded; but as Telephos went to kill him, Achilles chased him off and wounded him with his spear, before returning to his wounded friend.] He urges him not, in the hurly-burly, to stray far from the spear which has saved him on this occasion. The specification of the spear has a second resonance: it is the spear which Patroklos leaves behind when he impersonates Achilles in the Iliad; his inability to wield it is definitive of by how much he falls short of Achilles (Il.16.140-7). 0.9.79 is a melancholy glance to the time when Patroklos goes into battle without the spear.


20 The closest parallel in the Iliad is the pattern of Il.16.581-8, in which Epeigeus, Patroklos' friend, is killed, prompting Patroklos to counter-attack in fury, killing the killer and throwing the Trojans into retreat. The same pattern is followed at 4.494-505 (Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 207).

21 παρηγορεῖ suggests the emotional involvement of the asker to a far higher degree than would be the case if Achilles was simply suggesting that he and Patroklos fight together again, as a successful team. Bowra translates "begged".

22 Note ἄρει at 0.9.75; and ὁρθῇ ἀλαιτέρῳ at Il.18.100.
We have seen how the detail that Telephos tripped over a vine is a recurrent feature of later versions of the story. Pindar alludes to the detail in I.8:

\[
\text{xai neparv } \xi\dot{e}p\dot{e}\dot{u}v \sigma\varphi\rho\nu
\]

\[
\text{st\'\omicat' } \dot{a}p\dot{e}\varphi\rho\rho\sigma\nuv \dot{a}r\dot{e}t\dot{a}v 'A\chi\nu\dot{e}\dot{a}v'.
\]

\[
\text{O kai } \dot{M}\nu\sigma\iota\nuv \dot{d}m\dot{e}n\dot{e}n
\]

\[
\text{a}m\alpha\xi\epsilon \text{T}h\ell\epsilon\dot{e}f\omegau \m\acute{e}l\iota-
\]

\[
\nu \beta\acute{i}\acute{n}wv \phi\acute{v}n\acute{u} \varphi\acute{e}d\dot{i}\dot{e}u.
\]

(I.8.47-50)

The immediate inference is that Telephos tripped over the vine in the Cypria account. It is hard to see in Pindar's use of the word \(\dot{d}m\dot{e}n\dot{e}n\) any purpose other than the evocation of the complete account of the incident in that epic. Once again, it seems that traditional material is intrinsically valuable in an epinician.

---

23 cf Vian, CE 293f; Jouan, Euripide 245-248. Both conclude that the vine was doing Dionysos' work - and not simply Telephos' bad luck - in the epic. This seems confirmed by inferences which one may draw from the datum that Telephos was wounded in the thigh. Such a wound is typical of the fleeing soldier - both logically (because the spear will fall short of the target of the body) and HomERICALLY (Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 196, discussing II.4.517 - which occurs in broadly the same context, as I noted above; 16.314-6). This suggests that Telephos was, at a stage of the tradition before the establishment of the Cypria, hit while running away. The simplest explanation of the subsequent embellishment of the trip over the vine is that it was concomitant with the intervention of Dionysos.

24 See Bowra, Pindar 261, after Norwood, Pindar 147.

25 Contrast the encomiastic reductionism of Thummer: "Ob \(\dot{d}m\dot{e}n\dot{e}n\) zur Telephossage einen Konkreten Bezug hat, ist zweifelhaft. Die Geschichte, daß Dionysos den Telephos in eine Weinrebe verstrickte, findet sich erst in jungen Quellen. Sie würde hier das Verdienst des Achilleus eher schmälern und dürfte schon aus diesem Grunde nicht der Intention des Dichters entsprechen. So ist \(\dot{d}m\dot{e}n\dot{e}n\) wohl nur als schmückendes Beiwort von \(\varphi\acute{e}d\dot{i}\dot{e}u\) aufzufassen."
The I.8 account concludes with some witty ambiguity.

Given that Telephos is turned back from his attack on the ships, 51 immediately means that Achilles enabled the Achaeans' return from Mysia to Greece, ready for the second assembly at Aulis. But the words have a secondary sense in the context of what follows:

Given that Telephos is turned back from his attack on the ships, 51 immediately means that Achilles enabled the Achaeans' return from Mysia to Greece, ready for the second assembly at Aulis. But the words have a secondary sense in the context of what follows:

This is bold, because this is the sack of Troy, in which Achilles is not directly involved. The boldness is eased by the gliding shift of referent of 51.

The Telephos incident is also mentioned in I.5:

The Telephos incident is also mentioned in I.5:

26 Carey, Odes 200, contrasting P.1.54 of Philoktetes and N.7.35f of Neoptolemos.
There are two matters worthy of comment here: Pindar's treatment of the motif of the spear; and the extraordinary prominence which he gives to the incident.

The importance of the spear is, as we have seen, that it is the means of Telephos' cure. It is the hair of the dog.\textsuperscript{27} The cure was the action of Euripides' Telephus.\textsuperscript{28} But Pindar does not mention the cure: it is another example of the folkloric magic which he everywhere eschews.\textsuperscript{29} Nevertheless, this piece of sympathetic magic is the most notable aspect of the known story - and so the most effective signal of that story.\textsuperscript{30} The consequence is that, whilst nowhere referring to the miraculous cure, in each account of the incident, Pindar does refer to Achilles' spear (0.9.79; I.5.42; I.8.52).\textsuperscript{31}

The extraordinary prominence which Pindar gives to the incident is easily stated. In I.5, it stands as the climax (note ἑργὸς) of a catalogue of Achilles' exploits;\textsuperscript{32} in fact, the

\textsuperscript{27} Frazer, Apollodorus 188ff n.1; W. R. Paton, "The Armour of Achilles", CR 26 (1912), 1-4, here 2. On the spear, see above, p.116f.
\textsuperscript{28} Eur. fr.724 N\textsuperscript{2}: Handley and Rea, Telephus 27-39. Also, perhaps, Aeschylus' Telephus: Σ.Αr.Ach.332, Webster, Euripides 43; but see TrGF p.343f.
\textsuperscript{29} Grant, Folktale 32f.
\textsuperscript{30} cf ἀκόμωντα (N.3.48): see above, p.189.
\textsuperscript{31} These three passages cast some doubt on the utility of Race's thesis that Pindar typically "concludes narratives with an emphatic reference to the fighter's weapon" (Style and Rhetoric 47-9). Only 0.9.79 closes a narrative.
\textsuperscript{32} Hamilton, Epinikion 58; Bundy SP 2.56f. Race notes that this climax is then capped by the mention of Aegina itself, carefully placed at the beginning of the triad (43; Style and Rhetoric 20f n.36). See also below, p.205.
last term of a tetracolon ascendens. Of Achilles' achievements, Pindar turns more often only to the death of Memnon.

This emphasis seems counter-intuitive to the modern reader. We have lost the Cypria; and know the story of Telephos mainly through Euripides' notorious version, and Aristophanes' satires upon it in Acharnians and Thesmophoriazousae. The very circumstances of the fight - the ingenuous landing in Mysia - made it vulnerable to any kind of critical examination. It became proverbial: τάπτεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην καὶ ἀνατίθενται πολλαμένων. The story of Telephos leading the Achaeans to Troy after his cure runs counter to the Homeric account, in which Kalchas is the guide. Aristarchus denied the possibility of Homeric acknowledgement of the Mysian expedition.

33 τίνες Κύκνου,
tίνες Ἐκτορα πέφυν,
καὶ στρατηρχοῦ λαθιότων ἄφοβοι Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν·
tίς ὁ δὲ Ἑλλὸν Τήλεφον τρῶσεν ἔξω δορὶ Καἴκου παρ' ὀχθαῖς;
Cf Thummer ad loc; Illig, Erzählung 78-81; Race, Style and Rhetoric ch.1.

34 Five times: 0.2.83; N.3.63; 6.50; I.5.41; 8.54 (Privitera, Eracle 264 n.29). But we note that 1.5.41 is subordinate to the subsequent mention of Telephos.

35 Philostratus, criticizing the story on other grounds (see below), wonders why Odysseus and Menelaos, who had both been to Troy before, did not realize this was not the same place. And why did they not ask someone where they were? (Her.23.6). Strabo uses the story as a cautionary tale of the dangers of geographical incompetence (1.1.17).

36 Σ. Dem. de Cor.248.23; Mant. Prov. 2.28 = Paroem. Gr. 2.762.

37 Σ. A. I. 1. 71; Philostratus Her. 23.5; Severyns, CE 293.

38 Severyns, CE 113, 292.
But Pindar's concentration on the episode is in fact reasonably explained as an accurate reflection of the early importance of the story. We have seen, from his ancestry and from his success against Thersandros and in chasing the Achaeans back, that Telephos must have been a formidable adversary. Further, Proclus' summary of the Cypria suggests that the Teutharian episode occurs about two-thirds of the way through the work, and follows a possibly rather episodic section involving the gathering of the troops, and some storytelling by Nestor.\(^{39}\) The adventure in Mysia provided an opportunity for big battle action; I would be surprised if the opportunity was not exploited to the full.\(^{40}\)

Further, this is the first occasion on which Achilles fights. He is extremely young.\(^{41}\) He was not one of the suitors, but taken to Troy by Odysseus, who found him being brought up amongst the girls of Lykomedes' court on Skyros.\(^{42}\) The story of his transvestism there has long seemed to have marked his transition into adulthood; his age is thus central.\(^{43}\) One account explains Neoptolemos' name as a reference not to his own youth when he went to war, but to his father's:

\(^{39}\) Chrest. 110-124.

\(^{40}\) cf Davies, Epic Cycle 44.

\(^{41}\) He was only nine when he was hidden on Skyros, according to Apollodorus (3.13.8), but fifteen when he went to Mysia (Ep.3.16); cf Statius Achilleid 1.163.

\(^{42}\) Cypria fr.19 B = EGF incert. loc. F 4.

\(^{43}\) Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 154f; and, seeing ritual implications, E. Crawley, "Achilles and Scyros", CQ 7 (1893), 243-6; Bremmer, Heroes, Rituals 7.
Finally, in 1.8, the following juxtaposition is suggestive:

καὶ νεαρὰν ξέδεξαν σοφῶν
στόματι ἀπείρωσιν ἀρετῶν Ἀχιλέως.

(I.8.47.50) 

First in the catalogue of Achilles’ exploits, the fight with Telephos may be thought to be expressive of his youthful excellence.

I conclude that the fight with Telephos in the Cypria was a serious and important set piece in its own right, and remarkable as the debut of the wunderkind Achilles. Hence its prominence in Pindar.

---

44 cf Cypria fr. 19 (I) B = EGF incerti loci intra cyclum epicum F 4.

45 See Carey’s note on 47, and on the preceding line, above, p.129f.

46 One might even suggest that Achilles was held back from the fight at first, by worried elders, on grounds of his age. Hence Telephos’ early successes.

47 Certainly, Achilles’ youth when he killed Telephos may be connected with the age of Kleandros, the victor celebrated in I.8, and thought to be competing in the boys’ or youths’ class (but see Carey, 5 Odes 184f). Equally, P. A. Bernadini, Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro. La Nemea 4, l’Olimpica 9, l’Olimpica 7 (Rome, 1983), 147, stresses Achilles’ role as protector in 0.9 to hone the paradigmatic relation between Achilles and Patroklos and Lampromachos and Epharmostos; Boeckh went even further. But if these tensions are present, they are generated in no small part through the precise impingement of the epic tradition on Pindar’s text.
Kyknos

Kyknos' name appears in two catalogues of Aiakid endeavour:

[Achilles] Ἐκτόρα οφθαλμε, Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ χίουα, Κύκνου τε δαμάτῳ πόρεν,
'Αοίς τε παῖδ᾽ Αἰθίοπα.

(0.2.81-3)

[Aiakids] καὶ σὺν μάχαις διὰ πόλιν Τρώων πράσον, ἐσπάμενοι Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,
καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις. ἔξα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν λέγε, τίνες Κύκνου, τίνες Ἐκτόρα πέφυν,
καὶ ὀστάταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον Μέμνονα θαλαμάραν· τίς ἐρ' ἐσαῦ Τήλεφον τρώμεν ἕως δορὶ Καῦκου παρ' ἄχθαις;
τοῖς Ἀγίων προφέρει στόμα πάτραν.

(1.5.35-43) ¹

Kyknos' appearance has excited little comment; of which most is confined to the form of the catalogue.² The list of victims signals the end of the mythical section;³ and the catalogue and focus are typical in Aeginetan odes.⁴ There is nothing to suggest that Kyknos is anything other than a heroic warrior killed in the course of battle.

¹ Farnell objects to the wording of this passage: "Pindar is here more than usually self-willed and reckless of strict fact: all these achievements were performed by Achilles alone" (Works 2.366). But the shift from plural to singular is rather a blurring of focus, through which Achilles' exploits are named metonymically for those of the whole family.

² On which see above, p.201f.

³ Young, 3 Odes 4 n.3, comparing 0.13.84ff; P.10.46ff; 1.5.42ff; but see Slater, Lyric Narrative 129.

⁴ Hamilton, Epinikion 57-9; 64f. He seems to find the intrusion of Aeginetan form into 0.2, for Theron of Akragas, pleasantly surprising (58; 65).
The brevity and paucity of Kyknos' appearances accord with the modern reader's intuition of his status. But that intuition is informed in the absence of the *Cypria*, the epic which established him as a notable hero. A jarring corrective is provided by Aristotle, who, discussing the relative merits of Diomedes and Achilles, prefers the latter:

> οἶδα δὲ ἃ μηδὲνι ἄλλῳ συμβέβηκεν ἢ τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ, οὗν τὸ ἀποκτείνα τὸν Ἐκτόρα τὸν δριστόν τῶν Τρώων καὶ τὸν Κύκνου, δὲ ἐκώλυσεν ἁπαντας ἀποβαίνειν ἀτρόμος ὄν, καὶ ἦτα νεώτατος καὶ οὐκ ἐνορχός ὄν ἔστρατευας, καὶ δόα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα. (Rhet. 2.22 (1396b 14-18))

Achilles' triumph over Kyknos is as definitive of his greatness as his triumph over Hektor. Aristophanes' Euripides brackets Kyknos with Memnon (Ran.963). And Theocritus, in his advertisement for the value of poetic celebration, alludes to Sarpedon, Glaukos, and Odysseus; and amongst them, Kyknos:

> τίς δ' ἐν δριστής λυκίων ποτέ, τίς χομώντας Πραμίδας ἢ θῖλων ἀπό χροῖς Κύκνου ἔμνυο; εἰ μὴ φυλόπιδας προτέρων ἐμμησαν ἄβδοι; οὐδ' ὀδωρεὺς ἔκατον τε καὶ ἐξίκοι μήμας ἀλαθείς πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους. (Theoc.16.48-52)

Kyknos is, in fact, an important figure.

The death of Kyknos appears in both Proclus and Apollodorus as the turning point which establishes the Achaean beachhead at Troy.

---

5 e.g. Nisetich, *Pindar and Homer* 71.


7 See above, p.195.
There is no reason to doubt that both of these accurately reflect the Cypria. They describe precisely the same action: Kyknos' death; the flight of the Trojans; and their massacre as they run. Aristotle's detail that Kyknos was preventing the Achaeans' landing is implicit in both; and this, too, suggests that the Cypria is the source.

The importance of the fight between Achilles and Kyknos in the Cypria is established on three levels. First, Kyknos is a worthy adversary, the son of Poseidon. Secondly, the fight is crucial for the Achaeans' landing at Troy: the start of the Trojan War - and so an important event. Thirdly, unless the Cypria was entirely artless, it is reasonable to assume that it dwelt upon the fight, not only as the first action of the war, but also as the climax to the diverse business - in particular, the false start and the fight with Telephos - which preceded it. I have argued that the fight with Telephos was itself

---

8 cf RE s.v. Kyknos (3) 2438.
9 Proclus, Chrest.150; Σ. Theoc.16.49. Cf Sarpedon, Memnon.
important; now, the fight with Kyknos which signals the real landing at Troy, should overshadow it.

So, in the *Cypria*, the fight with Kyknos is a climactic turning point. We may flesh out the details of the fight in two respects. First, Achilles' jump to shore was the Τρωίκου πηδήμα, a mighty leap which started a spring on the spot where he landed. Presumably, the impetus of this leap enabled Achilles' counter-attack — in contrast with the other Achaeans, penned in their ships.

Secondly, we must consider whether the later invulnerability of Kyknos also featured in the *Cypria*. The first unequivocal mention of this is when Aristotle says that Kyknos ἔκβλυσεν ὀπαντῶς ἀποβαίνειν ἄτρωπος δὲ — "since he was invulnerable" (*Rhet.* 1396 b 17). I have suggested that the first datum here reflects the *Cypria*; and so it is not implausible that the second does also. Such invulnerability is certainly within the spirit of that work.

Moreover, three considerations suggest that the motif did occur there. First, as Pearson points out, labelling Kyknos ἄτρωπος means not simply that he was invulnerable but, more precisely, that his skin could not be pierced by a weapon. We have seen that Apollodorus, using the *Cypria*, gives the detail


11 pace Monro's caution (*Epic Cycle* 9).


that he was in fact killed by a stone: ἐξῄθηνε μετὰ Μυρμηδώνων Ἀχιλλέως καὶ λίθου <βασάλων εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν Κύκνου κτείνει. Certainly, convenient boulders are part of the Homeric warrior's armoury (e.g. at II.7.264ff); but only when conventional weapons have failed (259-63). In this case the failure of Achilles' weapons might signify Kyknos' invulnerability.  

Secondly, a universally known characteristic of Kyknos was the extraordinary whiteness of his skin. The versions of this story are given by the scholiast on Theocritus:

Κύκνου φησί τοῦ Ποσειδώνος καὶ Καλῦκης, τοῦ ἀνυρρημένου ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως. λευκός γὰρ ἦν τὴν χροὶν ἐκ γενετῆς, ὡς φησίν Ἐκλάμικος (FGH 4 fr.148) διὸ καὶ θῆλυν αὐτὸν ἐπειν δὲ Θεόκριτος. 'Ηοίδας δὲ (fr.237) τὴν κεφαλήν ἐχειν αὐτὸν φησὶ λευκῆν· διὸ καὶ ταύτης τῆς χλήσεως ἔτυχεν.

(Σ.Θεοκ.Ιδ.16.49)

Theocritus himself uses the version in which Kyknos has white skin, not hair, and seems to be looking toward the Cypria:

τίς δ' ἂν ἄριστης λυκίων ποτέ, τίς κομώντας Πριαμίδας ή θῆλυν ὑπὸ χροἰας Κύκνου ἐμνα, εἰ μὴ φιλόπιδας προτέρων ὑμησαν δοιδοί;

(Id.16.48-50)  

14 Pearson (loc. cit.) suggests that Ovid's baroque account of the fight, in which Achilles' weapons prove useless and plastic against his mocking adversary (Met.12.70ff), and which Achilles wins by backing him over a stone (137-9) and throttling him, is a development of Sophocles' treatment of the theme in the Poimenes. (See too Robert, Heldensage 1120 n.4.) Kyknos' skin is still unbreakable (cf Soph. fr.500 R); and the rock has a new role. It is natural to think that Sophocles' version was in turn a development of an earlier account - naturally, that of the Cypria.

15 Pearson's reasoning (loc. cit.); cf Griffin, Uniqueness 40, Gow ad loc.
It is tempting to surmise that the extraordinary whiteness of Kyknos' skin was known to the Cypria and was a sign of another extraordinary quality - its impermeability.

Finally, if one presumes that Pindar's mentions of Kyknos glance toward the treatment of the Cypria, then his expression in 0.2 also suggests that invulnerability featured there. Achilles Κύκνον τε θανάτῳ πόρευ, 'Αούς τε παῖς' Αἰθόμα (82f). θανάτῳ πόρευ is an odd phrase. One would expect death to be given to Kyknos, rather than vice versa (cf Od.18.202). Van Leeuwen argues that it is a version of the powerful phrase Μ' Αἴδι προίασεν, which occurs in the proemium of the Iliad (1.3); and is used also by Hektor to reassure Andromache: οδ γὰρ τίς μ' ὑπὲρ σίδην ἄνθρω Μ' Αἴδι προίασεν (6.487). θανάτος is, then, given a special weight here: it is marked by the syntax of the sentence. That special weight may reflect the difficulty there was in killing Kyknos. For the phrase also refers here to Memnon; and we shall see that his death, too, was not a simple matter in the Cycle - for Eos his mother (to whose role, by naming her, Pindar draws attention) obtained immortality for him. The odd phrase reflects the unusual nature of each case.

16 Gildersleeve ad loc. compares P.5.60, N.1.66 (reading φῶς ταῦτα μόρω), "and Lat. dare morti, "put (in)to (the maw of) death." Instead of flattening antique personification, let us emboss our own."

17 Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode (Assen, 1964), ad loc.

18 Nisetich, Immortality 10f.

19 Chrest.189f (Aethiopis).

20 See further below, p.253f.
These three indications, taken together, tend to confirm the plausible hypothesis that Kyknos was, in the Cypria, invulnerable.

I began by noting that the intuition of Kyknos' unimportant status is wrong: if we, as Pindar and his audience did, knew the Cypria, we would know him as a major figure. But that first intuition in fact accords with Pindar's scanty treatment: Kyknos receives just one brief mention in an Aeginetan ode; and another in 0.2. Once we jettison the assumption of his unimportance, we are entitled to ask: why is there not more about Kyknos?

A sufficient explanation is that his invulnerability is another example of the type of magic which Pindar eschews. As it is central to Achilles' achievement in overcoming him, it renders the material impossible. This is unfortunate, as, qua traditional aristeia, the same material is, as Aristotle's testimony shows, attractive. Hence the treatment at 0.2.82, which hints obliquely at the existence of the story, without embroiling poet or audience in it. Pindar accommodates the known version, without endorsing it, and thereby exposing himself to the difficulties which it involves.

Hektor

Hektor occurs as Achilles' opponent and victim thrice in Pindar; each time briefly, in a catalogue:

[Achilles] Ἐκτόρα σφιλε, Ἑλεῖ, Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβή κίουσα, κύκλων τε θανάτῳ πόρευ, Ἀοῦς τε παῖδ' Ἀἰθλοπα.

(0.2.81-3)
Little can be said of these allusions to Hektor in themselves.\(^1\) Οφφελε\(^2\) (0.2.81) sits well with the notion of Hektor as the pillar of the city; and that in turn may spring from the popular derivation of Hektor from ηχω.\(^2\) The uses at I.8.52 of

---

1 But see above on Telephos (p.201f) and Kyknos (p.205).

2 e.g. Plato, Crat.393a 1 - b 3. Gildersleeve ad loc.; Nagy, Best of the Achaean 145f.
... - a bold metaphor - and πολιοντο suggest, together, Hektor and the other Trojan chiefs holding Achilles back from their city. Both these images of Hektor, as pillar and tendon, suggest that his safety is vital if Troy is to remain standing.

What is remarkable about Pindar's treatment of Hektor is that there are just these three brief mentions. Pindar uses four of Achilles' victims to exemplify his abilities; but of them, only Kyknos is given less attention than Hektor. I have suggested that the brevity of Kyknos' appearances is due to the marvellous elements which occur in his story, rendering the material impossible for Pindar. No such argument is possible for the Hektor of the Iliad, which does not contain such elements. On the contrary, Achilles' fight with Hektor - the symbol of Achilles' decision to fight rather than return home - would seem paradigmatic of the heroic achievement of the athletic victors. First, because of the "reciprocity of martial and athletic endeavour [which] is so rudimentary to Pindar." The locus classicus is I.1.50f:

---

3 On this line, see Farnell, Works 2.383; Silk, Interaction 106.
4 Privitera, Eracle 264f (but add I.8.55 to his catalogue of Hektor's appearances).
5 Griffin, Uniqueness.
Secondly, because Achilles' decision epitomizes the choice between obscure comfort - the quiet return home - and glorious endeavour. 9

Simply: Hektor is by far the greatest Trojan hero in the Iliad: οἶς γὰρ ἔριστο Ἡλίου Ἐκτώρ (II.6.403). He dominates that work in a way which Telephos and Kyknos in the Cypria and Memnon in the Aethiopis do not. The Iliad itself epitomizes the entire Trojan war. 10 Further, he appears gloriously in the Cypria too: he kills Protesilaos, the first Achaean to land (Chrest. 149). The simple inference is that he was on that occasion also foremost of the Trojans. Finally, while he is alive, Troy resists the Achaeans' siege for nine years; he dies, and it falls in the tenth.

Achilles' triumph over Hektor would, then, have made an excellent paradeigma of heroic activity, and a powerful example of Achilles' ability. Why, then, does Pindar not make significant use of the episode?

I have already ruled out that it might be Pindar's avoidance of the fantastic that might disqualify the Iliadic story of Hektor from Pindar's attention. Another possibility is that the "unseemly events" of the story - the killing of the

8 cf 0.2.43ff; 10.16ff; P.8.26ff; N.1.16ff; 5.19f.
9 cf 0.1.81-5; P.4.185-7; Crotty, Song and Action ch.4, especially 108-11. See below, p.243f, on Memnon.
10 Young, Pindar, Aristotle 163.
suppliant Lykaon, the abuse of Hektor's body, and the sacrifice of the Trojan youths on Patroklos' pyre - might be inescapable: "best not to recall the Achilles of Iliad 16-23 in songs whose primary purpose is praise." But I doubt that Pindar's audience were so sensitive.

In fact, any explanation which appeals to a characteristic of Hektor's story in particular is unlikely to be right, because his absence from the odes is simply an example of the absence of Homeric material: "to Homer, as the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey, he owes almost nothing." 12

Now, Bowra's statement has excited a deal of criticism. Young comments: "Bowra's observation about Pindar's rather surprisingly limited use of Homer as a source for myth is sound but unnecessarily overstated." 13 But his counter-examples suggest that Bowra's was not such an overstatement. He suggests that the Tlepolemos myth of 0.7 is drawn from II.2.653-70; and notes verbal similarities between II.2.655f and 0.7.73ff, and between II.2.667 and 0.7.77. 14 But they are, to say the least, scarcely convincing: they simply provide epic colour. Further, there is good evidence that Pindar was using


12 Bowra, Pindar 283. It should not need to be said that this is not "an anti-Homeric bias", which suggests that Pindar disliked Homer, and provokes the citation of N.7.20f as an explanation of his dislike. Cf Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 2; Wilamowitz, Pindaros 463.

13 3 Odes 114 n.5.

14 3 Odes 82f, 83 n.1; 90.
another source: he describes Tlepolemos ἐλεύθερον ἀπὸ τῶν ἁλάμμων Μιδέας (29). This detail - whatever it refers to - does not appear in Homer, and defies explanation as a Pindaric invention, contributing in some way to the drift of the poem. The only plausible explanation is that it is an allusion to a detail in another account. 15 We know that other versions of this story existed ([Hes.] fr. 232). Presumably, it is to the Homeric account that Pindar refers in 21. 16

Young also suggests that P.3.101ff and I.8.56ff draw on Od.24.58-73 in their description of Achilles' funeral. 17 But what of the Aethiopis, in which the funeral was presented as part of the main course of the narrative (Chrest.196-200)? Pindar followed this work in the matter of Achilles' translation to some better place. 18

To these two instances Nisetich adds, as an example of "Pindar's creative use of Homer", P.9, as interpreted by Köhnken. 19 There, Pindar uses the vocabulary and mood of the seduction of Zeus in II.14 in the story of Apollo's seduction of Kyrene. So it is scarcely a parallel case: the substance of

Critics have ascribed other changes in this poem to Pindar's invention: he modifies the story in various ways "to show that Rhodes is in high favour with the gods" (Verdenius, Comm.2.56ff; cf Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 106ff). But there is nothing unlikely about the Rhodians making the modifications themselves - just as the Aeginetans cherished the Aiakids before Pindar.

16 O. Smith, "An Interpretation of Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode", C&M 28 (1967), 172-85, here 176; cf Pini, Correzioni 368 n.75.

17 3 Odes 55 n.3; cf Farnell, Works 3.383f.


19 Pindar and Homer 74 n.12; Köhnken, Heilichos Orga.
that myth is not Homeric at all, but from the Hesiodic Catalogue (fr. 215). Homer is not here being used as a source: he is providing the model for the story telling, rather than the story. Similar are the structure of P.3.1-80, exploiting that of Od.1.253-71; and its close, as I have described it (above, p.181ff), in which Pindar adapts Achilles' consolation of Priam to inform his consolation of Hieron. One can argue also for the allusive use of Homer on a smaller scale: thus N.2.14 might recall II.7.199f; N.6.52, Od.4.189; and 0.9.66, II.9.483. In each case, the Homeric source informs the Pindaric passage.

Homer is not here being used as a source: he is providing the model for the story telling, rather than the story. Similar are the structure of P.3.1-80, exploiting that of Od.1.253-71; and its close, as I have described it (above, p.181ff), in which Pindar adapts Achilles' consolation of Priam to inform his consolation of Hieron. One can argue also for the allusive use of Homer on a smaller scale: thus N.2.14 might recall II.7.199f; N.6.52, Od.4.189; and 0.9.66, II.9.483. In each case, the Homeric source informs the Pindaric passage.

So, the general principle that Pindar does not draw on Homer for mythical material remains sound.

20 Peliccia, Pindarus Homericus 54-7.

21 On N.2.14, see below, pp.277-9; on N.6.52, below, p.239f. In 0.9, Pindar describes the succession of Opous to his father's throne. This, according to Eustathius (ad II.2.531), was the upshot of a family feud. But Pindar not only glosses over the quarrel (Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 104), but, by using vocabulary used by Homer to describe Phoinix' happy adoption by Peleus, in which Peleus amicably handed over the 'rule of the Dolopes (II.9.483), suggests that Opous' accession was similarly happy. (Note that he does not openly contradict the traditional version.) For further examples of similar use of Homer in early lyric, see A. E. Harvey, "Homeric Epithets in Greek Lyric Poetry", CQ 7 (1957), 206-23, e.g. 214; and for scepticism on such borrowings, Fowler, Early Greek Lyric 20-39.

22 A pleasantly parallel result is thrown up by Schultz's close examination of Pindar's use of Homeric expressions in P.4 (De colore epico 12-24). Very few reappear in Pindar as they did in Homer. He also gives examples of Pindaric phrases bred through the combination of two Homeric phrases (35). Bowra emphasizes the new uses to which this epic language is put in Pindar (Pindar 214-9).
is so well known as the Homeric. On this criterion, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* should furnish excellent stuff for a victory ode. The solution to this difficulty is suggested by the one place in which Pindar challenges the authority of Homer, in N.7:

```
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοναι μύθοις. τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει ἤτορ ὁμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλείτοσος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐ τοῦ ὀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὐ κεν ὀπλῶν χωλθεῖς ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν λευρῶν ξίφος.
```

(N.7.20–7)

Following the lines establishing song as recompense for successful labour (11ff), the dictum that Odysseus' *logos* was more than his *pathē* must, on first reading, suggest that Homer's account of Odysseus' experiences outweighs his travail: that Homer was so good a poet that Odysseus was more than recompensed. But if the account exaggerates, it is false (22–24). Truth and authority collapse together.

*páthōn* suggests that this is the Odysseus of the *Odyssey* – *πολλὰ δ' ἐν τούτῳ πάθεν ἔλυεν δ' ἐν κατὰ θυμον* (Od.1.4).24

---

23 For the notion of the *pseudos* as exaggeration, compare 0.1.28–32, with Köhken, *Funktion* 52 and Richardson, *Pindar* 385f; cf Verdenius, *Comm.* 2.19. For Charis and poetic mechane going hand in hand, see P.8.21–34; cf Komornicka, *AAPHEIA* 252f.

Reluctant to imagine Pindar impugning Homer, and taking advantage of the description of the ἀπλων χρίας which follows, some critics have referred the ὀδ of 22 to Odysseus, as we know of Odysseus' ἔργα through his own account to Alkinous.

But context, metaphor and vocabulary all suggest that Homer is meant. Referring only 22f to Odysseus is a slightly desperate measure to evade the charge against Homer; the Greek becomes highly involved. There must be some ambiguity here. Most points out that as "the four books of Odysseus' fabulations are reported in oratio recta [lit] means that the words are simultaneously both Odysseus' and Homer's." At some point between 21 and 25f, the lie shifts from Homer's to Odysseus' lips; the opacity of the referent accommodates that shift.

The proof of the exaggeration to falsehood of Odysseus' worth comes in 24ff, the description of the ἀπλων χρίας, in which Odysseus was awarded the armour of Achilles, in preference to Aias (note γὰρ). Why should Pindar's audience accept that Aias ought to have won the armour over Odysseus? Because, of course, he is their hero, an Aiakid. In their eyes, he

25 Fraenkel, op. cit. 360f.
26 Carey, Odes 145; Köhnken, Funktion 51 on σεμνός.
27 Köhnken, Funktion 50.
29 Measures 150.
30 Hubbard, Subject/Object 63f.
31 On the ἀπλων χρίας see below, pp. 280ff.
should have been judged best of the Greeks after Achilles; and so, of course, Homer's glorification of Odysseus throughout the Odyssey must have been exaggeration. Pindar's challenge to Homer's authority is enabled by the attitudes of his audience. "What the poet tells is true or false, depending on where he tells it: the local traditions on which the poet's immediate audience has been reared constitute the ultimate criterion of 'truth'."32

In this case, local tradition outweighs Homer's panhellenic authority. And this is the clue which explains the absence of Homer from Pindar's myths. It seems that local material is more suitable for epinician: Homer, on the other hand, is too well known.33

We may give this broad notion content in several ways. Pindar was concerned to produce an authoritative version of a myth. And the authority of Homer was on the whole unquestionable. Any story from the action described in the Iliad which Pindar presented would either be a retelling of the Homeric story, or a challenge to it. In the latter case - except in special circumstances34 - Pindar's version would evaporate; and so put the victor's status into doubt. In the former, the material would never cease to be Homeric: it would

32 Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 3 §6 n; see too Griffith, Contest 191, 199f.
33 cf Grant, Folktale 100.
34 As in N.7; or 0.7, in which, presumably, the Rhodians cherished their own aetiology over the brief Homeric version.
not be linked with the victor, but remain rooted to its Homeric source. Pindar would not be producing an authoritative myth to celebrate a victory, but repeating a Homeric myth, which had nothing to do with that victory. The occasion would not be marked.

We may associate this with the ancillary pleasure of the narrative interest of the story-telling, which a retelling of a too well established story would lack. "The victor in turn basks in a reflected glory by being the cause of this entertainment to his fellow citizens." He wants to be remembered; hence the necessity for the myth to be the memorable version of the story.

Gregory Nagy has recently described similar tensions using the model of panhellenic and local traditions. He argues that "the Cyclic epics are so different from the two Homeric epics not because they are more recent or more primitive but rather because they are more local in orientation and diffusion."

35 cf Pindar's description of Homer's treatment of Aias:

```````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````
The Homeric epics have evolved their relatively more Panhellenic character, in comparison with the epics of the rest of the Cycle, which are at "a point of textual fixation that still seems like a case of arrested development in contrast with the ultimate Homeric form." He suggests that Pindar's praise-poetry is working within the same tradition of panhellenization, transforming local stories into Panhellenic ones: "the ainos purports to be both Panhellenic and local, grounding its Panhellenized truth-values in the legitimacy and authority of native traditions, which shift from city to city and which are the context for the here and now of performance." Ainos he has defined as "an affirmation, a marked speech-act, made by and for a marked social group." It is immediately clear that a good deal of Nagy's argument is to the good of my drift. In particular, it suggests a third type of content which we may apply to "too well known". Homeric, Panhellenic tradition is, in a sense, the opposite of the local traditions upon which Pindar often draws. Quite apart from the opportunity for the production of the authoritative version which such local traditions provide, their presentation must also generate some sense of community in the audience. Indeed, these local myths will in some way

40 Pindar's Homer 73.
41 ibid. 416.
42 ibid. 437, cf 423.
43 ibid. 148. See also Slater, Lyric Narrative 126f.
define the community. Nowhere is the importance of such material so clear as in N.5, where Pindar manages to include the death of Phokos despite its intrinsic unsuitability for epinician. Stories taken from panhellenic Homer, on the other hand, must always lack this focus. Because the story is common to all Greece, it cannot be special to the local audience of the victor's community; and once again, the occasion is less marked.

All of these explanations give some content to the notion that Homeric myth was "too well known" to feature in Pindaric epinician. This, I think, is a more illuminating level of explanation than that which appeals to the brilliance of Homer. "The cycle is seen as a repository of saga rather than as a literary work, in sharp contrast to the works of Homer. Pindar did not want to impinge on territory where a supreme poet had

---

44 Not simply in the extreme case of the charter myth (Kirk, Aetiology); but in more diffuse senses of "collective importance" also (Burkert, S&H 23). One may interpret Pindaric narration of those myths as the efforts of his patrons to reinforce the social order of that community (Rose, Paideia, especially 149ff; id. "Towards a Dialectical Hermeneutic of Pindar's Pythian 10", Helios N.S. 9.1 (1982), 47-73, here 55).

45 (Pae.7b 10-14)

Whatever particular Pindar was referring to, the drift of this seems clear: it contrasts hackneyed imitation of Homer with more adventurous poetics. (On the particular, see I. Rutherford, "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo", CQ 38 (1988), 65-75, here 66f.)
already trod." On this tack, one might go further and suggest that at the core of the poetics of Homer and Pindar lies the same principle (however obscurely expressed) - βαίλεται ποιητῇ ἄλλῳ οὖν ἔργῳ (P.9.77f); and it is this identity of aesthetic purpose which makes it unfeasible for Pindar to treat the material - for it has already received a "Pindaric" treatment, by Homer. There is a good deal to commend these explanations; but I do not think them illuminating.

By framing the matter in terms of how broadly known were the Iliad and Odyssey, on the other hand, one may see that Pindar's avoidance of Homeric mythical material suggests that the purpose of the myth in epinician, like other parts of the poem, was to mark the victory.

This explanation for the preference for the local over the panhellenic also suggests an explanation of the general preference for the traditional, for which I have argued throughout the present work, and which becomes explicit with the treatment

46 Stoneman, Mythological Tradition 63. Cf Davies, Epic Cycle 10, for the complementary judgement on Pindar's reliance on the Cycle as an example of "the improvement of the second-rate by the first-rate."

47 For the principle, see Young, Pindar, Aristotle, with Richardson, Pindar 389. Cf Race, Pindar and the Vulgus 254ff, comparing the P.9 slogan with Il.2.488ff; id., Pindaric Encomium 139f.

48 Contrast Kannicht on the absence of Iliadic subjects from the earliest iconography (Poetry and Art 85).

of the death of Phokos in N.5. Traditional material will mark a victory in a way which novel material will not. It bears the authority of tradition; and so will invest the victory with which it is associated with that authority. As the audience accept the version of the myth in the epinician, they should accept also the other things the poet tells: the worth of the victory. If the myth is true, so too is the praise of the victor. 50

I have so far ducked an interesting side-issue (one which does not affect my main argument). When Pindar writes of "Homer", what does the name signify? Does it refer, in accord with our usage, to the author of the Iliad and Odyssey only — or to the author of those and the other poems of the Cycle?

The earliest surviving expression of scepticism of Homer's authorship of epics other than the Iliad and Odyssey is Herodotus' comparison of Helen's route to Troy in the Iliad (6.289-92) and the Cypria (fr.14 B = EGF F ID. 51 He notes the discrepancy between the lengthy Iliadic journey via Egypt, and the quick three days of smooth sailing in the Cypria — and concludes that Homer did not write the Cypria. 52 Even in the time of Aristotle, some thought the whole Cycle Homeric; but it seems to have been his Poetics which forever differentiated the Iliad and Odyssey from the Cycle. 53

---

50 I amplify these points in my treatments of N.7 and O.1; and in the Afterword.
51 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 43-5.
52 Hdt. 2.116-7; cf 4.32.
53 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 73f; 117.
Nisetich has recently argued that Pindar's conception of Homer was the modern conception. But his arguments do not go home. Neither, for that matter, are there sure arguments which show that Pindar used "Homer" to refer to the authors of the Cycle. But in the absence of persuasive proof to the contrary, it is the safest interpretation.

It also tallies with the fact that, although Pindar does not treat Hektor at length, he does include him in catalogues of Achilles' victims. Further, he appears in those catalogues

54 *Pindar and Homer* esp. 1-23; 70-72.

55 The two important passages are *N.7.20-4* and *I.3/4/55-7*, both describing the suicide of Aias (on which, see below, p. 280ff). The former specifies the author of the *Odyssey* - but does not, of course, thereby necessarily exclude his being the author of other poems of the Cycle. In *I.3/4*, Nisetich discovers an antithesis between the poet of the *Aethiopis* and "Homer" (53f / 59f) and so concludes that the poet of the *Aethiopis* cannot be "Homer" (*Pindar and Homer* 10-12). But the antithesis there is in fact between Aias' contemporaries, who failed to honour him, and the epic poet who did (below, pp. 292-4). I shall argue that the treatment of the ἐπιλυμαχὸς in the *Aethiopis*, far from dishonouring Aias, presents the award of the arms to Odysseus as the upshot of an inequitable judgement.

56 As E. Fitch, "Pindar and Homer", *CPhil* 19 (1924), 57-65, attempts to show. First, *P.4.277ff*:

\[ \text{τὸν δ' Ὀμήρου καὶ τὸδε συνθέμενος} \]
\[ \text{βῆμα πόρονων} \] ἀγγελοῦ ἐκλᾶν ἕφα τι—
\[ \text{μάν μεγάλος πράγματι παυτὶ φέρειν.} \]

This, Fitch suggests, is sufficiently different from the closest Iliadic/Odyssean source - ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυχαι, ἢ τ' ἀγγελοῦ αἰώνα εἴδη (II.15.207) - to suggest a source elsewhere in the Cycle. But Braswell ad loc. points out that this "Homeric proverb" was constantly misquoted; and Burton, *Pythian Odes* 170f, demonstrates enough similarity of context between the Iliadic and Pindaric occurrences to suggest that Pindar did have the *Iliad* in mind. The rest of Fitch's argument is subjective.

57 So Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 339; Gildersleeve 302; Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* 414f.
undistinguished from the heroes of the rest of the Cycle. Only 0.2.81-3 even faintly suggests his pre-eminence as one of Achilles' victims; and 1.5 and 1.8 provide immediate counter-examples. The ranking of Telephos, Memnon and Hektor is entirely fluid. This might suggest that Pindar regarded them as characters of the same canon.

But this does not commit us to the idea that there was for Pindar no difference between the works of our Homer and the other epics of the Cycle. The fact that he does not make straightforward large-scale use of Homeric material is, I think, proof of it.

Memnon

Of all Achilles' exploits, it is his fight against Memnon which figures most frequently in Pindar. I shall first consider the reason for this predilection; and then comment upon the details of the various accounts.

---


59 Nisetich argues that Hektor's pre-eminence at 0.2.81-3 demonstrates "Pindar's preference of the *Iliad* over the poems of the epic cycle" (*Pindar and Homer* 70-72). He glosses over the other passages, which he sees as giving "the heroic deeds listed equal weight"; and as importantly different from 0.2.81-3.

60 Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* 415f and ch.14 passim.

61 contra Fitch, op. cit. 65; Nisetich, *Pindar and Homer* 1, 23. Despite Pfeiffer's dismissal of Herodotus' conclusion of multiple authorship of the Cycle as the mechanical spotting of contradictions and difficulties, I would prefer to see the identification of such anomalies as a hunt for hard evidence which could inform the perceived qualitative difference between the works. Pfeiffer denies such discrimination to the fifth-century critics (*Classical Scholarship* 42).
Both endeavours are hampered by the bald fact of our ignorance of all but the broad lines of the story of Memnon in the *Aethiopis*. This remains true, despite the efforts of neoanalytic critics to infer details of that poem from features of the *Iliad*. The neoanalytic argument is that the similarities between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopis* evidence a causal connexion. The direction of the causality is shown by the presence in the *Iliad* of various unassimilated details, which would have been organic in the *Aethiopis*. And so we may infer that they did occur there.

There are two difficulties involved in this method. First is the logical problem of inferring a cause from an effect. One may accept the basic thesis of neoanalysis, and yet be sceptical of the attribution of any particular detail to an *Aethiopis*. Because they are generated by a cumulative argument, neoanalytic results are vulnerable to scepticism. The impingement of an earlier work is not the only reason for the unusual in the *Iliad*.

Secondly, neoanalysis seems to give a strict priority to the *Aethiopis*, from which the *Iliad* was worked up. But this

1 Huxley, *GEP* 148f; Willcock, *Antilochos* 482.
2 An evidenced example is the lament of the Nereids for Patroklos (11.18.50ff). They have no business mourning him; but his death is modelled on Achilles' death in the *Aethiopis*, whom they mourn as Thetis' son (Chrest.198f). And so they have been exported from there into the *Iliad*, but resisted assimilation into their new context (Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* 65-72).
3 See Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes* 53f; 237.
5 This was the extreme position of Kullmann, *Quellen* 360-79.
is counter-intuitively schematic; runs counter to the tenets of oral poetry theory; and contrary to the traditional, evidenced, and altogether reasonable view of the priority of Homer. The neoanalyst must adopt the weaker position: Homer reflects "not the cyclic Aethiopis, but an earlier state of the mythological material which later found its way into it." There is no guarantee, then, that any particular aspect of this earlier state persevered to the known text of the Aethiopis. And so an unassimilated detail of the Iliad might illuminate this early state, but not the known text.

Further, this dilution of the strong neoanalytic position invites the further refinement, which sees the "incidents and details shared by the Iliad and Aethiopis not [as] inventions by the poet of the latter, which were then copied and re-cast by Homer, or vice-versa, but as typical epic material which was the sole property of no single poet or poem." On this model, both works spring from common stock; their similarities are to be explained by appeal to their shared parentage. And now it

6 Willcock, Antilochos 483. Kullmann acknowledges this refinement of his earlier position: the basic plot of the Iliad is "an imitation of a narrative known to us from one of the Cyclic epics, the Aethiopis, which in its core must be pre-Homeric" (Oral Poetry Theory 310; cf 311). Cf Davies, Epic Cycle 4f.

7 "Elles [sc. neoanalytic studies]... ont donné plus de corps à l'hypothèse de l'existence d'un ensemble poétique antérieur à Homère que l'on pourrait définir comme un Ur-Kyklos. Mais, à mon sens, elles n'ont pas réussi à démontrer l'identité de cet Ur-Kyklos avec nos trois épopées cycliques, Chants Cyriens, Ethiopide et Iliou Persis" (F. Jouan, "Le Cycle épique: état des questions", Actes du Xe Congrès Association Guillaume Budé (1980), 83-105, here 96).

8 Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 236. Cf Kannicht, Poetry and Art 71f; Edwards, Neoanalysis 311-6.
becomes even less likely that we may accurately recover details of the Aethiopis through consideration of those of the Iliad.

Inferences about the Aethiopis of the Cycle based on neo-analytic reasoning must, then, be used with caution. But still, neoanalytic results provide good corroborative evidence, and, on their own, attractive speculation.

Such good evidence as we have about the story of Memnon told in the Aethiopis is almost all provided by Proclus:

Μέμνων δὲ ὁ Ἡνίων υἱὸς ἡμαστότευκτον πανοπλίαν παραγίνεται τοῖς Τρωῖς βοηθῆσαι καὶ θέτις τῷ παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνωνα προλέγει. καὶ συμβολὴς γενομένης Ἀντιλόχος ἐπὶ Μέμνωνος ἀναφέρεται. Ἐπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμνωνα κτείνει καὶ τοῦτον μὲν Ἡνίων παρὰ Δίδυμα αἰτησάμεν ἀδιασάιρα δίδωι.

(Chrest. 185-90)

Apollodorus adds only that Memnon appeared μετὰ πολλῆς Αἰθιόπων δυνάμεως and that he killed many Achaeans before his own death (Ep.5.3).

Why, then, is Memnon the figure to whom Pindar most usually returns to demonstrate Achilles' greatness? Once again, Pindar's mythologizing is most easily explained by appeal to his sources. Memnon's predominance in Pindar is an accurate reflection of his importance in the cycle. Again, this is a counter-intuitive result for us; because we have lost the Aethiopis.

So Farnell writes of Pindar's "peculiar interest" in the Memnon story (Works 2.260; cf. 21); Nisetich, of Memnon's "comparative insignificance"; his resistance to Achilles at the end of the war is "anticlimactic" (Pindar and Homer 71). Privitera goes some of the way towards the right answer by describing the reason for Pindar's predilection as "a parte, genericamente, il grado di popolarità dell'Etiopide" (Eracle 265); but it is not simply a matter of the epic's popularity.
We may immediately see Memnon's importance in that work by considering its structure. A summary of the contents of the poem is given in the *Tabula Veronensis*:

\[ \text{Πενθεσείληα Ἀμαζών παραγίνεται.} \\
\text{Ἀχιλλεὺς Πενθεσείληαν ἀποκτεῖνει.} \\
\text{Μέμων Ἀμιλοχοῦ ἀποκτέινει.} \\
\text{Ἀχιλλεὺς Μέμωνα ἀποκτεῖνει.} \\
\text{ἐν ταῖς Σκαίσι πόλεις Ἀχιλλεὺς ὑπὸ [Πάριδος ἀναφέρεται] \} \\
\text{(*Aethiopis test.* 9 B = EGF T 3 (ii))} \]

Now, it is tempting to see here a reflection of the five books into which the Alexandrians divided the *Aethiopis*. And so Monro suggested:

"I. Arrival of Penthesilea - her ἀριστεία.

II. Slaying of Penthesilea - interval of truce, occupied on the Trojan side by her burial, on the Greek side by the Thersites scene and the withdrawal of Achilles.

III. Arrival and ἀριστεία of Memnon - he slays Antilochos.

IV. Achilles returns to the field, slays Memnon, and puts the Trojans to flight."

---

10 This reflects Proclus' *Aethiopis*; but is his outline a conflation of an Amazonia (cf *Aethiopis test.* 12 B = EGF T 2) and an *Aethiopis* (i.e. a *Memnonis*)? The two stories must originally have been discrete; when were they joined? "It seems to me that it is just a coincidence that in the summary of Proclus the Amazonomachia takes part of the *Memnonis* and both are labelled *Aethiopis*" (Burkert apud Kopff, *Amazonia* 62). But if one thinks Proclus reliable, this simply means that the two stories were once juxtaposed, and that juxtaposition was an [early] *Aethiopis*. I rely on Proclus; and so presume that the *Aethiopis* was always an Amazonia and a *Memnonis* (Severyns, *L'Ethiopide* 154-9 (especially 159 on the unity of the combination, generated through their roles as successive allies for the Trojans)); Davies, *Epic Cycle* 53).

11 *Chrest.* 174.
V. Death of Achilles in the gate - battle for the recovery of his body - ἀφθονία and apotheosis of Achilles - funeral games and contest for his arms.  

And this scheme would seem to be broadly right. From it appears Memnon's dominance of the core of the poem.

He is a well-matched adversary for Achilles. He is the son of a goddess, and, like Achilles, wears armour made by Hephaistos. Such armour should originally have made the wearer invulnerable, and may well have done in the Aethiopis. Their equality is further brought out by the kerostasia which seems to have figured their fight in the Aethiopis.

---

12 Epic Cycle 12.

13 Severyns criticized it because it did not leave enough space for the various events after Achilles' death - in particular, for Aias' suicide. He suggested that these events filled the last book; and he made room for them by squeezing Penthesilea's arrival, aristeia, and death all together into the first (L'Ethiopide 160, with n.2).

14 Chrest.185. Hesiod calls Memnon χαλκοχρυσος (Theog.984); Pindar, χαλκοάρας (I.5.41). It would appear from Aeneid 8.838f, where Venus says to Vulcan te filia Nerei, / te potuit lacrimis Tithonia flectere coniunx, that Memnon's armour was supplied in exactly the same fashion as Achilles' (E. Fraenkel, "Vergil und die Aithiopis", Philologus 87 (1932), 242-8; Kullmann, Quellen 307). This further emphasizes the evenness of the contest.

15 The armour should be impenetrable. Wearers of Hephaistos' armour who are killed: Patroklos, from whom it is first knocked (II.16.793-804); Hektor, who is speared through the throat (II.22.321-7); and Achilles, who is hit in the ankle (Apoll. Ep.5.3). P. J. Kakridis, "Achilleus' Rüstung", Hermes 89 (1961), 288-97, here 291-4; cf Edwards, Neoanalysis 316 n.19, 320f.

16 Although there is no explicit testimony, a kerostasia in the Aethiopis is suggested by: the evidence of later sources (O.S. 2.540f, with Vian, Recherches 28; Aesch. p.375 R with Severyns, CE 319, O. Taplin, The Stagecraft of Aeschylus (Oxford, 1977), 431); neoanalysis (Clark and Coulson, Memnon 67f); and iconographic evidence (L. D. Caskey and J. D. Beazley, Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Oxford, 1954), 3.44-6; Lung, Memnon 19ff).
In the context of the *Aethiopis*, the fight is climactically over-determined. Further, it functions as a climax within the context of the whole saga of the Trojan War.

Memnon’s defeat appears to be the turning point which starts a rout for the Trojans and leads Achilles to the very gates of Troy (*Aethiopis* test. 9 B = EGF T 3 (ii); Apoll. Ep. 5.3). This entry into Troy — although immediately frustrated by Paris and Apollo — is the climax to the Achaeans’ efforts not simply throughout the *Aethiopis* but the earlier books of the Cycle also. It is the supreme aristēia.

Further, Proclus writes that θέτεις τῷ παιδί τά κατά τοῦ Μέμνονα προλέγει (Chrest. 186f). Presumably, she tells him what will in fact happen: he will fight Memnon, and then be killed himself.17 Neoanalytic comparison of the entailment of his death by Hektor’s points in the same direction: Thetis tells him:

αδίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ’ Ἐκτόρα πότιμος ἐτοίμος.

(*II.18.96*)

And so the fight with Memnon acquires further significance.

And again, the context may be broadened to take in the various prognostications of Achilles’ mortality throughout the *Iliad*; the fight with Memnon is the last signal of his fate.18

17 See above, p.180f.

18 Kullmann, *Quellen* 308-14; 320-26. Again, whatever the causality which lies behind the diverse foreboding in the *Iliad*, the effect is tremendous. For example, Thetis’ warning to Achilles that his death will follow Hektor’s may originally have been appropriate to her warning to him before he fights Memnon. But as Hektor expires, he tells Achilles:

"φράξει νῦν, μή τοι τι θεῖαν μνήμη γένωμαι

ηματι τῷ οἴτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ τοῖς Ἀπόλλων"
Furthermore, the fatal nature of the fight is emphasized by the kerostasia; and by the subsequent headlong rush towards the Skaian Gate, where Hektor has told Achilles that he will be killed (Il.22.360; see last note).

Finally, the slaying of Memnon is Achilles’ revenge on him for killing Antilochos. He is another Patroklos: Agamemnon tells Achilles’ shade of the urn

The relationship between Achilles and Antilochos impinges even upon the Iliad: it is Antilochos who tells Achilles of Patroklos’ death, holding his hands in fear that Achilles may destroy himself (Il.18.2-34); and Antilochos who is the star of the games of 23:

μείζονεν δὲ ποδάρμης δίοις Ἀχιλλείος
χαίρων Ἀντιλόχου, οὕτως οἱ φίλοι ἦσαν ἐταξιρος.
(Il.23.555f)21

And at 24.83f Thetis begins to lament, for, as Kakridis comments, "Hektor is now dead, and... Achilles now belongs to the underworld, although the Iliad does not describe his death" (Homeric Researches 69 n.7).

19 Od.4.187f; P.6.30-43.

20 On the impingement of the Aethiopis here, see Heubeck on Od.24.16-18.

21 cf 785-97, where Antilochos’ good natured comments on his losing performance in the running race prompt Achilles to double his prize. See Willcock, Antilochos 483f. One might make much of the fact that it is during Patroklos’ funeral games that Antilochos supplants Patroklos in Achilles’ affections; for the games are the stage of the funeral which may be seen as expressive of "separation from death (and of the dead from the living), normality and order, group solidarity
But Antilochos replaces Patroklos in Achilles' affection only to be killed by Memnon in the *Aethiopis*; just as Patroklos was killed by Hektor in the *Iliad*. And, as Achilles takes his revenge on Hektor in the *Iliad*, knowing that it will entail his own death (1.18.96), so he kills Memnon in the *Aethiopis*, despite what his mother has told him (*Chrest. 186f*).

And so the fight between Achilles and Memnon is given further significance by Memnon's role as Antilochos' killer; and Achilles' as his avenger. And, once again, in the broader context, whatever the causality involved, the effect is heightened by the fact that it follows a similar incident in the *Iliad*: Achilles loses his dear companion again.

The incident is so rich that one may posit all kinds of ramifications. Achilles' fight with Memnon is the last great

and community ties, life, vitality" (C. Sourvinou-Inwood, "A Trauma in Flux: Death in the 8th century and after", in R. Hagg (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC = Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4° XXX* (Stockholm, 1983), 33-48, here 42). And so the games are exactly the right occasion for Achilles to find a new companion.

22 This is one of the corner-stones of the major neoanalytic theory which sees the second half of the *Iliad* as an echo of events of (the) *Aethiopis*. In particular, on the death of Antilochos, Kullmann, *Quellen 315f*.

23 Indeed, if he fell in love with Penthesilea at the moment he killed her, then Antilochos is the third he has lost. We cannot know if he did (Griffin, *Uniqueness 44f*).

24 See e.g. F. Heichelheim, "The Historical Date for the Final Memnon Myth", *RhM* 100 (1957), 262; Kopff, *Amazonia 61f*, who suggests that Achilles is disillusioned after a second disgrace, his killing of Thersites (*Chrest. 178-81*). Severyns labelled the poet of the *Aethiopis* as "un poète moins puissant mais plus tendre qu'Homère" (*L'Ethiopide 159)*.
victory of the best of the Achaeans. The frequency with which it occurs in Pindar reflects that status.

I now consider the Pindaric passages. [Χιρων τε οi φέρτατον ἀτιταλλεν ἔνων ἀρµένοιοι πάσι θυµον αἴξων, ἀφα ναλασσάιιας αἰνέμων διπατι πεµφθεῖς ὑπὸ Τροίαν βορίκτυπον ἀλαλών λυκίων τε προσµένοι καὶ ἔμυγών Δαρδάνων τε, καὶ εὐχεσθόροις ἐπιμείξαις αἰθίόπεασαν χείρας ἐν φρασὶ πά-εξαθ', ὕπωσ αφίας μὴ κοιρανος ὅπως πάλιν οἰκαδ' ανεψιὸς ζαµενὴς Ἐλένουο Μέμνων μόλοι. (N.3.57-63)

The first point of interest here is the odd phrase ἐν φρασὶ πάεξαθ', ὕπως... (62). Why should the emphasis be on the fact that Achilles determined that Memnon should not return home; and not upon the fact that he killed him? This oddity has contributed to a dissatisfaction with the text; but there is not enough wrong with it - and no satisfactory improvement - to justify emendation.

Carey notes rightly that the emphasis here is on resolution, rather than action, and realizes that unless some explanation is found, the "sentence is reduced to facile periphrasis". His own explanation is that it is an example of the theme of endurance which runs through the poem. But this

---

25 "L'Ethiopide devait présenter le duel entre Achille et Memnon comme le plus grand et le plus difficile du fils de Thétis" (Vian, Recherches 25).
26 0.2.82f; N.3.61-3; N.6.49-53; I.5.39-40; I.8.51-55.
27 Bury, Nemeans ad loc. and 231f.
28 3 Myths 159f.
theme is hard to discover. Carey argues that it is established by the Vormythos:

οὕτω πρόσω
άραται ὡς καίδιοι ὑπερ Ἰρακλέος περάν εὐμαρές.
Ἡρως θεός ὡς ἔθηκε μαυτικής ἑσκάτας
μάρτυρας κλυτας. δόμασε δὲ θήρας ἐν πελάγει
ἐπερόχου, ἤδη τ' ἐρεύνασε τεναγέως
ῥοᾶς, δητ' ἴππιμοι κατέβαινε μόστου τέλος,
καὶ γὰν φράδασε.

(Η.3.20-26)

"[Herakles'] endurance... is indicated both in the extent of his travels and his self-reliance, his readiness for the lone enterprise". But the notion of endurance does not help here; any more than it does, in fact, with Achilles' resolution to kill Memnon.

The explanation for the emphasis upon Achilles' resolution rather than his spectacular action itself is to be found in the story of the Aethiopis: καὶ θετις τῷ παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Μέμνονα προλέγει (Chrest.186f). I have suggested that the only reasonable explanation of this line is that she told him that his own death would follow. And so Achilles resolved that Memnon would not go home, despite knowing that he himself would die in consequence. That is why the resolve is so important. Achilles consciously sacrifices his own life to heroic endeavour.30

30 Privitera does not make enough of this: "nell' uccisione di Memnone egli vide il segno di un eroismo assoluto realizzato consapevolmente a costo della vita. L'affermazione finale della III triade, che Achille avrebbe impedito a Memnone di tornare nel proprio paese, è perfettamente riversibile: egli stesso uccidendolo non sarebbe tornato" (Eracle 266).
This interpretation explains the surprising grammar of the sentence, which reveals that Achilles’ resolve was the aim of Chiron’s education: ἀνίκτολεν ἐν ἀρμένοιοι πᾶσι κωμὰν ἀβέλων, / ἐφρα... πᾶξαν’ (58-62). Chiron formed his character so that he would make this choice.

Now we may see thematic interplay between the *Vormythos* and the told myth of Achilles’ career. Herakles’ superlative heroism (involving self-reliance and so forth) displayed itself in the ultimate journey; Achilles was brought up to achieve great things (cf 44); and crowned his career with the superlative heroism of his suicidal foray against a tremendous adversary in revenge for his dead friend. The feat establishes the limits of heroic activity, beyond which one cannot go, as Herakles’ pillars establish the limits of navigation.31

Another curious aspect of the N.3 passage is the specification of Memnon as Helenos’ cousin: δήνεψις ζημενής Ἐλένος Μέμνου (63). This is mythologically uncontroversial: Tithonos, Memnon’s father, was Priam’s brother (II.20.237). All of Priam’s sons are his cousins; but why is Helenos picked out here? Farnell realized something was afoot, but not what it was; Wilamowitz thought that Helenos was irrelevant; Bury, that ζημενής might mean inspirational, and so that Helenos was mentioned as “specially susceptible to such influences”; and Erbse, that Achilles’ success is contrasted with the failure of Troy’s best seer to anticipate it.32

---

31 cf 0.3.44f; N.4.69; I.4.12f; Hubbard, *Pindaric Mind* 30f; Race, *Style and Rhetoric* 191-5.

None of these convinces. But Erbse does concede that we do not know whether Helenos had a part in the story of Memnon in the *Aethiopis*. I presume that he did; and that is why he is singled out here. But we cannot know what that part was. I would guess that he forecast Memnon’s fate. The two episodes in the *Iliad* which neoanalysis shows to be similar – the deaths of Sarpedon and Hektor – both contain broadly similar scenes: Zeus foresees Sarpedon’s defeat (*I.16.433f*); and Priam imagines Hektor’s (*22.38ff*).

I turn now to the second passage in which Memnon’s end is treated:

\[ \text{епеї ῥηιν Ἀλακίδαι} \]
\[ \text{ἐπορον Ἐσθοχον αἴσαυ ἄρε-} \]
\[ \text{τὰς ἀποθελεῖνυμενοι μεγάλας,} \]
\[ \text{πέταται δ’ ἐπὶ τε χόνια καὶ διὰ δαλάσσας τηλόθεν} \]
\[ \text{ὁνυμ’ ἀDETων’ καὶ ἔς Αἰθιόπας} \]

50 Μέμνουος οὖν ἀπονοστή-

\[ \text{σαιτος ἔπαλτο.} \]

50b μεγαῖς Ἀχιλεύς
\[ \text{ἐμπεοε χαμαὶ καταβαῖς ἄφ’ ἀρμάτων,} \]
\[ \text{φαιννᾶς υἱὸν εὔτ’ ἐνάριηεν Ἀδός ἀχικῇ} \]
\[ \text{ἐγχεοες ζακότοιο.} \]
\[ \text{καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαῖότεροι} \]
\[ \text{δόν ἀμαξιτῶν εὐρον.”} \]

(N.6.46-54)

There are three major points of interest here. First, φαιννᾶς υἱὸν εὔτ’ ἐνάριηεν Ἀδός (52) alludes, I think, to a mention of Memnon in the *Odyssey*:

---

here, as elsewhere in Pindar, it means spirited – very strong, or mighty. Erbse, *Dritte nemeiscbe 283 n.2.*
The similarity of description recalls the *Odyssey* passage; and so suggests that Antilochos did not go unavenged.

The second point is the metaphorical description of Achilles’ killing of Memnon: βαρύ δὲ αφιω / νείχος / ἐμπεσε χαμαὶ καταβαλς ἄφ’ ἀρμάτων (49-51). From many alternatives, it is this text that involves the slightest correction of the text of the MSS, βαρύ δὲ αφιω νείχος ἐμπεσι’ (var. δεντεο’). Ἀχιλλεὺς χαμαὶ καταβαλς ἄφ’ ἀρμάτων, which does not scan. Hermann’s transposition solves the metrical problem, but critics have still been worried by the intransitive verb, ἐμπεσι’, which entails the apposition of Achilles and νείχος. Can Achilles be what he brings?

The scholiast’s paraphrase runs: 

βαρεταὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπαχθὶ μάχην διὰ φιλοσεικίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπέδειξεν ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς τοῖς Αἰθέριοι, χαμαὶ κλίνας τὸν Μέμνωνα αὐτὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀρμάτων κατελθὼν.

(Σ.Ν.6.85α)

Some have thought that this confirms that the scholiast read a transitive verb; others go further and infer that the necessary verb means “showed”.

33 It was made by Hermann, and appears in Heyne’s 1824 edition of the poems 3.247.

34 Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921) 488; his own candidate was δορα. Alternatively διδηκε (Rauchenstein, “Rudolphus Rauchenstein Theodori Bergklio S.D.P.” Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft 2 (1844), 405-7, here 406f); ἐμπαε (Fennel); ἐμβαλε (Sandys).

35 δεξίε (Dissen ad loc.); δανε (Bury ad loc.).
An alternative solution to this difficulty of the apposition of Achilles and νεῖκος is to retain the apposition, and ἔμπειρος, but replace νεῖκος. Εἴκος is the most popular substitute. Most notably, it was followed by Hermann in 1844—twenty years after his simple transposition which is now in Bowra’s and in Snell-Maehler’s texts. But the scholiast’s μηλονεικίαν must indicate that he read νεῖκος. Wilamowitz’ ὁρεῖ and Sandys’ ἐμβαλε both appeal to Homeric usage. But I should think that the Homeric precedent in fact suggests that Pindar wrote something different. The apposition of Hermann’s first version fits the bill. The scholiast’s transitive ἐπέδειξεν may only reflect his difficulty in paraphrasing Achilles as the strife, falling on them.

The third point of interest in the whole N.6 passage is the circumlocution for Achilles’ victory in the fight:

...δύνας αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐς Αἴθιοπας
Μέμνονος οὐξ ἀπονοστή-

σαντος ἔπαιλτο·

(N.6.49f)

36 Ahrens, in Schneidewin’s edition (Gotha, 1843).
37 “Pindari Nemeorum Carmen Sextum”, Opuscula B (Leipzig, 1877), 68-75, here 73.
38 e.g. Il.12.348, 361 (νεῖκος ὁρωθεν); 2.376, 4.444: Eris νεῖκος δυσλίου ἐμβαλε μέσας.
39 cf Bowra, Pindar 214-9; see above, p.217 n.22.
40 Farnell hails it as Pindaric (Works 2.285).
41 Is it possible that the scholiast took ἔμπειρος in the sense "was exposed to" (cf N.7.73, LSJ s.v. ἔμπιπτω 4)? Then the paraphrase makes perfect sense. But it is a perverse translation.
We have seen a similar phrase in N.3: Achilles resolved

οὕτως αφίσι μὴ κοίρανος ὁπίσω

πάλιν οὖκατ' ἀνεψιός ζημενής "Ελένου Νέμων μόλοι

(N.3.62f)

Now, the use of missing one's return as a periphrasis for death encountered on an adventure is common and unsurprising. It is deeply pathetic: it accumulates the fact of the dead person's failure to return to his family alive; the impossibility of their burying him; and the likelihood that no one else will perform the duty for them. All three of these tensions appear in the wounded Sarpedon's appeal to Hektor in Iliad 5:

"Προσαμίδη, μὴ δή με ᾠλω Δαμασκίνιν ἐάσις

κείσαι, ἄλλ' ἐπάμυνοι· ἐπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰῶν

ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμελλόν ἔγγιμ

νοστήσας οἰκόνυδε φίλην ὡς πατρίδα γαῖαν

ἐφαρμενέου ἀλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον νιόν.

(5.684-8)"

42 Griffin, Homer 106-112, on the pathos of "death far from home", citing e.g. II.15.705f: Hektor fires a Greek ship, η Πρωτεόλαου ἐνεπεμένεν

ἐς Τροίην. οὔτε οὕτως ἀπήγαγε πατρίδα γαῖαν.

43 Vermeule, Aspects of Death 12: the importance of the relatives' duty is exemplified at Od.24.418, where the dead suitors are sent home: the Ithacans τοῖς δ' ἐς ἄλλας πολίων οἰκόνυδε ἐκαστὸν

πέμπων ἄγειν ὀλιγοῦς ἀδὲς ἐπὶ υμοῖς τιθέντες.

Cf Aesch. Ag.452-5.

44 The unburied dead is not fully dead. Patroklos' ghost chides Achilles:

θάπτε με ὅτι τάχιστα, πύλας 'Αἴδου περήσω.

τῆλε μὲ εἰργούσι φυκαί, εἰδώλα καμόντων,

οὐδὲ μὲ πῶς ἄγεον ὑπὲρ ποταμοῦ ἅμαιν.

ἄλλ' οὕτως ἀλάλημα ἄν' εὑρυπυλές "Αἴδος δέ.

(IL.23.71-4)

Cf Rohde, Psyche 162f.

45 This is not a death speech; but it should be, whatever the
The equation of successful nostos and salvation reverberates through the Odyssey. The nostos is by definition successful; the return from a dangerous adventure. Death is its complement, the price which made the adventure worthwhile.

These values are thoroughly Pindaric:

τὸν δὲ παμπεληθῆ γλυκῶν ἡμιθάοι-
σίν πόθοι ένυδαθεν Ἡρα

μας Ἀργοῦς, μὴ τινα λεπόμενον
τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰ-
ῶνα πέσαντ’, ἄλλ’ ἐπὶ καὶ θεατῇ
φάρμακον κάλλιστον ἐπὶς ἄρετάς ἣ-
λιξίν εὐφράοικεν οὐν ἐλλοις.

(P. 4.184-7)49

Further, the nostos becomes an epinician theme.

τοὲς [sc. the losers] οὗτε νόστος ὁμοῖς
ἐξαλπυνος ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη,
οὖν ἀλλὰ μολύνων πάρ πατέρ’ ἀμφὶ γέλως γλυκῶς

causality which brought it to its place in Book 5. Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 69-71.

46 e.g. 3.142; 19.85, and especially 9.94-7, the lotus eaters (on whom see Fraenkel, Poetry and Philosophy 49f.; Page, Folktales in the Odyssey 14-21); cf Aristotle Poetics 17 (1455b 16ff); Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 35-41, 97-102, on the contrast between Odysseus and Achilles, summed up in Achilles’ comment in the Nekyia: ἄλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, αὕτως κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔσται (Od.9.413). Odysseus wins both.

47 See Crotty, Song and Action ch. 4, and especially 109-11; Nagy, Best of the Achaeans index s.v. nostos.

48 D. Frame, The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic (Yale U.Pr., 1978), argues, via a perceived identity of root, shared by νόος and νόστος, of *nes, "return to light and life", that it is ultimately a return from death itself (ch.3, especially 34-6).

49 cf 0.1.81-4; 5.16f; 6.9-11; P. 4.207; C. Segal, "God and Man in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes", HSCP 68 (1964), 211-67, here 212; L. Kurke, The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy (Cornell U. Pr., 1991), 27f.
It seems at first that they, like the dead hero, have lost their return altogether; but it is the public, glorious nostos which they miss. The loser gets a νόστον ἔχθρωτον καὶ ἄτιμοτέραν γλῶσσαν καὶ ἐπίχρυφον ζῆμον. The successful athlete, on the other hand, forgets death: 'Αίδη τοι λάθεται / ὦρμενα πρόξεις ἀνήρ (0.8.69-73). His travel to the games is his adventure, and his happy return defines his success.

There should, then, be no difficulty involved in his description of a hero's death through the circumlocution of his failure to return. It is, indeed, especially appropriate when, like Memnon, he dies attempting a great deed, the achievement of which would be signified by a triumphant nostos. But it is not, by that token, uniquely appropriate to Memnon. And yet Pindar uses the phrase twice for his death, but nowhere for the death of another hero.

A plausible explanation is that the unusual circumlocution is in some way connected with Memnon's unusual fate in the Ἀεθιόπις, in which, as Proclus makes clear, he neither straightforwardly died, nor returned home.

50 Pindar, typically, implies that the risk proper to martial activity applies also in the analogue of athletics (Bowra, Pindar 185f); see above, p.213.


52 e.g. 0.12.13-16; N.11.22-6 (Kurke, op. cit. 25-7); P.1.35; N.2.24, 4.76f, 9 passim.

53 Again, I appeal to the tradition. Hubbard sees Memnon's failure to return home in N.3 as an example of the opposition
Now, there are two clear epic parallels for this: the removal of Sarpedon's body to Lycia in the *Iliad*, and the translation of Achilles to Leuke in the *Aethiopis*.

Neoanalysis offers a neat description of the former as a shadow of the Memnon episode, involving oddities induced by the collision of the *Aethiopis* story of the divine son's escape to immortality and the harsher world view of the *Iliad*, in which such escape is impossible. After Sarpedon is killed, Zeus tells Apollo to retrieve his corpse, which is then washed and handed over to Sleep and Death, who carry it to Lycia for burial (16.666-83).

So it is with Achilles, who furnishes the second epic parallel. After his death, the Muses and Nereids mourn him; of the *alotrión* and the *oikeiōn* which runs through the poem (*Pindaric Mind* 44). But Memnon fails to return in H.6, also.


55 Nagy argues that *tarchúsovai* (16.674) does not mean "bury" but "treat like a god" ("On the Death of Sarpedon" in C. Rubino and S. Shelmerdine (eds.), *Approaches to Homer* (Austin, 1983), 189-217, here 196f). "The word *tarchú* indicates not only that the relatives and comrades of Sarpedon will treat him like a cult figure but also that he will thereby attain some sort of immortalization after death" (ibid. 204f). Neoanalysis would explain differently: *tarchúsovai* becomes an unassimilated detail from the story of Memnon.

56 And, indeed, neoanalysis suggests that Memnon's translation was the model for Achilles' (A. Dihle, *Homer-Probleme* (Opladen, 1970), 18-20). For a review of neoanalytic results on this question, Edwards, *Achilles in the Underworld* 219f.
White Island is a particular μαχάρων νῆσος; a place for the happy dead equivalent to the unspecific Islands of the Blessed, themselves thematically equivalent to Elysium. 57

The translation of a dead mortal to a land of immortality is a not uncommon motif. 58 The precise destination varies, but they are all the same sort of place: the Elysium to which Menelaos goes in the Odyssey (4.561-9); 59 Hesiod's νῆσοι μαχάρων (Op. 167-73); and a handful of similar places on the cusp between this world and another, such as Pindar's land of the Hyperboreans (0.3.31f; P. 10.30ff); 60 and the Phaeacians' Scheria in the Odyssey. 61

Aethiopia falls neatly into the same pattern. It is at the farthest edge of the world, by Okeanos; 62 and is regularly a

57 Achilles is found in all three places: Pindar puts him on the Isles at 0.2.68ff; Simonides puts him in Elysium (PMG 558). See below, p.258f.

58 Rohde, Psyche ch.2. On the paradoxes involved, see Vermeule, Aspects of Death ch.4; cf Burkert, GR 194-9, whence it appears that they simply cannot be resolved, pace Nagy's endeavours: Best of the Achaeans 174f, 208.

59 See West's note.

60 See Köhnken, Funktion 158-174, esp.168-71.

61 Od.6.8, 205; 7.112-32; 8.248f, 557-63, with Hainsworth's introduction to Book 6 (289f); cf Eur. Hipp. 741-51.

62 Iris says: ἔμι γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐπ' ᾿Οκεανοῦ Ῥέαθρα, Αἰθήλοπος ἐκ γαῖου... (II.23.205f). Okeanos is located at the πέρατα γαῖης at II.14.3102f. Cf Od.4.563 (Elysium); Hes. Op.168-70 (Islands of the Blest); 0.3.31f (Hyperboreans); Od.6.8, 205 (Scheria). D. Rolof, Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung, und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben (Berlin, 1970), 84f; J. S. Romm, The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought (Princeton, 1992), 46-50.
place of entertainment for the gods. Memnon, King of the Aethiopians, is son of Eos and Tithonos. They are firmly located at the edges of the world, by the streams of Okeanos, usually (but not always) in the East:

"Ἡκλ ἐν προικάπελος ἀπ' ὤκεανοῖο βοῶν ἄρτιν, ἵν' ἀνακύκλος φῶς φέροι ἣδε βροτοῖς.

(II.19.1f)

Tithonos, who was snatched by Eos (Hom. h.Aphro.218)

"Ἡνὶνπερπόμενοςχρυσόβρονῷπριγκενεῖῃ

ναῦεπαρ'ὁκεανοῖοβοῆςἐπὶπείθασιγαῖς.

(Hom. h.Aphr.226f)

So: Memnon's kingdom of Aethiopia is a standard example of a destination for a translated mortal; and he, as its king, and son of Eos, would seem an ideal candidate for it - for he belongs there. Nagy comments: "Memnon's immortalization is actually unique, to the extent that the realm in which he lived before his death as a hero is also appropriate as the setting for his afterlife. For Memnon, the afterlife is by implication a homecoming."

---

63 Od.1.21-5; cf 5.282f. Gods also feast with the Aethiopians at II.1.423f, 23.205-7. Cf P.10.35-40 (Hyperboreans); Romm, op. cit. 51.

64 Hes.Theog.984f:

Τιθώνες δ' Ἡκλ τέχεε Μέμνωνα χαλκοχοριστήν.

Αἰθιόπων βασιλῆς...

65 On western Aethiopes (e.g. II.23.205-7), see J. Ramin, Mythologie et Géographie (Paris, 1979), 77f.

66 cf Od. 4.563f; Op.167f; Bacch. 3.51-61 (Kroisos taken to the land of the Hyperboreans by Apollo); P.10.44.

67 Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 205.

68 Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 213 § 1n. That Memnon is translated back to Aethiopia is also asserted by Rohde, Psyche 64f; Clark and Coulson, Memnon 66, 71.
But this is a startling result in contrast with what I have said above about Pindar's presentation of his death as a failure to return home. The question now is: why does Pindar twice use this periphrasis - as he does nowhere else - for the death of a hero for whom it is uniquely inappropriate?

The answer may lie in part in the gradual impingement of the originally mythical Aethiopes upon the real world. Oriental Aethiopes were located in two places - south of Egypt, and the Near East.

The former is not securely attested until Hecataeus (FGrH 1 F 325-8, esp 327), but appears suggested in two mythical geographies - the list of countries visited by Menelaos (Od.4.83-5), and the list of countries overflown by the Boreads in their pursuit of the Harpies in the Hesiodic Catalogue (fr.150.15-19). Both these are yet mythical; but they are at least geography, and not eschatology - the realm of the Aethiopes is reached by a fantastic journey, but is not a home for an afterlife. In both cases, the citation of the Aethiopes points up the distances involved - and this, we note, is the thrust of Pindar's mention of them in H.6 (49f). Even for Herodotus, the Aethiopes in Egypt are still a mythical lot, although they be in a real but distant place. Comparison of

69 On this question, see Lesky, Aithiopika; cf Ramin, op. cit. 80.

70 Ramin, op. cit. 76f.


72 Lesky, Aithiopika 34.
Herodotus' account of them with what we have seen about the entirely mythical Aethiopes as examples of a blessed afterlife demonstrates that his conception of them springs from Greek myth.  

\[\text{\footnotesize (Hdt. 3.114)}\]

So, they are at the end of the world and live long (cf 3.22f); and they are the κάλλιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων (3.20). Their longevity is a substitute for immortality; and Memnon was the κάλλιστος man at Troy (Od.11.522) (and huge at O.S. 2.109).

The Aethiopes in the East, on the other hand, were more quickly rationalized. Although the author of the Prometheus Bound still uses the name to refer to the farthest East, Aeschylus reports another version:

\[\text{\footnotesize (Aesch. fr.405 R)}\]

73 See Fehling, Herodotus 191f.

74 Io is told:

\[\text{\footnotesize (807-9)}\]
And Herodotus twice calls Susa Memnonian (5.54; 7.151); and mentions τὰ βασίλεια τὰ Μεμνόνια there (5.53).  

What appears to have happened is this: the name Aethiopes was reapplied to real people in the better known East; and the more mythical aspects associated with the name transferred to the less well known south. Memnon, mythically son of Dawn, is firmly grounded in the east; becomes associated with the real city of Susa; and his genealogy is doctored to tie him to the place.

It is no surprise that this confuses the traditions involving Memnon’s remains. He cannot be translated back to immortality in mundane Susa. And so, for example, Aelian records that, although the people of the Troad say there is a grave for Memnon there (on the banks of the Aisepos, Paus.10.31.6),

καὶ αὐτὸν μὲν τὸν νεκρὸν ἐξ τὰ Σοῦσα τὰ ὀνόματα Μεμνόνεια ὑμνούμενα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς κομισθέντα μετέψωρον ἐκ τῶν φοινίκων τυχέων κηδεύσας τῆς προσήγουσας αὐτῷ, ἐπονομάζεσθαι δὲ οἴ τινι στήλην τὴν εἰμπτῇ ἄλλως.

(Animal 5.1)

Strabo reports that Simonides produced an interesting compromise:

λέγεται γάρ δὴ (sc. τὰ Σοῦσα), καὶ κτίσμα Τιθωνοῦ τοῦ Μεμνονοῦς πατρὸς... ἢ δ’ ἀκρόπολις ἐκαλεῖτο Μεμνόνιον... ταφῆμαι δὲ λέγεται Μέμνων περὶ Πάλτου (Βαυδάν codd. morz) τῆς Συρίας παρὰ βαδάν ποταμών.

---

75 cf Steph. Byz. s.v. Σοῦσα; Paus. 10.31.7.
77 The article in RE devotes a good deal of attention to these (644ff).
Whatever the precise destination (Paltus is on the coast due east of Cyprus), it is clear that Memnon has been buried on the way back from Troy to Susa. 78

The important question is: what happened to Memnon in the Aethiopis? Quintus Smyrnaeus, for whom Memnon, once killed, is a decomposing corpse carried away to be buried by Aisepos (2.565-92), does record a variant: Memnon, seeing the honour paid his tomb,

εἰν 'Αίδοιο δόμοιον

'Ηλύσιον πέδον αιγής

καρχαλάς

(2.650-2)

And this, Vian suggested, was the version of the Aethiopis. 79

In other words, already by the time of the stabilization of the text of the Aethiopis, "Aethiopes" referred too firmly to the real east to accommodate a pleasant afterlife. Certainly, the Aethiopis account is by no means a primitive form of this myth; we cannot simply assume that Memnon returned to his kingdom there. 80

78 Forbes Irving argues that the birds which mysteriously appear and fight yearly at Memnon's tomb (e.g. Q.S.2.549ff; Robert, Heldensage 1184) mediate between Memnon's mundane death and his immortality elsewhere (Metamorphosis 246f, 120f). This is another compromise that eases the eschatological paradox I have outlined. See too above, p.245 n.55.

79 Recherches 26.

80 Memnon is not the only person Eos snatched; as we have seen, she seized her lover Tithonos (Hom. h.Aphr. 218-38); but also Orion (Od.5.121) and Kleitos (Od.15.250). Memnon is the odd one out: he is her son, and he returns to the mythic East. I wonder if he was not originally another of Eos' lovers. He was very handsome - Odysseus tells Achilles, of Eurypylus: καλύττων ἢ κόλλιστον ἢ οὖν μετὰ Μέμνου δῖον (Od.11.522) - as was
I would explain Pindar’s two descriptions of Memnon’s end in this world by appeal to this confused and evolving tradition. He definitively rules out the version in which Memnon is carried off home: Aethiopia was no longer a suitable destination for an afterlife. 81

His periphrasis, on the other hand, accommodates both the story recorded by Simonides of Memnon’s burial in a strange land, 82 and also the datum that Memnon was translated to an afterlife in some place other than his home in the east. It glosses over the eschatological difficulties involved; alludes to the sensible narrative, and denies the implausible. From confused and possibly intractable (qua supernatural) material, he conjures a dignified and authoritative myth.

Now, what of the vocabulary used elsewhere by Pindar to describe Memnon’s death? It shows the same cautious awareness of the difficulties involved.

Tithonos (Hom. h.Aphr. 225), typically for a mortal lover of an immortal (Il. 20.235). And Eos’ lovers, in the iconography, are surprisingly young (Vermeule, Aspects of Death 164f). I suspect that his rescue from the battlefield may originally have been motivated by erotic rather than maternal concerns. But, for that matter, these two concerns are not mutually exclusive where the sun is concerned: Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 197-201. On all this, see Vermeule Aspects of Death ch.5; D. D. Boedeker, Aphrodite’s Entry into Greek Epic (Mnes. Suppl. 32 (1974)), 67-84.

But whatever the early history of the myth, the point is that the Aethiopis does not seem to have reproduced an Ur-form of it; and so we cannot assume that Memnon’s ultimate destination there was the obvious one of Aethiopia.

81 Robertson noticed that Pindar often uses a word or phrase “carefully designed to recall the rejected story” (Food of Achilles 179). This is one reason: Pindar tells his version in language which simultaneously denies the rival. See above, p. 98ff on N.3.34.

82 Farnell, Works 2.285.
We have seen that θανάτῳ πόρευ is an odd phrase; but only now does its full weight emerge.

In her suggestion to Zeus for the disposal of Sarpedon’s body, Hera specifies its removal by Sleep and Death:

αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὸν γε λίπη ψυχή τε καὶ αἷμα,
πέμπειν μιν θανάτῳ τὸ φέρειν καὶ νησίμου Ὠπιου,
εἰς δὲ καὶ δὴ λυκίης εὐφρείης δήμου ἱκώνται,
ἐνθὰ δὲ ταρχύσουσι κασίγνητοι τε ἐται τε
τύμβῳ τε στήλῃ τε τὸ γάρ γέρας ἐστι τανάτων.

(II.16.453-7)

And this is what happens (666-83). Neoanalysis suggests the inference that they removed Memnon’s body in the Aethiopis. Iconographic evidence confirms.

I suggest that θανάτῳ πόρευ is best understood as an allusion to Death’s removal of Memnon’s remains and best construed on the lines of the Iliadic parallel, of Apollo’s part in the removal of Sarpedon:

πέμπει δὲ μιν πομποται τὰμα κραεπνοταὶ φέρεωθαι,
:"Ωπις καὶ θανάτῳ διδυμάσοιν...

(II.16.671f)

83 See above, on Kyknos; Gildersleeve, Van Leeuwen ad loc.
84 Kullmann, Quellen 318-20. But he asserts that Eos is sister to Sleep and Death, and uses this as evidence of the priority of their removal of Memnon, at her request (op. cit. 35f). But the evidence is slim (inference from Q.S.2.626) and there is an alternative Hesiodic genealogy (Theog.372). This spoils the argument – but does not invalidate it. Contrast Vermeule, Aspects of Death 162f.
85 Lung, Memnon 57-60; Clark and Coulson, Memnon 71-3.
The suggestion of 0.2.82f is that Achilles gives Memnon to Death, to carry away.

Neither 1.5 nor 1.8 stresses Achilles' killing of Memnon; in both cases, the important verb is to be understood. But N.6 appears to draw attention to Memnon's death, with the strong word - and Pindaric hapax - ἐνάριξεν:

φαενώς υἱὸν εὐτ' ἐνάριξεν Ἄδως ἄκινη
ἔγχεος Κακότοιο.

(N.6.52f) 86

The use of ἐνάριξω here may hint at Achilles stripping Memnon's famous armour. There is some evidence that this was important for Achilles. In the Iliad, he vows that he will dedicate Hektor's armour on Patroklos' pyre:

οὔ σε πρὶν κτερίζω, πρὶν γὰρ Ἐκτορὸς ἐνθῆδ' ἐνείκαι τεόχεα καὶ κεφαλὴν, μεγαθύμου σοὸ φοίης:

(II.18.334f)

Might this be a detail shared by the Aethiopis? The neo-analytic inference is supported by Philostratus:

τὸν Ἀχιλλέα πυρὰν τε ὑφοία τῷ Ἀντιλόχῳ καὶ πολλά ἐς αὐτὴν ὁφάξαι, τὰ τε ὅπλα καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Μέμνουος ἐπικάυομαι αὐτῷ.

(Philostr. Her. 26.18)

If this did occur in the Aethiopis, then ἐνάριξεν at N.6.53 lightly alludes to it. I have suggested that the other vocabulary of the line recalls Od.4.188, and by that token suggests

86 It is odd, and, presumably, not entirely irrelevant, that the only two occurrences in Greek of ἐναρίμβροτος, cognate with ἐναρίξω, are in the other passages describing Memnon's death (P.6.30; I.8.53).

that Antilochos did not go unavenged. .Syncrêve confirms the successful revenge killing.

Finally, we note that Memnon is twice referred to as στράταρχος Ἀθηναίων (I.5.40; P.6.31).  στράταρχος is, surprisingly, an uncommon word.  It is unidiomatic; and I suspect therefore has an exotic ring.  Herodotus uses it to refer to the leader of the Babylonian army (3.157).

Memnon is the last and greatest of Achilles' victims; his own death follows shortly.  We have seen that each of Pindar's canon of Achilles' opponents is, in some way, problematic for an epinician: Telephos is indissolubly linked with Achilles' magic spear; Kyknos is invulnerable; Hektor is too well known; and Memnon's own end is confused. And yet they do all appear: their intrinsic value is exploited, and their difficulties avoided.

The Dead Achilles

Pindar once, briefly, describes the burial of Achilles:

τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντα ἄδικα <ἐπὶ> ἐλιπών,
ἀλλὰ οἱ παρὰ τᾶς ψυ-

ραν τάφον ὦ Ἐλιξώνια παρθένοι

στάν, ἔπει δρῆμον τῇ πολύφατῳ ἔχειν.

ζῶος ἦρα καὶ ὀδανάτοις.

60 ἐσθόν γε φῶς καὶ φθίμε-

νοι οὕμνοις θεὰ διδόμεν.

τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ξι-

αυτῷ τῇ Μοισαίου ὄρμα Νικικλέος

μνάμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι.

(I.8.56a-62)\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Carey soundly considers the difficulties here (5 Odes 2014); see also M. Alexiou, The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition
Homer also has Thetis, her sisters and the Muses singing a lament (Od. 24.39-94); and so, from the time of the scholiast, critics have seen the influence of the Odyssey’s account of the burial. The scholiast compares 57f to Μούσαι δ’ ἐνεέα πάξαι ἀμετρόμεναι ὧπε καλῇ / θρήνεον (Od. 24.60f). But the Muses’ lament is a feature shared by the account of the funeral in its proper place in the cycle, after Achilles’ death in the Aethiopis:

καὶ θέτεις ἀφικόμενη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς
θρήνει τοῦ παῖδα.

(Chrest. 198f) Agamemnon’s account of Achilles’ end and burial in Od. 24 exactly follows Proclus’ outline of the Aethiopis’ account of the same events. Either they both spring from a common tradition; or the author of Odyssey 24 knew the Aethiopis. (The second explanation might accord well with the hypothesis that the end of the Odyssey is not integral with the whole.)

(Cambridge, 1974), 12f, and ch. 7 on πολύφωμον as “polyphonomous”; Köhnken, Gods and Descendants 30f and Gerber Comm. 165, illuminating 61.

2 Young, 3 Odes 55 n. 3.

3 Thummer suggested that 56a was influenced by σὺ μὲν οὖν ὄμων διὸνυμ’ ἔλεος (24.93). But the verbal echo is slight, and the thought different.

4 Severyns, CE 322-4.

5 (Except in the matter of the destination of Achilles’ remains) Edwards, Achilles in the Underworld 224.

6 See Heubeck on Od. 24.36-97 (and on 50-57). For other Aethiopis episodes known by the Odyssey, see Edwards, Achilles in the Underworld 223.

Pindar knew both the *Aethiopis* and the *Odyssey*. There is no warrant for the claim that Pindar's source is the *Odyssey* rather than the *Aethiopis*: on the contrary, given Pindar's preference for the cyclic over the Homeric, if we are to accord priority to either epic, it should be to the *Aethiopis*. 8

In the matter of the destination of Achilles' remains, the epics do diverge. In the *Odyssey*, Achilles' shade stalks the underworld (11.467ff), while his ashes are mixed with Patroklos' in a golden amphora, brought by Thetis (24.72ff).

But in the *Aethiopis*:

Plainly, this translation is incompatible with the collection of Achilles' bones.

---

8 Note the Homeric bias of the comments of Farnell, Carey and Privitera, who all acknowledge, but dismiss, the *Aethiopis*.

9 Vian, Recherches 35. The taphos is, presumably, a cenotaph (Rohde, *Psyche* 84 n.29; Edwards, *Achilles in the Underworld* 224 n.23; cf Od.4.584). For χώσαι τάφου of a cenotaph, Hdt.9.85.3.
Pindar mentions Achilles' afterlife twice, in different terms. He does allude to a white island as Achilles' realm in N.4:


díaρ

Αξας Σαλαμίνι ἔχει πατρίδαν·
ἐν δ' Ἐδείνης πελάγει φαενάν Ἀχιλλεύς


(N.4.47-50)10

But in 0.2 Achilles is on the Island of the Blest, taken there by his mother, ἔπει Ζηνός ἄτορ / λίτας ἐπεισε (79f). This location, it has been argued, is the poet's innovation: Pindar presents an alternative fate for the hero, more pleasant than the very distressing Odyssean picture; or he makes Achilles, literally immortal, an analogue for Theron, literally so.11

But neither of these arguments compels.12 Once again, the poetic context only explains Pindar's selection of a particular version, and goes no way towards demonstrating that he has invented it. The existence of the versions he presents can be satisfactorily shown to be the product of a gradually evolving eschatological tradition.

During the first stage of this tradition, Achilles is snatched to a distant, better place, a white island. There are traces of a number of such destinations in early mythology: cool and pleasant, they lie at the ends of fantastically long sea voyages: Elysium; the Islands of the Blest; the land of the

10 See Σ.Ν.4.79a for φαενάν = λευχάν.
11 Solmsen, Achilles 20; Nisetich, Immortality.
12 Solmsen does not consider the Aethiopis.
Hyperboreans; Scheria; Aethiopia. White Island is typical: it is the right colour, and an island.

Next, this White Island is identified with an island in the Black Sea, near the mouth of the Danube, Leuke. Greeks seem to have known the northern coast of the Black Sea in the eighth century, but there is no evidence for settlement before the seventh. By the late sixth century, Achilles was worshipped in cult on Leuke. Presumably, the identification preceded the cult; given that White Island was, qua place for an afterlife, beyond the reach of mortals, far away, it must

13 See above, p. 246 on Memnon; Edwards, Achilles in the Underworld 221-3. Cool and pleasant: Od. 4.566f; 0.2.70-2, 3.18 (with Köhnken, Mythological Chronology 57); Od. 7.118f; D. Roloff, Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung, und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben (Berlin, 1970), 94-6. Distance: such places are at by Okeanos at the πείρατα γαίης (Od. 4.563; Hes. Op. 168; cf Od. 6.8, 205); Roloff, op. cit. 84f. Sea voyage: B.C. Dietrich, Death, Fate and the Gods (London, 1965), App. 5.


17 Hommel, Achilles 8f.

18 Unless "Achilles" already had a role in the Black Sea. Hommel's identification of Achilles as a god of the underworld who then rules this island in the Hospitable Sea seems implausible: could this god be prior to Achilles the hero (G. F. Pinney, "Achilles Lord of Scythia", in W. G. Moon (ed.), Ancient Greek Art and Iconography (Wisconsin, 1983), 127-146, here 144 n.64)?
have been made before Leuke was thoroughly within bounds to the settlers. 19

By the end of the sixth century, then, Achilles is in some sense established on Leuke. 20 The fact of the cult on the island confirms that the island is now within the range of mortals and so precludes its role as an Island of the Blessed. 21 The two conceptions could not have coexisted in the same place. 22

But Achilles is taken off to immortality, as the Aethiopis probably had it, and as his worship in cult suggests. 23 He must, then, go to an Island of the Blest which remains out of this world. Simonides and Ibycus sent him to Elysium. 24 Pindar puts him on a μακάρων ναός (0.2.71f). 25 All this requires no special pleading: it is the inevitable upshot of a process of eschatological rationalization. 26 The reference at N.4.49f is

---

19 cf Rohde, Psyche 565f n.102.
20 His journey there may be shown by an amphora of c.540 (LIMC 1.1 p.195 (no.901)).
21 cf Od.6.8; Hes. Op.167; Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 74f n.20.
22 Note Nisetich's insistence on the separation (Immortality); cf Burkert, GR 205.
23 Farnell, GHC 323, 363, 371f.
24 PMG 558 = 291; also an Attic skolion (PMG 894).
25 cf this fragment of epic, which goes on to describe Aias and Odysseus taking Achilles' body out of the fighting:

ες μακάρων ναός τ[...i][υπομ[...] οδειαν [πέμψα]); δει ημειες 'Ραδύμενων.'

(II.Parv. fr.dub.32.2f B = P.Oxy.2510.2f)

But we do not know what, or how old, this is. See below, p.284 n.12.
26 Nisetich's argument for Pindaric innovation, motivated by poetic tensions, depends on his claim that "whether Leuke,
plainly to Achilles' cult on Leuke, and does not discord with his presence on a less terrestrial island.\(^{27}\)

Which Leuke was meant in the \textit{Aethiopis}\(^{28}\)? In early stages of the tradition out of which the \textit{Aethiopis} evolved, of course, Achilles' destination must have been out of this world. It is a neat coincidence that those settlers in the Black Sea were Milesian, and that the tradition of the \textit{Aethiopis} seems to have been localized in Miletus.\(^{29}\) The Milesians, if anyone, would have identified the distant island with that mentioned in the epic of their homeland: it is more plausible that they should do so than anyone else should. Some stage in the evolution of the \textit{Aethiopis} must have used that identification.\(^{30}\) But I doubt that mundane Leuke was still so unknown and mysterious by the time of the stabilization of the text of the \textit{Aethiopis}.\(^{31}\) So

\footnotesize

\(^{27}\) cf O.S. 3.775ff (Achilles on Leuke); 14.224-6 (Achilles in Elysium), with Vian, \textit{Recherches} 35 n.3. Of course, traces of an afterlife on Leuke remain (Eur. \textit{Andro.} 1259-62; I.T. 427f).

\(^{28}\) See Monro, \textit{Epic Cycle} 16f.

\(^{29}\) Monro, loc. cit.; Hommel, \textit{Achilleus} 22-4; Pinney, op. cit. 133, 139.

\(^{30}\) Nagy attempts to rule out the previous stage, in which the White Island is extra-terrestrial (\textit{Pindar's Homer} 71). This is to ignore Rohde's observations. It also appeals to the identification of mythical places of immortalization and ritual places of cult (\textit{Best of the Achaeans} 189-92). But White Island is not the place at which Achilles disappears from the face of this world (as if struck by lightning, or snatched by a gust of wind), but the place he is taken to. The right place for Achilles' immortality, on Nagy's argument, is at his pyre - and that is where Nagy gives him immortality in \textit{Best of the Achaeans} (340ff).

\(^{31}\) We have seen much the same difficulty with Memnon's afterlife: once the Aethiopes are located in this world, Memnon
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the Leuke to which, as Proclus testifies, Achilles was taken in the *Aethiopis* must have become, once again, entirely terrestrial.

The Odyssean version, in which Achilles' afterlife is simply that of a shade in the Underworld, remains anomalous. No certainty is possible, but it seems highly plausible that this harsher world view, central to the *Iliad* and important for the *Odyssey*, was not a more primitive tradition, but a deliberate poetic strategy.  

In 0.2, Achilles is on the Island of the Blest by virtue of the intervention of Thetis, who *ξηρὰς ἡπερ' λιταῖς ἔπαινε* (79f). Her role complements his own qualities, catalogued in the following lines. There is no good reason to doubt that the detail springs from the *Aethiopis*.  

First, Eos wins immortality for Memnon in this way (*Chrest.* 189f); and her case cannot be taken back to his kingdom for his immortality. And it seemed probable that already in the *Aethiopis* his afterlife was in Elysium (above, p.251).

---


34 cf Rohde, *Psyche* 65; G. L. Koniaris, "On Pindar’s Olympian 2: ΑΧΙΛΛΕΥΣ, and Much More", *Hellenika* 39 (1988), 237-69, here 255 n.48. This article vigorously attacks the interpretations of Nisetich (rightly, 254-7) and Solmsen. Koniaris offers his own interpretation of the significance of the detail (264-7), but is throughout (most clearly in the note I cite here) dogged by the possibility that 0.2.79f is simply a detail taken from the *Aethiopis*. 

---
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seems exactly parallel to Thetis'. Further, neoanalysis argues that Achilles' translation is based upon Memnon's: if this is so, then Eos' prayers become the model for Thetis'. Nisetich does not confront these points; and his alternative explanation of what he sees as Pindar's innovation, based on the parallel scene with Eos in the Aethiopis, is unconvincing: he does not explain why the divine favour shown Achilles manifests itself as Thetis' intercession with Zeus. It is hard to see how Thetis' role can do anything but spoil any precisely worked-out lesson which Theron is supposed to draw from the depiction of Achilles in 0.2. For who is to play Thetis — in whatever sense — for Theron?  

---

35 Zeus is involved more often than not in such translations: cf Bacchylides 3.53, Edwards, Achilles 221f; Od.4.569; Köhnken, Funktion 178.  
36 A. Dihle, Homer-Probleme (Opladen, 1970), 18-20. On the relation of the death of Sarpedon, in this respect, see Clark and Coulson, Memnon 68f.  
37 Immortality 11 and 10-15. Solmsen's argument, in which Thetis' request is a Homeric motif (Il.1.493ff), used to gain—say Homer (Achilles 20f) would be attractive but for its failure to consider the Aethiopis. The idea that Pindar modelled this detail on the Eos scene in the Aethiopis was proposed by J. K. and F. S. Newman, Pindar's Art; its Tradition and Aims (Heidelsheim, 1984), 175 n.27.
Infancy

In 1.6, Pindar describes an episode from Herakles’ journey to Troy: stopping to recruit Telamon for the expedition, he prays to Zeus that his friend will have an outstanding son; and seeing an eagle, instructs Telamon to name after it the son he shall have—Aias (1.6.35-56).

A scholium claims that Pindar’s source was the Hesiodic Megálaí Ἡμερίαι:

εἰλημέτα τε ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων Ἡμερίων ἡ ἡμερία τῶν Ἡρακλείων τῶν Τελαμόνων καὶ ἐμβαίνων τῇ δορᾷ καὶ ἐγκυώμενος οὖτως, καὶ ὁ διὸ ποιμέν παριστάτος, ἀφ’ οὗ τὴν προσωπομείαν ἔλαβεν Αίας.

οὖτως καὶ Wilamowitz: καὶ οὖτως codd.

(Σ.Ι.6.53α = [Hes.] fr. 250)

But this scholiast is suggesting that, along with the facts of Herakles’ entertainment by Telamon, his prayer, and the eagle which signals the prayer’s success, Pindar took the detail that Herakles stood on his lion-skin from the Hesiodic poem: τὸν μὲν ἐν βινδῷ λέοντος στάντα κελάσατο νεκταρέας ἀπουδάζαιν ἄρειαν / ἄμφιτρυπνιάδαν (I.6.37f). But the line cannot mean that Herakles stood on his lion-skin— for he later draws
attention to τὸ δέρμα [which] μὲ νῦν περιπλανάται (47). This misunderstanding undermines our confidence in the scholiast, who is simply projecting his understanding of Pindar back on to the Μεγάλα "Ηόδαι."

But it is unlikely that the attribution is completely worthless. Some knowledge of the Great Ehoeae went into the Pindar scholia: they are one of the few sources for fragments. It is plausible to imagine that our scholium was the work of a scholar who did not know the Hesiodic original, but had a note which identified it as a source for the story; and that he elaborated upon this. We may infer only that something like Pindar's story occurred in the Hesiodic poem.

The prominence of Herakles' lion-skin in 1.6 is remarkable. Herakles prays:

λίονος θεία δρακόντι εξ Ἐρετοίας
κυρίως τῷ ξείνῳ ἀμφότεροι τῶν μὲν ἄρρητου φιόν, ἢ-
περ τὸ δέρμα μὲ νῦν περιπλανάται
θηρός, διὰ πάμπρωτον ἄσθελων κτείνα ποτ' ἐν Νεμέα.
θυμάς δ' ἐπέδωκα.

(1.6.45-9)

---

1 See also Farnell ad loc.
2 Σ.1.6.53b (τουτέστι μὴ ἀποθέμενον τὸ δέρμα, ἀλλ' ὡς εἶχεν ἀρξασθεὶ τῶν σπουδῆν); Vürtheim, De Aiacon origine 1-3; cf. χαλακίωσιν δ' ἐν ἑντεοί (0.4.22): Terzaghi, Unverwundbarkeit 312.
3 Vürtheim, De Aiacon origine 3f; Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 67f.
4 Frr. 253 and 259 (as well as 250).
5 This is Schwartz' model (Ps-Hesiodelia 146f). West's criticisms do not affect my point (Hesiodic Catalogue 1f n.5).
There is plainly some connexion with the following story:

There are two possible explanations of the connexion: the Pindaric "idea is degraded by later littérateurs of antiquity to a magical significance"; or Pindar's version is "his own, somewhat rationalized, version of the encounter between Herakles and Telamon."

Other explicit testimony for the story is little help: the earliest is broadly contemporary with Pindar:

Farnell, Works 1.267.
The date of Aeschylus' play, the *Thracian Women*, is unknown; but it must have been written in the same era as *I.6*, which may have been written in 480, or rather earlier.\(^8\) An Etruscan statuette, which plainly shows Aias impaling himself through his armpit, and which must therefore use the story of the vulnerable spot, is dated to the second quarter of the fifth century.\(^9\)

But scholia to the *Iliad* give some help. In that poem, Aias is twice almost wounded: first, when Hektor hits him with a spear

\[\text{Tη} \, \text{διόν} \, \text{τελαμώνε} \, \text{περὶ} \, \text{στήθεσιι} \, \text{τετάσκην.} \]

\[\text{Ητοι} \, \text{δὲ} \, \text{μὲν} \, \text{σάκεος}, \, \text{δὲ} \, \text{φασάνου} \, \text{ἀργυροῆλου·} \]

\[\text{τῷ} \, \text{οῖ} \, \text{δυσάσθην} \, \text{τέρεμα} \, \text{χρόα.} \]

(*II.14.404-6*)

Secondly, during the games for Patroklos, when he and Diomedes are fighting:

\[\text{Τυδειάδης} \, \delta' \, \text{ἀρ'} \, \text{ἐπείτα} \, \text{ὑπὲρ} \, \text{σάκεος} \, \text{μεγάλοιο} \]

\[\text{αἰέν} \, \text{ἐπ'} \, \text{αὐχένι} \, \text{κύρε} \, \text{φαινὼν} \, \text{δουρός} \, \text{ἀκούει.} \]

\[\text{καὶ} \, \text{τότε} \, \delta' \, \text{Ἀ'αντι} \, \text{περιδείσαντες} \, \text{'Αχαιοί} \]

\[\text{παισμένους} \, \text{ἐκέλευσαν} \, \text{άδελφια} \, \text{το} \, \text{ἀνελέσθαι.} \]

(*II.23.820-3*)

\(^8\) *I.5* is also for Phylakidas, and specifically celebrates his second Isthmian victory (17). The battle of Salamis is also mentioned, as a recent event (49). *I.6*, for his first victory, must, then, be rather earlier.

\(^9\) M. I. Davies, "The Suicide of Ajax: a Bronze Etruscan Statuette from the Käppeli Collection", *A.Kunst.* 14 (1971), 148-57, here 148, 153f, 156. He also discusses another, contemporary, statuette, which also seems to be predicated on the Aeschylean version (153 n.29, 155).
The brief Aristarchan comments (οτι εκ τοις και τοιοις φαίνεται καθο "Ομηρον μη διαι άπρωτος δ Αιας")\textsuperscript{10} are supplemented by Eustathius:

Σημειώσας δὲ καὶ οτι καθο "Ομηρον ου την πλευραν μόνην τρωτός ήν δ Αιας, διοι μηθ ου δ αιμον είπεν. εξης δ Αιομήνης καταθηρεῖ του ανθένος δια τα ταυτων κατάφραγκων σώματος. ἐκφάτησε δὲ φήμη τοιαυτα των μηδαμου τρωτον η βλητόν εἶναι τοιον Αιατα, ει μη διτι γε κατα μόνην πλευραν, ἐπει ουδαμον τις 'Ιλιάδος εὑρηται τρομος.

(Eust.ad.II.23.824 (1331.28ff))\textsuperscript{11}

The appeal is to the Aristarchan principle that the Neoteroi are "imitateurs maladroits d’Homère".\textsuperscript{12} The principle seems to work excellently here, for it appears that the various parts of the body identified as Aias’ vulnerable spot all neatly match the parts that appear as vulnerable in the Iliadic passages.\textsuperscript{13} So, from the latter come the versions in which Aias’ neck is vulnerable (Σ.Ε.ΙΙ.23.821); or that part of him covered by his shield (Σ.Λυκ. Αλεξ.455). From the former, those where the vulnerable spot is somewhere under the telamon, the strap over one shoulder and under the other arm: οι μεν περι την αλειδά φασιν εἶναι, οι δὲ περι τα πλευρά (Σ.Λυκ.Αλεξ.455). Likewise the version in which the point is specified as the armpit.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{10} Σ.Α.ΙΙ.23.822; cf Σ.Α.ΙΙ.14.406.
\textsuperscript{11} cf Eustathius ad 13.323 (834.43f); 14.404 (995.1ff); Σ.Τ.14.404-6; Severyns, CE 326f.
\textsuperscript{12} Severyns, CE 83-93; here 86.
\textsuperscript{13} Würtheim, De Aiaxis origine 94.
\textsuperscript{14} κατα Αιαχύλου και ἄλλους (Eust.ad.II.14.404 (995.2)).
But it now seems that, in matters such as this, Aristarchus had mistaken the causality involved. It appears that Homer excluded traditional supernatural elements from the *Iliad*—elements which might resurface in the cyclic treatments.\(^{15}\) So, the fact that Aias is not wounded in the *Iliad* is an effect of his traditional invulnerability, not its cause. Equally, the passages in the *Iliad* in which Aias is almost wounded are traces of a story of a vulnerable spot, rather than its seeds.

Against this, Severyns posits that the *Aethiopis* probably featured Aias' complete invulnerability, and no vulnerable spot.\(^ {16}\) But he has no convincing evidence. None of the relevant *Iliad* scholia quite spells it out as clearly as we should like.\(^{17}\) One wonders whether complete invulnerability could ever feature in a satisfactory narrative. Finally, complete invulnerability is incompatible with what is, perhaps, the

---


\(^{16}\) CE 326-8, endorsed by Griffin, *Uniqueness* 40, and, perhaps, Davies *Epic Cycle* 61.

\(^{17}\) Severyns argues that it is not uncommon for the second part of Aristarchan comments of the form "this is not Homeric, but a story from the Neoteroi" to drop out of the transmitted scholia (CE 16); hence the less exciting comments which we do have, attributing the story to Aeschylus and others (Eust.ad. ii.14.404 (995.2)); to Lykopron as well (Eust.ad.ii.13.323 (834.44)); or simply to those after Homer (Eust.ad.ii.23.824 (1331.29)). The right form of words is preserved by Σ.Gen.ii.14.406 (διὰ τούτων παραδίδωσιν τρωτῶν αὐτῶν ὅ ποιητής, καὶ ὅδε οἱ Νεώτεροι αὐτῶν ἑστηκότων ἀτρωτοῦ) — but there is no guarantee that Νεώτεροι is here used in Aristarchus' technical sense to refer to the authors of the Cycle (cf CE 40f. n.1 for other authors called Νεώτεροι in the scholia) — nor, for that matter, that the comment refers specifically to complete invulnerability.
feature most fundamental to the character of Aias: his suicide. Of the stories of the magically weak point, Tzetzes writes:

\begin{equation}
\text{taūta de λῆρος, οὕτως δὲ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἔχει.}
\end{equation}

περιδέξειος δὲν στρατιώτης ὡς Αἰας καὶ πολλοὺς

πολεμῆςς τοὺς πολέμους οὐδέποτε ἑτρώθη τῷ ἀριστᾳ

τηρεῖν διαυτόν καὶ σκέψεαι τῇ ἀκάκει. ἐπεὶ δὲ

αὐτὸς διαυτὸν διείλε τὸ ἔφος κατὰ τῆς πλευρᾶς ὅσας

καὶ τοῦ τραχήλου, εἰς μῆδον ἐτέθη ὥστε τοὺς τόπους

toūtous mόνος eἰxe tru̇tou̇s.

\begin{equation}
\text{(Σ. Lyc. Alex. 455)}
\end{equation}

Although there is no direct testimony, then, the story of an invulnerable Aias with a vulnerable spot seems to have been of high antiquity. What of the story of his acquisition of that flaw? A terminus post quem is provided by the part played by the skin of the Nemean lion, on which the story is predicated: Aias is made invulnerable because the hide was impenetrable. Herakles begins to wear the lion-skin in the sixth century, or a little earlier: according to Athenaeus, it is Stesichorus who first presents Herakles ἐν ληστοῦ σχήματι

μόνον περιπορευόμενον ἔλου ἔχουσα καὶ λευτήματι καὶ τόξα (PMG

229); but according to Strabo, εἰτε Πείσανδρος ἢν εἰτε άλλος

tic (Pisander fr. 1 (I) B = EGF F 1). In an epigram for a statue of Pisander, Theocritus notes that it was he who first described Herakles τὸν λευτήμαχου (Ep. 22.2). Bacchylides

describes Herakles' sword bending back from the lion's hide (12.46ff). 19

There is a full account in Theocritus *Idyll* 25 (192ff), including the detail that Herakles used the lion's claws to flay it (272ff). Henrichs has argued that Theocritus' account recalls that of the fifth-century Panyassis. 20 But the verbal echoes are unconvincing; 21 only the location of the lion in Bembina, a place near Nemea, by both poets is at all striking. More convincing are the echoes of another early epic that Henrichs sees in the *Idyll*: Theocritus' description of Herakles' fight with, and then flaying of, the lion recalls the description in the *Meropis* of his fight with, and then Athena's flaying of, the giant Asteros. 22 The easiest explanation is that both accounts follow an earlier description of the fight with the lion. The *Meropis* seems to have been a work of the sixth century. 23 And so the description of the fight which it follows cannot have been of the fifth century: it cannot have been from Panyassis' *Heracleia*, but must have been from Pisander's. 24

---

19 cf J. D. Beazley, review of CVA U.S.A. v. 4, JHS 54 (1934), 89f, here 90, for slim iconographic testimony (but the iconography of the scene is very varied (LIMC 5.1 p.30f)).

20 Zür Meropis 72f.

21 Two fragments from his *Heracleia* are relevant: δέρμα τε θήρεων Βεμβινήταο λέουτος (fr. 4 B = EGF F 1): δέρμα... θηρός (25.175); καὶ Βεμβινήταο πελώρου δέρμα λέουτος (fr. 5 B = EGF F 2): τοῦδε πελώρου (25.195).

22 op. cit. 73-5.


This evidence, along with that cited above, suggests that the mechanics necessary for the story of Aias' iron-proofing were found in Pisander's *Heracleia*, of the late seventh century. We know that Telamon accompanied Herakles to Troy in that poem (fr 11 B = EGF F B): did, then, Herakles stop on the way to enlist Telamon, as he does at I.6.35f, and wrap Aias in the lion-skin? Some evidence that he did not is provided by Σ.Β.ΙΙ.23.821, which notes the story without any mention of the expedition to Troy: κατ' ἑκείνῳ καιροῖς ἔτυχεν Ἡρακλῆς τῇ μήσῳ Σαλαμίνι κατά τινα χρείαν προσπελάσας. Further, one might expect the story to be rather later than the lion-skin. Its working out is not evidenced until the first half of the fifth century. An attractive hypothesis is that the story was worked out by Panyassis. Unfortunately, it seems that he lived just a little too late.

As the alternatives are ruled out, it is tempting to hypothesize that Aias was wrapped in the lion-skin in the *Great Ehoeae*; that this was the account which fr. 250 suggests.

Consideration of Pindar's version reveals a little more about the evolution of the story. Pindar's version is a

25 Test.1 B = EGF T 1; see above, p.41.

26 Würthen, *De Aiacis origine* 12.

27 His dates are carefully estimated as 505/500-455/450, with a preference for the lower alternatives, by V. J. Matthews, *Panyassis of Halikarnassos* (Mnes. Suppl. 33, 1974), 12-19; cf West's review (*CPhil* 71 (1976), 172-4, here 172; he is, however, sceptical about the precision of Matthews' calculations). Matthews thinks the *Heracleia* is a late work, to boot (25f).

28 And so Schwartz emends ἐμβάλλων to ἐμβάλλων (*Ps-Heisioidea* 391f n.6; 566).
rationalization, which does away with the magical business of the hide. But once it is established that the story of Aias wrapped in the lion-skin antedated I.6, it becomes impossible entirely to separate Pindar's version from it. 29 ἀπρήκτου, with γυναί as an accusative of respect, should be metaphorical ("stalwart"; "staunch [of frame]"; "hardy, stout"). 30 But its primary meaning of "unbreakable" too strongly suggests the story of invulnerability to be simply ignored. 31 Typically, to effect a change in a known story, Pindar has selected a word "designed to recall the rejected story"; 32 the old version cannot be entirely ignored. 33

Nonetheless, although the I.6 myth is a more sensible version of the story of Aias' acquisition of his flawed invulnerability, it is not only this. The rationalization does not account for the broadest difference: in I.6, Aias is not yet

29 As, for example, does Jebb: "Herakles merely prays that the lion-skin which he is wearing may be a symbol of the strength which shall be given to Eriboia's son" (Ajax xviii).

30 Fennel ad loc.; Jebb, Ajax xviii; Slater Lexicon s.v.

31 Terzaghi, Unverwundbarkeit 310f.

32 Robertson, Food of Achilles 179; cf e.g. N.3.34 (above, p.101f); N.3.63, N.6.50 (above, p.252); αὐτόν (P.3.27); 0.1.26f, with Köhnken, Time and Event 71 n.27 (see ch.8).

33 Theocritus' Herakles describes how, having stunned the lion, he wrestled with it: οὐχένος ἀνθρώπως παρ' ἐνίον ἥλλοιο (25.264). Might ἀνθρώπως be from the epic source shared by the author of the Heropis and Theocritus? If so, Pindar's use of the same word here is particularly flirtatious.
born; Herakles is praying that Eriboia may bear a son to Telamon. When he sees the eagle, he announces:

"Εσπερνά τοι πατίς, δι' αιτείς, ὦ Τελαμών." (I.6.52)

The rationalization of the application of the lion-skin is quite discrete. Critics might, then, argue that Pindar has invented a good deal here — but no convincing explanation of such innovation has been found. And so one might suggest that Pindar drew at least some of his story of the prayer from another source.

Certainly, late testimony suggests two separate stories.

And we compare Apollodorus’ version:

And prayers and prophecies are typically Pindaric motifs, this does not mean that, where they occur, they are Pindar’s invention (Fehr, Mythen 126f).

34 Terzaghi, Unverwundbarkeit 312 n.1; cf Tzetzes’ account of the story, obviously drawn from I.6: Herakles, being friendly to Telemachus, leaves to Telamón, and then, seeing the eagle, announces: "Herakles, my father, you are praying for me, Telamón.

35 Thummer 2.98f n.1.

36 Although prayers and prophecies are typically Pindaric motifs, this does not mean that, where they occur, they are Pindar’s invention (Fehr, Mythen 126f).

37 Philostratus Her.35.6; Σ. Lyc. Alex. 455; Vürtheim, De Aiacis origine 6.
To Pindar's story, he appears to add the detail that the occasion was Telamon's marriage. If so, this detail reflects the stream of tradition from which Pindar took the story of the prayer for a son. 38

Where was this story preserved for Pindar? It may have featured in Pisander, if the proofing story did not. But we have seen that in the matter of Telamon's adventures with Herakles after they have been to Troy, Pindar does not follow Pisander. 39

In that case, the story of Herakles' fight against giant Meropes seems to have been eclipsed by the story of the full-scale gigantomachy. I have suggested, too, that the myths of Aiakos building a weak spot in the wall of Troy (0.8), and the prophecy that Thetis' son will be stronger than his father (1.8), are both old stories which became eclipsed by more dominant versions. All were preserved only locally, by the Aeginetans, until Pindar used them in epinicians for Aeginetan victors, and so resuscitated them.

That model illustrates the likely development of the myth of I. 6, also. 40 I suggest that the story in which Herakles

---

38 P. von der Mühll suggested γόμον to fill the lacuna at I. 6.36 ("Bemerkungen zu Pindars Nemeen und Isthmien", Mus. Hel. 14 (1957), 127-32, here 130f). But the paraphrast's τῶν πλούτων καὶ τούτην τὴν συμμαχίαν καὶ δὴν suggests καὶ νομ (Schroeder). Further, it is unlikely that Apollodorus used Pindar here (Van der Valk, Bibliotheca 162); and he calls Aias' mother not Eriboia (I. 6.45), but Periboia. (Her name does float (also Meliboia and Phereboia); if there is any rationale to it, Periboia is the Athenian version (also Xen. Kynege.1.9; Paus.1.17.3; 42.2, 4).)

39 Above, p. 166.

40 Jebb also saw its myth as rooted in Aeginetan folklore ("Pindar", JHS 3 (1882), 144-83, here 178).
prayed for a son for Telamon was old, but was eclipsed by the similar (and presumably related) story of Herakles wrapping the infant Aias in his lion-skin - as narrated, perhaps, in the Great Ehoeae. In I.6, Pindar rationalizes that story, and combines it with the story of the prayer for a son, to produce a sensible and authoritative myth.

The narrative in I.6 has been thought unPindaric. In I.8, Pindar used a good deal of epic language to canonize the story which he was presenting. This may reveal what is un-Pindaric about I.6: for it, too, uses epic forms - a greeting type-scene, and an omen type-scene. Hence the unusual, para-tactic style. This narrative style should perhaps be explained as the vehicle necessary for the presentation of the new version, a combination of radically rationalized and little-known folkloric versions of Herakles' visit to Telamon. It is a deliberate bid to canonize material which as yet lacks an authoritative narration.

In I.6, then, twin principles vital to Pindar's mythologizing are to the fore: his version is a rationalization; and it is founded in local mythology. On these principles are the myth's claims to authority based.

41 Kirkwood, Selections 287 (on his explanation of its unique quality, see Nisetich, Victory Songs 67f).
42 See above, p.125.
43 Greeting: Od.3.40-61 (as Dissen noted); cf II.15.84-100 (M. W. Edwards, "Type-scenes and Homeric Hospitality", TAPA 105 (1975), 51-72, here 55, 58f). Omen: cf Od.2.141ff (Edwards op. cit. 56). Schultz also compares χείρας διάκοχος (41) with the Iliadic χείρας ἄπτους (De colore epico 34).
44 cf Nagy, Pindar's Homer 423f, 60f, 437 and passim.
Finally, we note the derivation of Αίας from σιτετος (53). This need not have been part of the traditional version of Herakles praying that Telamon should have a son — for the eagle may simply have been an endorsement sent by Zeus of Herakles' other prayer, that the baby be invulnerable. But the pun is unlikely to have been Pindar's, as it works satisfactorily only with digammas in place: σιτετος / Αίας. Though little known, it is probably traditional. (But note that Pindar compounds the wordplay with σιτετος (52).)

Aias and Hektor

The only Pindaric treatment of an episode from Aias' Iliadic career is a fleeting allusion in Ν.2:

καὶ μὰν ἄ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατών δυνάμεις. ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν ὁ Ἑκτώρ Αἴαντος ἄξιον εἶναι.

(Ν.2.13f)

ἄξιον εἶναι is puzzling. The scholiast glosses ἱσθήτο τῇ πείρᾳ; but it "would rather mean the reverse ("knew by hearing

45 Pease, Cicero, De Divinatione 129f, 290f.

46 Farnell. The position of the digamma in Χαίσθος is guaranteed by Hesychius' σιτετος· σιτετος, Περγαμωτικος. Αίας may be cognate with Mycenean aina (Chantraine s.v. σιτετος, Αίας). Tzetzes was so unimpressed by the equivalence of the two sounds that he introduced a middle term: καὶ γεννηθήναι τοῦ Αἴαντος Περγαμωτικος· Αἴαντος ἡκόλουθος, εἶτα Αἴαντος (Σ.Λυκ. Alex.455).

47 Also only in [Hes.] fr.250, Σ.Λυκ. Alex.455, Philostratus Her.35.6; and Apoll.3.12.7. Although [Hes.] fr.250 does not guarantee the pun appeared in the Great Ehoae, and Tzetzes used I.6., Apollodorus seems not to have been directly influenced by I.6 (above, p.275 n.38).

48 Bowra, Pindar 211f.
Méautis translated it as "obéir" - but his translation shows that this is not enough: ""A Troie, en effet, Hektor a obéi à Aias"; c’est-à-dire dut reconnaître son inferiorité, fut vaincu par lui."2 On the same lines, Instone gives "had to submit to"; but his parallels do not show that ἀκούω can mean this.3 ἀκούω may mean "submit to someone" in the sense of obeying his rule or orders - but that is not what is needed here.4 Nor is there anything in the text which suggests Hurst’s version of, in in effect, "was taught a lesson by".5

If ἄκουσεν is right, then the best interpretation of it is that given by Monro.6 Hektor heard Aias just before their duel in II.7, when he spoke to him ἀπειλήσας (II.7.225-32). But the passage specifically referred to here occurs a little earlier, when Aias, chosen by lot to fight Hektor, closes his address to the other Achaeans:

"οὐ γὰρ τίς με βίη γε ἐκὼν ἀκούσα δίηται, ὄλλος τι ἱδρείη. ἔπει οὖθ' ἐμὲ νήθά γ' οὕτως ἔλπωμαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε." (II.7.197-9)

---

1 Σ.Ν.2.22a; Bury ad loc. Farnell makes this a virtue: "heard tell of Aias" (Works 2.253); but Hektor did not hear about Aias, but met him in battle: there is no sign of ironic understatement here.


4 See Kannicht on Eur. Helen 733.

5 Aspects du Temps 192 n.27.

Monro suggests that Pindar has simply made a mistake, in attributing this vaunt to Aias' exchange with Hektor, a few lines later, and translates "Salamis was ever the nurse of heroes: such was the boast of Aias to Hektor."

This neatly contrasts with what follows, for by implication, the boast is made again, on the occasion of the present victory: it is through Pindar's celebration, which includes the vaunt, that the victor's prowess in the pancration makes him greater.

---

7 cf his loose quotation of Il.15.207 at P.4.277f. The archaic φῶτο (13) may bestow a Homeric patina.

8 Monro, ibid.

9 The victor was in fact an Athenian (16); but must have had some connexion with Salamis - perhaps a member of the family Salaminii (Instone, op. cit. 115).
Apart from the episode from his infancy described in 1.6, and his appearance in N.2, Aias' career features in the epinicians only in connexion with his death. The principal account is at N.8.23ff; the incident also occurs at N.7.23ff and I.3/4.53ff. As with Achilles' fight against Hektor, it may be the fact that Aias' greatest exploit, his lone stand against the rampaging Trojans, was definitively narrated in the *Iliad*, rather than in another cyclic poem, which precluded its narration in an epinician.  

A convenient starting place is the ὐπλών κρίσις itself. It was narrated in both the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad*. Σ.Αρ. Εq.1056 gives the version of the latter:

τὸν Ἅπετορα δὲ οὐμομολούσαί τοῖς Ἑλλησ πέμψα
τιμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τὰ τείχη τῶν Τρῶων, ὀτακοῦν-
στήνοντας περὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας τῶν προφερομένων
ηρῶν. τοὺς δὲ πευφέντας ἀκοῦσα παρθένων
διαφερομένων πρὸς ἀλλήλας, ὥσ τὴν μὲν λέγειν ὡς ὁ
Αἰας πολὺ κρείττων ἔστι τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, διερχομένη
οὕτως:

Αἰας μὲν γὰρ ξειρε καὶ ἑστάρε ἡμῖντως
ὁ υἱὸς Πηλείδην οὐδ' ἠθελε δὴς Ὀδυσσέως
τὴν δ' ἐτέραν ἀντεπειν Ἀθηνᾶς προοίμια
πῶς ἐπεφυσήσης; πῶς οὖ κατὰ κόσμον ἐξειπες;

---

*Σημείωσα τοις τετίμαχες δι' ἀνθρώπων, δι' αὐτοῦ
πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἄρεταν κατὰ μᾶθον ἔφρασεν
τεσσαράς ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.*

(I.3/4.55-7)

(But this need not refer only to the *Iliad*; see above, p.225ff on Pindar's notion of "Homer").
The account of the Odyssey (11.543-60) tells us a little more. It gives us the fact of the competition, that Odysseus won, that Thetis set the prize, and that παίδες Τρώων δίκαιον καὶ Πάλλας Ἀθηνῆ (547). On this line, the scholiast comments: ἀντὶ τοῦ Τρώων, ὡς "ὑπὲρ Ἀχαίων" καὶ "δυνάμει τῇ παῖδες" (II.6.127). οἱ φονευθέντες ὑπὸ Ὀδυσσέως ὄντα Αἴας τὸ πτώμα Ἀχιλλέως ἔβάσταξεν. Δειγματίζει Ἀρίσταρχος: ἡ δὲ ἱστορία ἐκ τῶν Κυκλοείων.

The line sits well enough in context here; if there was a real reason for Aristarchus’ athetization of it, it must be sought in the other epics.

Severyns suggests that he marked it because he thought it was an allusion to the romantic story of the Little Iliad. The reasoning is this. The scholiast believed that παίδες Τρώων had to be masculine. His explanation of who these Trojans were preempts the objection that the Trojans who judged the matter in the Little Iliad—the ones who were overheard on

---

2 καὶ χε γυμνὴ κτλ was inserted by Hermann, plainly correctly; without it there is no connexion with the passage from Knights. We should not be disturbed by its tone; the same phrase is quoted by Plutarch (De Alex.M.Fortuna aut virtute 2.5) in a serious context, to describe the accession to the throne of the idiot Aridaios. In any case, the whole episode is "d’une manière aussi compliqué et aussi romanesque" (Severyns, CE 331); the product of the need to innovate the Aethiopis account, the gulf between Homer and the Cycle (CE 330; cf Griffin, Uniqueness passim) and, perhaps, the tone of the Little Iliad in particular (Jebb Ajax xvi).

3 But not particularly happily, pace Jebb, Ajax xii. It may naturally follow ἐδηματ ὑπὲρ πόλυνα μήτηρ (546), but it is flaccid after διωξόμενος in 545; and is suspiciously precise.

4 CE 329ff; cf 95-98.
the wall were women. He shows how Trojan men might also have
been said to have been judges. So he must have thought that
the line referred to the *Little Iliad* — perhaps because Athena
had no part in the *Aethiopis* account. His comment confirms
what *II. Parv.* fr. 2 (I) $B = EGF F 2^A$ suggests: the award of
the armour was in that poem judged on the criterion of who
killed more people during the recovery of Achilles' body.

On this model, the version of the *Aethiopis* might be given
by another scholium on the same line:

> φυλαττόμενος δ’ Ἀχαϊμένῳ τὸ δόξαι θατέρῳ
> χαρίσσαθαι τῶν περὶ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως ὀπλῶν
> ἀμφιβολοῦσι, αἰχμαλώτους τῶν Τρῶν ἄγαμῶν
> ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ὅποτέρου τῶν ἴδια ἱλλου ἐλυπήθησαν.
> εἰπόντων δὲ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, ὅπλαθι
eκείνου εἰναι τὸν ἄριστον κρίματες τὸν πλείστο
> λυπήματα τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ἐδωκεν εὐθὺς τῷ Ὀδυσσέᾳ
tὰ ὀπλὰ.

(Σ.ΗΟΥ.Οδ.11.547)$^5$

I think it likely that Σ.ΗΟΥ.Οδ.11.547 does refer to the
*Little Iliad*, rather than to the *Aethiopis*. But what is
important for the present purpose is that, whichever of the two

$^5$ Severyns, *CE* 330ff; Davies, *Epic Cycle* 60.

$^6$ ἡ δὲ ἱστορία ἐκ τῶν Κυκλικῶν (Σ.ΗΟΥ.Οδ.11.547), of course,
accommodates a reference to either. The scholiast might have
meant the *Aethiopis* (so Bernabe). One could argue this by
noting that the role of the Trojans does not seem to be that
specified in *II. Parv.* fr. 2 (I) $B = EGF F 2^A$; note Τρώας, and
not Τρῳᾶδες, as in the Aristophanic scholium (λέγεται ἀπὸ τῶν
Τρῳάδων κρινομαχῶν κτλ). And so one might reconstruct the
*Aethiopis* version thus: Odysseus won the armour because of the
number of Trojans he killed during the recovery of Achilles' armour.
On this model, Athena had a hand in the decision in the
*Aethiopis* as well as the *Little Iliad*. I can think of none
better than that the suggestion of the criterion for the award
was hers. She might have suggested it to Odysseus (appearing
to him alone; cf *II.1.197ff*; 2.166ff) or to the Achaeans
(appearing in the guise of another; cf *II.4.92ff*).
epics it does describe, it gives that Achilles' armour was awarded on what was, effectively, a body-count after the recovery of his corpse. This is a crucial detail, which must, I think, have been common to both epics, even if both the fragments I have been discussing are from the *Little Iliad*. The innovation of the later *Little Iliad* over the earlier *Aethiopis* lay in the romantic circumstance of its adjudication. But the count was the standard explanation of the failure of Aias, the best of the Achaeans after Achilles, to inherit his armour.

This brings us neatly to the fight over Achilles' corpse - an ἵμαρτα μάχη, according to Proclus (*Chrest.* 193). The *Epitome* of Apollodorus describes this action:


Note τὸν πλεῖστον λυπώματα τούς ἐκθροῦς in Σ. H.O.V. Od. 11.547, which easily accommodates the count. Quintus Smyrnaeus uses the version in which Trojan prisoners decide the matter; and he specifies that they were taken during the fight over Achilles' body (5.161), and are to decide who did most to recover it (159ff). Odysseus answers Aias' claims: μὴν δέ σει ἄμφθ 'Ἀχιλῆς πολὺ πλέονας κτάμων ἄνδρας / δυσμενέων (285f); and Aias answers that they all ran from him (294ff). Cf 183ff; 218ff.

8 cf Davies, *Epic Cycle* 64.

9 cf Most, *Measures* 152ff: note that his explanation of the various solutions to this contradiction does not confront the problem.

10 Aias is always to the forefront of this scene (*LIMC* 1.1.187ff (nos. 866-884)); see also Severyns, *CE* 321f, on no. 850 (a sixth century amphora showing Aias killing Glaukos) which, he suggests, like Apollodorus, reflects the *Aethiopis*. 
Achilles' corpse was, in the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad*, hefted by Aias, while Odysseus covered the retreat:  

Aristarchus was severely critical of this detail:

---

11 And in most of the iconography - most famously on the handle of the François Vase - it is Aias who is shown carrying body and armour (*LIMC* 1.1.187-90 (866-888)).

12 What of P.Oxy.2510? It is a fragment of epic, and describes Odysseus volunteering to carry the corpse:

And it seems that Odysseus does indeed lift it: *"Οδυσσεύς οδηγείς Τελαιώνει, κοιρανε λαίμη, μάχη καὶ νότοισι νέων αδικωμένη, Ιονία κατὰ φρένα με. Ιονία Ιπ. [έως έγώ νεότοισι φέρω, σοί δὲ ν. Έ[ει.]

(II. Parv. fr. dub. 32.10-13 B)
It is Aias (with the other Aias) who fights off the Trojans while Menelaos and Meriones pull Patroklos' corpse out of the fighting (II.17.716ff). As the Aristophanic scholium has it:

λέγεται δὲ εἰς οὖ τὸ τοῦ Αἰαντος ἔργον ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως

(II. Parv. fr. 2 (I) B = EGF F 2^B (II)).

But it seems more likely that this surprising division of roles was not the upshot of incompetence, but a deliberate decision by the author of the Aethiopis. We have seen that this point is given a surprising amount of weight in Proclus' epitome, suggesting that it is in some way significant.

And we have already seen the most likely explanation: the odd choice of role for each hero in the recovery of the body is governed by the subsequent story of the award of the arms, in which the criterion is going to be the work done by each hero in the recovery of Achilles' body. Odysseus wins the armour because of the Trojans he killed while Aias was carrying it (Aeth. fr. 3 (I) B = EGF II. Parv. F 2^B).

---


14 Hence my confidence that the same criterion was shared by both Aethiopis and Little Iliad.

15 Severyns CE 321; Kullmann Quellen 54, 80, 82f. Compare Kakridis op. cit. 67, whose explanation is simply that the incident as narrated does Odysseus more honour, and this neatly connects with his increasing importance through the latter stages of the Cycle.
In the context of a competition for the armour, this mark for the adjudication is surprising; but it is simply the formal expression of the recovery of the armour guaranteeing its possession: whoever does most to recover the armour, should keep it. At some stage in the evolution of the tradition, the obvious roles for Odysseus and Aias must have been switched, and this straightforward procedure hijacked to provide Aias with a motive for suicide in the context of an award of the arms.16

Now, if the Epitome reflects the Aethiopis, Aias recovers the armour first (presumably wresting it from Paris; he would not strip it himself), and sends it back to the ships. He stays and returns with the body. But although he has retrieved the armour, Thetis arrives and makes it a prize.17 οπερηθείς (N.8.27) may carry a good deal of weight beyond the claim that Aias should have won the armour.18 It must have been physically removed, at some stage, from his possession.

Now we can see the full weight of the criterion for the judgement for the award of Achilles' arms. The accounts of the epics are deliberately constructed to give a result which observes the rules of the competition, but which is at the same time iniquitous. How could Aias have killed as many as

16 Now we see why P.Oxy.2510, even if it is early, is not too disturbing: it simply preserves an expression of this version whose prior existence is implied by the more sophisticated version of the Aethiopis and Little Iliad.

17 Od.11.546; Ep.5.6. This scene might be that figured on a fourth century Etruscan vase (LIMC 1.1.324f (70)), which appears to show Thetis adjusting a strap on Aias' breast-plate - an unknown scene. She might in fact be removing it.

18 de Feo, Aiace 124 n.17.
Odysseus? He was carrying Achilles' body. He did not suicide over an unjust decision; the contest itself was unjust.\(^\text{19}\)

Odysseus' explanation in the Odyssey accords neatly.\(^\text{20}\)

This is the traditional context in which Pindar's account in N.8 should be set:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xrono\'ewn } & \delta' \text{ Aias } \text{ stere\'heis } \deltai\lambda\nuw \phi\nu\nuw \pi\lambda\lambda\iota\nu\varepsiloni. \\
\text{h} & \mu\nu \text{ an\'ymoi} \gamma\varepsilon \text{ d\'eai} \nu\nu \text{ d} \text{erum\'i} \text{ xro} \iota
\\
\text{elke a} \deltai\xv\dot{\varepsilon} \text{ pelemu\dota} \nu\nu\nu
\\
\text{up' } \text{ ale\xi} \text{m} \text{br} \text{ot} \text{w} \\
\text{l} \text{\'y} \text{ch} \text{. t} \text{a } \mu\nu \text{ } \dot{\alpha} \text{mf' } \text{Achi} \text{le} \text{i} \text{ neoxtou} \nu \text{.}
\\
\text{\'all} \text{w } \nu \text{ te } \mu\chi\text{ke} \nuw \nu \text{ en } \text{ polu} \text{te\dota} \nu \nu \nu
\\
\text{\'am} \text{e} \text{rai} \nu.
\end{align*}
\]

(N.8.27-32)

Köhnen comments that Pindar's account is "merkwürdig unscharf."\(^\text{21}\) One problem is trying to assess the force of \(\hat{\eta} \mu\nu \ldots \gamma\varepsilon\). It might introduce a strong and confident

\(\text{Nisetich has the wrong end of the stick when he complains that, in the Aethiopis and the Little Iliad the contest boils down "to the question of their relative effectiveness. Heroic worth scarcely enters into the picture. Equally significant, Ajax in both versions appears as a victim of divine enmity" (Pindar and Homer 17). Rather, the contest in both epics boils down to their effectiveness on one particular occasion, so that it is an iniquitous contest which Odysseus can win. Carey, Nemean 8 31, also speaks of Odysseus' traditional unfair advantage - that Athena was a judge in the Odyssey account, and that she suggested the tart reply in the Little Iliad (καὶ ἰε ναμὴ φέροι ἁχίδος ἑπεὶ κεν ἀνήρ ἀναθέτη). Again, this is wide of the mark.}\)

\(\text{With or without 547. Note 544: Aias' shade is κεχολωμένη πώς. But Odysseus' words must be treated with great caution; cf Od.13.291ff; Köhnen, Funktion 56f.}\)

\(\text{"Pindar sagt nicht ausdrücklich"; only in context of the next lines does 28f become clear. He accepts the allusion to the Aethiopis, and its implications (Funktion 29f). He also (29 n.35) compares 28-30 to II.2.543f, the description of αἰγματικοί μεμάζοντες δρεχθήσθων μελημούν θώρηκας ῥήζειν δην ὁμφί στηθεσθο.}\)
assertion; 22 be adversative; 23 or ironic. 24 We cannot establish the tone.

26f describes the award of the arms to Odysseus, and the upshot. 25 

στερηθεὶς (27) certainly indicates that Aias should have won the armour. 

We expect a description of how he lost it. ἄνυμοι (28) must allude to the precise criterion of the judgement: who killed the most Trojans during the recovery of Achilles’ body. The interpretation of πελεμιζόμενοι follows: it suggests the defensive action of the withdrawal. 26 So far, it seems that Pindar is simply explaining why Odysseus won the armour: because the wounds each inflicted during the withdrawal were unequal; and as this was the criterion for the judgement, Odysseus (who had dealt more) won.

But now Pindar specifies the fight Ἀχιλέως νικητῶν (30). He cannot go against the account in the Aethiopis and

22 Denniston GP 350; e.g. P.4.40.
23 cf II.7.393: Paris will not return Helen; ἂ μὴν Τρώως Κάλουσαι; Plato Philb. 18d.
24 cf Plato Euthyd. 276e: τὴν Ζεὺς, ἔφη θυγ, ἂ μὴν καὶ τὸ πρῶτον γε καλὸν ἂ μὴν ἔφη τὸ ἐρώτημα; Rep.432d.
25 Köhnken, Funktion 26; it also suggests the earlier incident, when Thetis put the armour Aias had retrieved up to be a prize.
26 cf II.4.535; 16.108. The scholium ad loc. is instructive: Aristarchus, unlike the other scholiast, captured the fact that it refers to defensive fighting:
πελεμιζόμενοι δὲ ἀντι τοῦ πελεμίζοντες ἐνεργητικῶς καὶ διακυμαίνοντες. ὃ δὲ Ἄριστορχος οὕτως: άνυμοι πλήματα τοῖς πολεμίοις ὡς τε ὅθιος καὶ Αῖας ὑπὸ ἀλεξιμβρότου λόγχης κινούμενοι.

(Σ.Ν.Θ.48)

See Bury on 28.
claim that Odysseus carried the body, or deny that Aias did.27 He speaks explicitly only of the fight before they took the body out - the fight in which Aias distinguished himself by killing Glaukos (Apoll. Ep.5.4), and, presumably, retrieved Achilles' armour from Paris. Thereby focussing on Aias' aristeia, he casts doubt on the body count that favoured Odysseus. Then, he subverts it entirely, by broadening the focus so that it takes in the whole war (31f). Now we must return to reinterpret ἄνωμος; it no longer refers to the more wounds that Odysseus inflicted during the recovery of the body, but the more wounds that Aias inflicted during the fight over the body, and the whole war.28 Hence the opacity of η ἐμ'... γε: it accommodates both interpretations.29

I suggest, then, that this passage in N.8 must be interpreted in the light of the tradition, as represented by the Aethiopis. It challenges the award of the arms to Odysseus.

27 As Nisetich would like to argue, and implies: "The most explicit point of difference [between the accounts of the cyclics and of Pindar]...may be the most important: in the Little Iliad, as in the Aethiopis, Aias carries the body of Achilles off the field of battle while Odysseus guards the retreat" (Pindar and Homer 18); this is later modified to the less exciting "Ajax does not put down his spear to carry the body of Achilles; he keeps it in hand, over Achilles' body as on other occasions" (20, my italics). Farnell equivocates by speaking of the "chief part" in the recovery: "Pindar deliberately falsifies the story for his own purposes" (Works 2.307).

28 The locus classicus for a phrase in Pindar demanding reinterpretation in the light of what follows is P.3.27, where Apollo's σκότος finally turns out not to be the raven that we are at first led to believe. Also 0.1.26ff. See below, ch.8.

29 cf the difficulty over ἐπει... μᾶς ἂν (0.9.29f): one cannot be sure whether it means "how else..." or "how could have..." (Molyneux, Herakles 302f); see below, p.430.
within that tradition, by suggesting the criterion was unfair. Others, however, have seen a departure from the *Aethiopis* here: according to them, Pindar's Aias is judged not by the Trojans (as he is in the *Odyssey* and the cyclic poems), but by the Greeks, to whom Odysseus lies to win the prize.30

The most appealing argument for Pindar's innovation of the *Aethiopis* account is N.8.26: κρυφίαςι γὰρ ἐν τἀφοις Ὀδυσσῆι Δαυσίοι θεράπευον. The most natural reading of this suggests that it was the allies, and not Trojans, who decided the matter.31 And they seem to have no role in the *Aethiopis* or the *Little Iliad.*32 They do, of course, in Sophocles' Ajax, in which the award is settled by their majority vote.33 All iconographic evidence of this time shows them voting.34

Further, the broader context of N.8 suggests deceptive speech. 26-32 is a clarification of the statement: μέγιστον θ' αἰόλῳ ψεύδει γέρας ἀυτόται (25). After the brief *aristeia,* Pindar comments:

30 Carey *Nemean* 8 31; de Feo, *Aiace* 124 n.16; Nisetich *Pindar and Homer* 18-22.

31 καὶ κρυφάντων τῶν Τρώων, ὡς δὲ τινες τῶν συμμάχων Ὀδυσσέως προφίνεται (Apoll. Ep.5.6).

32 Jebb, *Ajax* xv; Nisetich, *Pindar and Homer* 18ff; 22: "Pindar's treatment of the tragedy of Ajax in N.8 is a profound reworking of the notion, first put forth in the *Aethiopis,* that Ajax was judged by someone other than his own comrades."

33 Whether it was fair or not (1243, 449).

34 *LIMC* 1.1.326f (81-86).
This, surely, suggests that Aias and Odysseus were both arguing their claims to the armour, and that Odysseus’ claim was fraudulent.

But these observations do not compel us to conclude that Pindar has innovated. Rather, they help to fill out the sketchy outline of the Aethiopis version.

The suggestion that the award be made on the basis of the number of Trojans killed during the recovery of Achilles’ body must have been made in the course of an argument about who should have it. Once Odysseus triumphantly trumps Aias’ tally with his own, the Achaeans vote to give him the armour.

35 *ψεύδος* can be “le mensonge, au plan éthique et désignant toute sorte de fourberie, astuce, ruse. L’erreur, inconsciente, liée à ἀπάτη, εἴδωλον et due à la faiblesse et l’ignorance de l’esprit humain. La fiction – dans le domaine artistique, poétique en premier lieu (μυθος – θλάδεοι)” (Komornicka, AAAGIA 236); cf Verdenius, Comm. 2.19. Komornicka compares αἴδολος with μεταμόλυνος, ποικίλος and πυκνός (Etude sur Pindare et la Lyrique Archaique Grecque. Termes désignant le vrai et le faux (Lodz, 1979), 262). *ψεύδος* combines the notions of the perversion of truth and persuasion (Miller, Phthonos 116f, citing 0.7.65; P.9.43; N.5.31; Köhnken, Melichos Orga 91 n.53, has “falschen Aussage” and malevolence in the word here – the crux is that it is “falschen” and not “irrigen”). Like αἴδολος, αἴδωλον also suggests not a crude lie, but slippery argument.

36 Agamemnon wants ἀπεργάζοντας τῶν περὶ τῶν Ἀχιλλέως ὄψεως ἀμφισβητοῦντων (Σ.ΗΟΥ.Οδ.11.857). The violence of this argument is brought out in the iconography of the time; the common reverse for the judgement scene is Aias and Odysseus in a fierce quarrel: swords (Aias’ the first) are drawn (LIMC 1.1.325f (71-78)).

37 Carey, Nemean 8 31 rightly insists that χρωματίας ἐν ψάφοις (N.B.26) does not mean the voting was fixed (as is suggested by de Feo, Aiace 125 n.21; cf Soph. Ajax 1135f); only that the ways of envy are secret (Köhnken, Funktion 27 n.29, citing e.g.
And we still need the emphasis on false speech on this model, also. First, Odysseus must exaggerate his claim so as to equal Aias', and thus provoke the impasse which the appeal to the body count solves. Then, it may well be Odysseus himself (perhaps at Athena's prompting) who suggests that they consider the body count. 38

That Odysseus' falsehoods were part of the traditional version is also suggested by the more allusive treatments in N.7 and I.3/4.

In I.3/4, Aias is tripped by the τέχνα of a lesser man. 39

μουσαν ἔχει / παίδεσάιν Ἔλλανων (54): the Greeks found fault with him when they should not have done so; cf N.8.39. 40 But Homer has honoured him aright (55ff).

In N.7 we move smoothly from the exaggeration — not falsification: πλεόν' of Odysseus' adventures to the judgement. 41 Cleverness κλέπτει παράγοια; cf στερηθείς

0.1.47). (I would put more emphasis on the complex of recognition and obscurity.) That there is no iconographic evidence of secret voting is the product of the demands of representational art, and not a divergence of tradition (Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 77ff n.9).

38 But in the Little Iliad, it is Nestor's idea that they eaves-drop near the walls of Troy (Il. Parv. fr. 2 (I) B = EGF F 2 A).

39 Köhnken 107 n.85 on the text here; 109 n.94 on the echo of the language of the Iliadic (23.708ff) wrestling match between Aias and Odysseus (cf Σ.1.4.58c, d); Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 112 n.18.

40 There is no appeal to grammar which can rule out either this meaning or the alternative — that Aias has good reason to rebuke the Greeks (cf Thummer 2.72f). The only appeal is to context; both function happily; and so both must be considered. R. A. McNeal, "Structure and Metaphor in Pindar's Fourth Isthmian", GUCC 28 (1978), 135-56, here 151 n.24.

41 On the move from Homer to Odysseus, see above, p.219. 23f is the unfocussed cusp between them, in which the οὐφλα is both
It was the blindness of the ὀμιλὸς ἄνδρῶν, the failure to see the truth, that drove Aias to suicide. Apart from Achilles, he was the best (27) — and so Achilles' armour should have been his.

The allusiveness of these two treatments suggest that they look towards the traditional account; and they harmonize perfectly happily with the model I have outlined above.

Further, we note that, once again, in a case in which Pindar presents accounts of the same episode in different odes, his accounts do not discord with each other. The story of Aias' death is in fact paradigmatic of how Pindar achieves various purposes with mythical material by changing his selection of detail and emphasis, and not by innovating. 43

At the core of the story of Aias' death lies the Achaeans' failure to recognize and honour Aias' true worth. In Η.8 Pindar presents this as the result of ἐθνος, and turns it to be a contrast with encomium, at the heart of which is the correct appreciation of the laudandus' worth; 44 in Ι.3/4 it begins as a demonstration of the unpredictability of fortune,
and then contrasts with Aias’ celebration in epic, which compensates; and in N.7 it prepares us for the myth of Neoptolemos, whose true worth, Pindar is going to argue, has been thoroughly obscured. In each case, the poet sets the record straight: Homer in I.3/4, and Pindar in the Nemeans. The message to the patron of epinician is clear: kleos depends on poetry:

"Ομηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι’ ἄνθρωπων, δις αὐτοῖς πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ βάβδου ἐφρασεν θεοπείαν ἐπέων λοιπῶς ἄθροειν. τοῦτο γὰρ ἄθανατον φωνήν ἔρειε, εἰ τις εἰς ἐπὶ τινα καὶ πάγ-καρπον ἔπρεπεν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ πόντου βέβακεν ἐργασίας ἀκτίς κοιλῶν δοσιστος αἰεί.

(I.3/4.55-60) ⁴⁷

Aias’ suicide was, again, treated in both the Aethiopis and the Little Iliad. Arguing that the Little Iliad tends to innovate upon the earlier poem, and that it reveals, in

⁴⁵ Köhnken, Funktion 110-14; C. Segal, "Myth, Cult and Memory in Pindar’s Third and Fourth Isthmian Odes", Ramus 10 (1981), 69-86. Although some of his interpretation is fanciful, much cannot be denied; he is right on the contrast of ἀράμεια (I.3/4.49) and ἐς ἐν νυκτὶ (53bf) with the beam of Homeric celebration (60) (op. cit. 75); Silk, Interaction 116-f.

⁴⁶ See below, p.371.

⁴⁷ Contrast Aias’ lack of kleos amongst the Greeks in N.8: λάθα (24) (Carey is right to see both Dissen’s contemnitur, causa cadit, and oblivion here (Nemean 8 31)); ἄχλωσον (but also a glance at Aias’ sublime silence in the underworld (D. J. Bradshaw, "The Ajax Myth and the Polis: Old Values and New". in D. C. Pozzi and J. M. Wickersham (eds.), Myth and the Polis (Cornell U.P., 1991), 99-125, here 104); λαμπρῶν (cf the light-dark imagery in I.3/4). Cf N.7.11ff, 31f, 49f, 61-3 and passim.

⁴⁸ Aethiopis T.8 B = EGF T 3; fr.5 B = EGF F 1; Iliupersis fr. 4.5ff B = EGF F 1.5ff; Little Iliad fr. 3 B = EGF F 3; Chrest.209f.
general, a penchant for the bizarre, critics have seen Aias' madness and his attack on the Achaeans' booty as part of its account. In the simpler version of the Aethiopis, the implication is, Aias suicides "fou de douleur et d'humiliation".

There are three difficulties with this reconstruction. First is the mention in Aethiopis T 8 (II) B = EGF T 3 (i) of Aias μαυλίωδης, which suggests that Aias was mad in that poem also. This is tantalizing evidence. It is the caption for a picture of Aias before his suicide, hiding his head in his hands, near a dead ram. The value of the table as evidence is ambivalent; certainly some of its scenes of the Iliad seem to have been inspired by epitomes or other pictorial representations, rather than the poem. It may simply be a careless caption, reflecting not, as it claims, the action of the Aethiopis, but the dominant tradition. Like the Chrestomathy, the table smooths over the overlap between

49 Jebb, Ajax xiv, xvii; Severyns, CE 325-31; Kamerbeek, Ajax 3 (who does, however, concede that the argument is unevidenced).

50 Severyns, CE 331.

51 This seems to be either ignored or glossed over. Kamerbeek, Ajax 2 mentions it without investigating the implications; Vian, Recherches 40 n.4, interjects it as an objection to Severyns' reconstruction, but without pursuing the matter.

52 This detail clinches what would otherwise be a speculative supplement (see the drawing at I.G. XIV.1284). It need not mean that he was mad when he killed himself. Touchefeu (LIMC 1.1.335f) discusses the conflicting pictorial evidence for Aias killing himself when mad or sane. But dishevelled hair is no knock-down argument for insanity; nor is the representation of two features in one picture a guarantee that they are simultaneous.

53 Sadurska, Tables 27, 34; Horsfall, Stesichorus.
Aethiopis and Little Iliad; this detail may easily have been taken from the latter. At best, then, this may be taken as corroboration of other evidence only.

Secondly, the evidence of Iliupersis fr. 4 B = EGF F 1. Arctinus, ἔν Ἰλίου παρόδου, described Podaleirios' abilities: τῇ δ' ἀκριβείᾳ πάντ' ἂρ' ἐνι στήθους ἐπήκεν δοκοῦντα τῷ γνώμαι καὶ ἀναλείπῃ ἡμεροθαλ'. Ὁς βα καὶ Αἰαντος πρῶτος μάθε χωμένοιο ἐμμετά τ' ἀστράπτοντα βαρυνόμενον τ' νόημα.

(Iliupersis fr. 4.5-8 B = EGF F 1.5-8) This seems to refer to a fuller account, presumably in the Aethiopis. Jebb sees the contrast as between what Podaleirios could diagnose and what the others realized in the light of Aias' suicide; but this does not sit particularly happily with the Greek. His reasoning, that there is no time for the others to see Aias' mood before he dies, is at fault; there must be — in his own words — "the few hours of darkness between his defeat and death".54

But Jebb is right, inasmuch as Aias, if he really is mad with grief, ought to go off and kill himself immediately. Van Hooff catalogues seventeen examples of suicides through furor — "acute frenzy in consequence of punishment by the gods or as a reaction to severe grief"; and in every one of them, the victim destroys him or herself straightaway.55 Such an instant

54 Ajax xiv; he rules out (n.2) the alternative on the grounds that "he was represented as dying almost immediately after the award" (so too Robert, Heldensage 1200); only supported, I think, by Eust. ad Od. 11.543ff (498.51): καί εὐθὺς ὅδε ὁμοους μὲν ἔλαβε τὰ δίκαια, Ἀιας δὲ ἀναλείπῃ ἐξ' ὕπνων; and counter to the reliable Aethiopis fr. 5 B = EGF F 1.

55 A. J. L. van Hooff, From autothanasia to Suicide: Self killing in Classical Antiquity (London, 1990), 99; Appendix A, with 96-99. (The only possible exception is that found at Livy
reaction would also seem to accord with the behaviour of characters in the Iliad. No need for a doctor to interpret Achilles' mood on the death of Patroclus:

τοῦ δ' ἀχλεός κεφέλη ἔξωλυψε μέλαινα· ἀμφότεροι δὲ χεροῖν ἔλων κόνιν αἰθάλεοισιν χεύοτο καὶ κεφαλῆς, χαρίειν δ' ἦσομεν πρόσωπον· νεκταρέω δὲ κτώμι μέλαιν' ἀμφίζων τέφρῃ.

(II.19.22-25)

Equally, when Andromache, fearing the worst for Hektor, rushes to the walls of Troy μακρὰι τοῖ (II.22.460), she does so instantly; and if anything, thereafter becomes calmer.57

It seems to me that we must either posit for Aias a psychology sophisticated enough to accommodate a slow crescendo towards furor58 - but this seems inappropriate to early epic; or accept that the first signs which Podaleirios sees in the Aethiopis (Iliupersis fr.4 B = EGF F 1) are not the first signs of a furor which drives the hero to suicide.

Finally, we consider Aias' burial. In the Little Iliad, he receives special treatment:

42.28.10-12 - not in any case a good example of furor.) Note that the methods of suicide through furor reflect its immediacy (Appendix B.8).

56 But the comparative evidence of Homer does not reliably illuminate the cycle in this matter: B. Simon, Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece (Ithaca and London, 1978), 67f; Davies, Epic Cycle 65.

57 M. I. Davies, "The Suicide of Ajax: a bronze Etruscan Statuette from the Käppeli Collection", A.Kunst 14 (1971), 148-57, here 149 n.9, compares her behaviour to Aias'.

58 So Simon, op. cit. 231 (Aias as melancholic); cf Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 17.
His unusual burial is usually ascribed to the fact that he committed suicide. But suicide is not a sin, in Homer at least, and there is no evidence that the suicide's body entailed special treatment until the fourth century. And why does II. Pars. fr. 3 describe the special burial as διὰ τὴν οργήν τοῦ βασιλέως? It seems that it was the upshot of the treacherous attack on the cattle. Had Aias simply suicided in grief, this treatment becomes inappropriate. We might expect, then, if in the Aethiopis Aias killed himself in grief, and only expressed his feelings in this way, that in that poem he was cremated in the usual fashion, and his remains taken home. But there is no record of his burial anywhere other than in Rhoeteum.

These three points must awake us to the possibility of a more convincing reconstruction of the action of the Aethiopis.

---

59 cf Apoll. Ep.5.7: Αγαμήμονω δὲ κυλήσε τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ καθισει, καὶ μόνος οὐτος τῶν ἐν Ἰλιῷ ἀποδιανότων ἐν αορῇ κεῖται. δὲ δὲ τάφος ἐστιν ἐν 'Ροιτεῖο.

Σ.(Ar)ABD.II.4.199 confirms the uniqueness of Aias’ treatment.

60 Philostratus Her.35.14-15; Rohde, Psyche 187f n.33; Frazer, Apollodorus 2.219ff; Davies, Epic Cycle 65.


62 Van Hoof, op. cit. 162f (note also 67; cf Parker, Miasma 42).

63 Farnell, GHC 306.
What seems to have been lost sight of is Aias' anger. The criterion of the judgement was established to resolve the quarrel between Aias and Odysseus (ἡμερεσίβητοντων, Σ.ΗΔV.Οd.11.547). Pictorial representations give the violence of the debate: swords - primarily Aias' - are drawn. Aias and Odysseus are held back by others. Podaleirios notices Αίαντος χωμένου / διματά τι αστράπτοντα βαρύσφεινον τε νόημα (Iliupersis fr. 4.7f B = EGF F 1.f). Odysseus describes Aias' soul as κεχολωμένη είνεχα νίκης (Od.11.544). Pindar describes him as ὑπάλω χολωθείς (N.7.26).

There is an excellent Iliadic parallel which demonstrates what may have happened in the debate. Achilles, suspecting that he is to be deprived of his prize, eyes Agamemnon ἑπόδρα (II.1.148); told that he will be, he is not sad, but furious: Πηλείων δ’ εὖχας γένετ’, εὖ δέ οἶ διὸ τοῦτο στήθεσαν λασίοιο διάνδικα μεμηρίζενεν. Ἦ δ’ αὑτοῖς δοξαγοιν δεῦρο εὐρυσφεινος παρὰ μηροῦ τοὺς μὲν αναστήσανεν, ὡ δ’ οὕτω παραδέχετο ἐναρίζοι, ἰέρ χόλον παύσασεν ἐρημώσεις τε ὅμων. (II.1.188-92)

He is held back by Athena, and retires to his tent in sorrow at his dishonour (1.349-56). The situation is very close to Aias'. He has retrieved the armour, only for it to be made a prize for valour. Tempers rise; Podaleirios realizes the intensity of his passion. The award is made to Odysseus; and Aias attempts to attack Agamemnon. He is restrained; retires to his tent and suicides in shame.65

64 LIMC 1.1.325f (71-78).
65 van Hoof, op. cit. 107ff; and note 267 n.44.
This account is consistent with all the evidence, bar the Tabula Capitolina, which must be rejected as an accurate record of the Aethiopis. Podalirios notices Aias' increasing rage before it bursts into action, when everyone realized his state. This treacherous assault on Agamemnon earned Aias his disgraceful burial. The innovation of the Little Iliad lies in the introduction of insanity, which deflects Aias' attack on the Atreidai onto the booty. The Odyssey account does not discord in tone or matters of fact.

Pindar's use of this may be simply stated. Everywhere, Aias kills himself with a sword; everywhere, it is bluntly and vividly described.\(^66\) The only clue as to his mood is χολωθεὶς (N.7.25); not a gloss over his madness,\(^67\) but an accurate reflection of the Aethiopis.

\(\delta\psi \iota\) εἰς νυκτὶ (I.3/4.53bf) confirms the use of the Aethiopis. The scholiast is perplexed; unable to decide whether the phrase means at dusk, midnight or towards dawn:

\[\tauοις δὲ τὸν ὀβρον ἁκούομαι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας συμάδειν· ὁ γὰρ τὴν Ἀθηνοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὀβρον φησὶ τοὺς Ἀιναντα ἑαυτῶν ἀμελεῖν.\]

\(\Sigma .1 .4 .5 8 = A e t h . f r . S \ B = E G F F 1 )\)

The incomprehension confirms the validity of the ascription to the Aethiopis.\(^68\) That this detail is a small one taken from his

\(^66\) N.7.26f; N.8.27; I.3/4.53f. Contrast the tact of the Athenian vase painters, who, in the second half of the sixth century, show only the setting up of the sword.

\(^67\) van der Kolf, Quaeritur 65.

\(^68\) Bethe DuS 2.167.
source does not, of course, invalidate comment upon its use in the poem. 69

Finally, I note that Aias' invulnerability, which Pindar avoided in his treatment of the hero's birth, and which may have made his suicide difficult in the Cycle, 70 is ignored entirely. Once again, Pindar excludes the traditionally fantastic.

69 Köhnken, Funktion 105; it has a role in the web of darkness and obscurity contrasted with light and fame (110ff; cf p.294 n.45 above).

70 cf Aesch. fr. 83 R. On Aias' invulnerability, see above, p.266ff.
Neoptolemos appears by name in two of the epinicians for Aeginetan victors. First, his kingdom is briefly described during a catalogue of Aiakid heroes at N.4.51-3. Secondly, his career, from the fall of Troy to his posthumous duties at Delphi, is the matter of the mythic part of N.7.

This is certainly the most controversial poem of the corpus. Its tone seems apologetic and defensive - qualities which sit uneasily in an epinician, and which demand explanation. The scholiast reports that the difficulty was resolved by appeal to another of Pindar’s works:

In the Paean, then, Neoptolemos visited Delphi bent on plundering the temple; and in N.7 Pindar responds to Aeginetan displeasure at this unfavorable treatment of one of their heroes. This theory became a focus for Pindaric scholars when fragments of the Paean, containing material about Neoptolemos, were published in 1908.¹ If the scholiast’s explanation of the apparent oddities of N.7 was correct - and the fragments of Pae.6 seemed to corroborate it - then the poem was at once an encomium for Sogenes’ pentathlon victory and a personal

¹ P.Oxy.841 = Pae.6.
statement by Pindar to the Aeginetans about a matter entirely
discrete from that victory. How, then, could it have a unity?
N.7 became the test case for this central question of Pindaric
scholarship. The critic who followed Aristarchus in this
matter could either deny the poem unity; or ascribe it a unity
complex enough to accommodate the twin demands.

The case for the connexion of the two poems rested on
three kinds of argument. First is the evidence of the scholia
themselves. Aristarchus seems to state it as a fact that the
Aeginetans were unhappy with Pindar. Secondly, the differ­
ences in the two narrations of the story of Neoptolemos may be
thought to be significant—in particular, in the matters of
Neoptolemos' motive in going to Delphi, and the identity of his
killer. Finally, various passages in N.7 seem extraordinary
and inexplicable by reference to an athletic victory—in
particular, Pindar's apparent emphatic denial of an attack on
Neoptolemos (102-5), and his confidence that an 'Αχαιὸς άνήρ
will not be unhappy with his poem (64).

By the time Bundy attacked the received opinion that the
two poems were connected, all three arguments had been honed.
Tugendhat showed that the Nemean was not a defence of the
account of the Paean, but contained a conciliatory retelling of
the same story, carefully re-emphasized for his Aeginetan

---

2 Young, PC 61f, 8f and passim.
3 The first approach is exemplified by Wilamowitz siebentes
nemeisches; the second, by Schadewaldt, Aufbau.
4 Σ.Ν.7.70; cf 94a, 123a, 150a.
5 Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 49f.
audience. Only 102ff refers directly to the scandalous Paean, but other passages dwell on the integrity of the poet, an epicurean theme which is in this case especially significant. (The question of unity is thus reframed as the question of the identity of the first person in the poem.) And Fraenkel showed that the existence in the scholia of other explanations for the narration of the Neoptolemos myth indicated that the Hellenistic scholars had no independent evidence that gave them confidence in Aristarchus' assertion that the Aeginetans were displeased.

We may gather that Bundy would have attacked the received opinion on all three heads. He agreed with Fraenkel that the scholiast's theory was a guess, and so discounted it. He thought that the phrases understood as Pindar's personal apologies for (or defences of) the Paean were "the encomiast's rhetorical poses" misunderstood. And he believed that the differences of narrative were differences of emphasis only.

How he might have argued the second point, and shown the generic character of all the controversial phrases, is another matter. Slater attempted to pick up the baton, and argued that 102ff was simply litotes for "I claim that I have praised..."

---

6 Rechtfertigung 404; 389-92.
7 Rechtfertigung 404f; 391ff.
8 cf Σ.Ν.7.123a; Carey, 5 Odes 16 n.37.
9 Scholien 385-91.
10 SP 1.4 n.14 (Fraenkel did not discount the guess).
11 SP 1.4; cf 29.
12 See Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 223 n.14.
Neoptolemos with fitting words"; but although it is well known that Pindar's litotes are often not logical, the phrase is too obscure to be readily understood in this way. \(^{13}\)

And now the controversy remains in uneasy stasis. Bundy's general thesis that the odes are the product of the disciplined professional encomiast, and are dedicated to the praise of the victor, is unquestionable. But \(N.7\), and in particular 102ff, seems extraordinarily defensive. \(^{14}\) Perhaps that extraordinary quality cannot be accounted for on Bundy's terms. \(^{15}\) In that case the scholiast's theory of a connexion with \(Pae.6\) seems to offer a valid explanation of the apparent intrusion of the poet's own voice, be it integrated within the poem as encomium or not. \(^{16}\)

On the other hand, the theory of a connexion, although easily loosely stated, is still hard to formulate exactly. \(^{17}\) 102ff remains a problem for this interpretation, also: if Pindar has worked so hard to mitigate the account of the \(Paean\), why does he finally appear to deny it? \(^{18}\)

---

13 Slater, \(Futures\) 91ff; see Fogelmark, \(Studies\) 104-116.

14 Kirkwood, \(Vicissitude\) 56.

15 Young, \(3 Odes\) 25 n.1.

16 Lloyd Jones, \(Modern Interpretation\), \(passim\) and 136: "amends for the alleged slight to Neoptolemos within the framework of an epinician ode"; cf Kirkwood, \(Vicissitude\), \(passim\) and 76; Most, \(Measures\), \(passim\) and 209f; contrast Carey, \(5 Odes\) 177 on 102-4: "since the ode proper has finished, it is not unreason- able for Pindar to speak of his own affairs."

17 Slater, \(Doubts\) 204; cf e.g. Norwood, \(Pindar\) 84: "a masterly blend of serene audacity, perfect diction, and impeccable manner".

18 Slater, loc. cit.
I shall consider the problem under the three heads which I outlined above. First, I shall briefly describe the weight of the scholia. Secondly, I shall consider the shifting and complex mythological tradition which lies behind Pindar’s account of Neoptolемos’ career. For I believe, following Slater and Lefkowitz, that the extraordinary features of N.7 are explicable by appeal to the difficulties of the tradition in which Pindar was working. Finally, I shall consider the poem itself.

The Scholia

I have quoted the scholium attributed to Aristodemus, Aristarchus’ pupil, above. Earlier, Aristarchus himself is credited with the theory — and it seems that he knew for a fact that the Aeginetans were displeased:

'Αρισταρχος οδης ἐπεὶ μέμψις τῆς Αἰγινῆταις πρὸς τὸν ποιητὴν ἦν χάριν τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου, εἰς τὴν ἀπολογίαν τῆς περὶ Νεοπτόλεμου...

(Σ.Ν.7.70)

But Aristarchus is also credited with a wild guess about the motivation for the story of Neoptolemos — an idea which his follower took up and refined:

παρεξήγαγεν δὲ εἰς τὰ περὶ Νεοπτόλεμου, διὸ μὲν 'Ἀρισταρχος, διὸ χαρισμένος στὶς ἀνάρρησιν τὸ τῷ Σωφρόνι Νεοπτόλεμος ἦν τὸν νόμον, ἢπειρώτης τὸ γένος, διὰ οἷς οὕτω φησιν ἔχειν δ

19 Slater, Doubts 205, 207; Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 44f; cf Woodbury, Neoptolemos passim and 133.

1 p.302. For Aristodemus as Aristarchus’ pupil, see Σ.1a (117.12 Drachmann); Deas, Scholia Vetera 16.
Fraenkel rightly labels this a monstrous example of the scholiast’s recourse to biographical anecdote to explain obscure passages. It is important because it may also reveal Aristarchus’ own lack of confidence in his other theory — betraying the fact that he had no external evidence to support it. Further, our scholia preserve another explanation for the Neoptolemos myth, Callistratus:

If Aristarchus had already thought of his interpretation, then Callistratus rejected it.

But these observations do not necessarily undermine the Aristarchan theory. They may only show that Aristarchus (and Callistratus and Aristodemus) was not concerned to develop a unified theory that covered all the problems of this ode, but simply tackled its difficulties as they arose. He first

---

2 cf Σ.Ν.7.1a, for the same idea, cited anonymously.
3 Scholien 390f; on this tendency see Lefkowitz, Influential Fictions. The locus classicus is 0.2.86-8: Σ.Ο.2.154b, 157a.
4 Fraenkel, Scholien 385-91.
5 Slater, Doubts 203.
6 Lefkowitz, Scholia.
answers the question: why the myth of Neoptolemos? and then the separate question: why the lines which sound like apologies?

A plausible reconstruction is that the hypothesis was first directed at 64f, and then re-used for other apologetic-sounding lines - 48, 64, 85 and 102ff.  

The closest reference to the Paean is in the comment on 64, which actually quotes the offending line:

οὗ μέμψοιτο ἄν ὑμὶν μὲ Ἀχαιός ἀνήρ ἐπὶ τῷ βοκείῳ
μικρόλογον παρεσταθέναι τῷ Νεοπτόλεμοι, ὅτι εἶπον
αὐτῶν περὶ κρεών μεμαχθέαν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο
ἀπολώλεαν. καθόλου γὰρ ἀπολογεῖται βούλεται
περὶ τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμοι θανάτον πρὸς τοὺς Ἀιγίνητας.
ἐκείνοι γὰρ τιθήντα τοῖς Πίνδαροι, ὅτι γράφων
Δελφοῖς τὸν Παιάνα ἐφη: αἱμφιτόλοις μαρνάμενον
τιμώριαν περὶ τιμᾶν ἀπολώλεαν.

(μυρίαν BD Ἰουρ. Ἰα. P. Oxy. 841 μουρίαν Boeckh)
(Σ.Η.7.94α)

The quotation is from a part of the Paean which was covered in the papyrus:

Λαμφιτόλοις δὲ
ἀμπελίαν περὶ τιμᾶν
δηριαζόμενον κτῶνεν
<ἐν> τεμένειν φίλῳ γὰς παρ᾽ ομφαλὸν εὔρων.

(μουρίαν Housman μουρίαν Verrall after Σ.Η.7.94α)
(Pae.6.117-20)

But what are the τιμάι? Aristodemus, it seems, thought that they were the temple property which Neoptolemos went to Delphi to steal. Σ.Η.7.150a reports that Aristodemus explained that the Aeginetans were unhappy because Neoptolemos had been depicted as going to Delphi ἐπὶ ἑροσυλίη. But nowhere in the

7 Smith, Seventh Hemen.
Paean — and we have all the relevant parts — is Neoptolemos' motive for going to Delphi discussed. Aristodemus must have inferred that Neoptolemos went to Delphi to plunder from his interpretation of peri τιμήν as peri χρημάτων.

This explains the quotation of Pae.6.117–9 as the line of the Paean to which the Aeginetans objected (Σ.Ν.7.94α). It ties in, too, with the scholiasts' identification of Pindar's apologies:

'Αρισταρχος οὖτως ἔπει μέμψις τοῖς Αἰγινηταῖς πρὸς τὸν ποιητήν ἦν χάριν τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου, εἰς τὴν ἀπολογίαν τὴν peri Νεοπτολέμου δικαίως διαρκέσει τρία ἔπεα, φησὶν: ὅτι μόρασον ἢν αὐτῷ αὐτῶ τελευτήσαι, καὶ ὅτι πεπρωμένου ἢν ἐνα τῶν Αἰακίδων ἀποθανόντα τεθήκαι ἐν τῷ ναῷ, τρίτων ὅτι ταῖς ἡρωικαῖς ποιμαῖς ἐνα τῶν Αἰακίδων θεμίσθου ἐϊναι... ἐνοι δὲ οὖτως ἀπολογοῦνται peri τῆς τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου τελευτής, τρία φέροντες τούτα, ὅτι τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν χρεῶν εἰπεῖν αναρκθηθαι, καὶ ὅτι οἱ Δελφοὶ ἐξαράσθησαν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτι πεπρωμένου ἢν αὐτῶν ἀναιρεθήναι.

(Σ.Ν.7.70)8

The transmitted view of the Hellenistic scholars, then, is that the Aeginetans objected to the depiction of Neoptolemos as a temple robber; and that Pindar responded in Η.7 by emphasizing other reasons for his death.

But it is hard to believe that the Aeginetans could have interpreted τιμᾶι so confidently as so detrimental to the

8 cf Σ.Ν.7.94α:

ἀπολογούμενος γὰρ τι δινείσθηγεν τούτῳ δ Πινδαρός, ὅτι οὐκ ἔφησε peri χρημάτων γεγονέναι τῇ Νεοπτολέμῳ τὴν μάχην, ἀλλὰ peri τῶν νομιζόμενων τιμῶν τοῖς Δελφοῖς.
honour of their hero. The scholiast on the Paean could not produce a univocal reading:

The very line which the scholiast quotes to example Pindar's offensive attitude to Neoptolemos in the Paean does not refer unequivocally to a sack - ἐσροσύλια - of Apollo's temple, which is given as the precise cause of offence in Σ.Ν.7.150a. This remains true, whatever adjective we read with τιμᾶν. The choice between μυριᾶν or χυριᾶν is hard. The former is evidenced by Σ.Ν.7.94a. But whether τιμᾶι refers to sacrificial meat, or to the temple goods, it lacks significant meaning: the quantity of meats or goods is uninteresting. χυριᾶν, on the other hand, gives better sense on either interpretation: if Neoptolemos is trying to steal temple property, it is properly Apollo's; and if he is arguing about the sacrificial remains, he is challenging what, as we shall see, is customarily the priests'. I would read χυριᾶν.

9 I am for the moment assuming that the Aeginetans knew the alternative story, in which Neoptolemos died in a quarrel over a sacrifice. I shall argue for the antiquity of this version. The earliest literary evidence for it is Pherecydes (FGrH 3 F 64a).

10 Radt 86.

11 The υ of the papyrus rules out Boeckh's μοιριᾶν (Radt 164).

12 And so read by Radt (163-8).

13 Gentili, Trittico pindarico 10f.
If it is thought implausible that the Aeginetans should understand that ἔμπληκαν περὶ τιμῶν referred to the plunder of the temple, some doubt is cast on the whole theory of the two poems’ connexion.

On a slightly sceptical view, Aristarchus has been misreported: he did know that the Aeginetans were unhappy, and that the Paean was the cause, although ἔμπληκαν περὶ τιμῶν were not the offensive words.

The extreme sceptical position is that Aristarchus had no corroborative evidence, but conjured the hypothesis out of the text of Ν.7. It seems that he was applying his technique of Homeric exegesis, ὑπηρετήσατε ὑπηρετήσατε, to Pindar. He then looked for the most offensive material in the Pindaric corpus, and found it in the Paean. His presentation of alternative explanations may after all show that he had no guarantee for his own theory.

Whichever; the next step in the argument is the same. Both positions would be disproved if it could be shown that Paean 6 could not have offended. Either remains possible if it could be shown that it might have.

14 Bundy, SP 1.4 n.14; Carey, 5 Odes 133.
15 Irigoin 54f; cf Deas, Scholia Vetera 8f; Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 221f; 225-7.
16 See Smith, Seventh Hemean 12-14 for a speculative account of the growth of the scholiasts’ theory, using this model.
17 Radt 85. One might emend his name to Ὄριστονίκος at Σ.Ν.7.56a (E. Horn, De Aristarchi studiis Pindaricos (Diss., Grundeswald, 1883), 65f n.94). But note that Aristodemus too seems to have employed a variety of approaches to the poem’s problems (Σ.Ν.7.70).
And this is the case. For the narrative of Neoptolemos' death in the *Paean* does him little credit. Its tone is set by the central point that Apollo kills the hero in punishment for his murder, at an altar, of the aged Priam.\(^{18}\) Such a narrative may well have offended the Aeginetans.\(^{19}\) Pindar's apologies, as noted by Σ.Ν.7.70, cover Apollo's punishment of Neoptolemos as well as they do the charge of temple robbery.\(^{20}\) Whether Aristarchus had corroborative evidence or not, his theory cannot be disproved.

Do the scholia provide any sure evidence for the question of the two poems' connexion? Fogelmark points out that N.7 is the only one of the *Nemeans* or *Isthmians* for which a date is given: perhaps the scholiast knew the date because of the scandal of the *Paean*.\(^{21}\) But the date is preserved in the context of the details of the victor (Σ.Ν.7.inscr. = 116.6 Drachmann), and for a good reason: Sogenes was the first Aeginetan to win the boys' pentathlon at Nemea. If, on the other hand, the date was remembered because it was related to a scandal, it would have appeared in some form in Aristarchus' remarks. (The actual dates given in the manuscripts are in

\(^{18}\) I discuss this below (p.313ff).

\(^{19}\) Lloyd-Jones, *Modern Interpretation* 136f.

\(^{20}\) But this change cannot be approached from N.7: Pindar does not deny Apollo's involvement in that poem. He does, however, explicitly say that the quarrel was ἐπεξ ἔρευ (42). This may explain why the scholiasts settled on that as the focus of Pindar's change. We shall see, too, that Neoptolemos' murder of Priam sits well in a narrative with his plunder of Apollo's temple. It may be that the interpretation of τιμῶν was coloured by the murder - and that is how the Aeginetans could be sure that it referred to the temple-robbery.

\(^{21}\) *Studies* 105f.
fact both impossible, setting the victory long before Pindar's career (in 547 or 527); they are no help in establishing the relative dates of N.7 and Pae.6.22)

In sum: Aristarchus' explanation of the apologetic lines which seem to occur in N.7, which turns on differences between the narratives of Pae.6 and N.7, need not be based on any more than inferences drawn from the texts. But it cannot simply be derided for that reason. It is a possible explanation of a real problem.

The Mythological Tradition

The Death of Priam

Neoptolemos' behaviour during the sack of Troy, epitomised by his slaughter of the aged and helpless Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeios, has earned him a black reputation: "Briefly, Neoptolemos was the first great war criminal of Greek cultural history."1 But a too simple statement of this half-truth is dangerously anachronistic: it both projects our values onto the ancient Greeks, and views the ancient evidence synchronically.

There were three important accounts of the death of Priam prior to Pindar: in the Iliupersis; the Little Iliad; and in Stesichorus' Sack of Troy. There is no account in the Odyssey.

Proclus describes Priam's death as it occurred in the Iliupersis:

22 Most, Measures 133.

1 Most, Measures 160.
This seems to be a textbook example of supplication via contact with a sacred object - in this case, an altar - in which the suppliant shares in the inviolability of that object. But little attention has been drawn to the fact. And this is especially remarkable given the antiquity of this example.

Before Alcaeus, the technique is mentioned only in the Odyssey, as a strategy open to Phemios, the bard:

"...εἰς τὸν θυσίαν καταφεύγωντα." (Od. 22.330-7)

2 Apollodorus is clearly sharing Proclus' source here:

καὶ Νεοπτόλεμος μὲν ἀποκτείνει Πρίμον ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ἔρχειον βωμῶν καταφεύγωντα.

(Chest. 257f)

3 Parker, Miasma 182f; see Gould, Hiketeia 77 and passim. Cf LSJ s.v. καταφεύγω 1 - e.g. Hdt. 5.46.

4 T. Tosi labels Priam a supplicant (Scr. di Filologia & di Archaeologia, ed. N. Terzaghi (Firenze, 1957), 7); also Vickers, TGT 449.

5 Parker (Miasma 182) describes contact with the altar as a characteristic of classical supplication, but (n.212) notes the Odyssey example I give below ("already a possibility in Homer").
He decides on the latter course, and successfully supplicates Odysseus (344-54); and is sent off out of the way with the herald, Medon:

\[
\text{τὸ δ' ἔξω βῆτην μεγάρων κλώντε,}
\]
\[
\text{ἔξεσθη δ' ἄρα τῷ γε Διὸς μεγάλου ποτὶ βουλῇ,}
\]
\[
\text{πάντωσε παπταίνοντε, φόνου ποτιδεμένως αἰεῖ.}
\]

(\textit{Od.} 22.378-80)

Priam does what Phemios decides not to do: he goes to the altar of Zeus Herkeios in the court.  

But, it does him no good. Neoptolemos kills him there. And this has rich implications.

First, we discount the extreme theory that the notion of pollution was entirely alien to the Homeric world – which would make the circumstance of Priam’s death uninteresting. For in particular, the notion of fleeing to the altar is senseless unless there is some authoritative taboo validating the protection it offers; and in general, the argument for the absence of pollution in the Homeric age from the silence of Homer no longer convinces. 

This leaves two alternatives: that the institution of supplication, younger and less developed than in its classical instantiation, did not operate in this particular case; or that it did, and Neoptolemos was, from the first, an offender against the gods. The former is the more plausible.

---

6 For the position of Odysseus’ altar, see Gould \textit{Hiketeia} 77 n.22.

7 Parker, \textit{Miasma} 130-43; cf Lloyd-Jones, \textit{Justice} 74-8.
First, supplication is, for the Homeric warrior, something which does not work. Gould notes that in the Iliadic cases, the crucial point is that physical contact between suppliant and supplicated is broken before the killing. But this is simply a ritual symptom of the more general fact: supplication does not work in war. Or in time like war: as Gould admits, Leodes' supplication of Odysseus is faultless (Od. 22.310ff), and yet Odysseus cuts him down while he is still speaking.

And, as no pollution attaches itself to Odysseus after this last case, so none appears to have been attached to Neoptolemos in the early stages of the tradition. In the Odyssey, he has returned safely to Phthia (3.188f), and preparations are afoot for his marriage to Hermione (4.5f). Although there is no explicit discussion of the cause of the gods’ anger at the returning Greeks (e.g. 3.132ff), if there is any hint of a particular cause, it is that it was the behaviour of Lokrian Aias which wrecked the fleet (4.499ff), as in the Iliupersis. In that work, the Greeks, fearing the consequences of the violence which he did Cassandra in Athena’s

---

8 e.g. 11.6.45ff (Adrastos killed by Agamemnon); 21.64ff (Lykaon killed by Achilles); 22.337ff (Hektor himself). MacLeod, Iliad 24 15f.
9 Hiketeia 80f.
11 For pollution as the consequence of the violation of suppliants’ rights, see e.g. Aeschylus Suppl. 370-5.
temple, want to stone Aias, but fail to. Wherever the cause is specified, it is always Aias' behaviour which torpedoed the safe return of the Greeks - never Neoptolemos'.

This is not to say that the killing of Priam at the altar rather than anywhere else did not add a terrific frisson to the act; but simply that its repercussions were, in the earliest stages, negligible. The altar exaggerates tensions inherent in Priam's supplication of Neoptolemos, which seems to exemplify the most extreme values possible: the defeated king's utter self-abasement in the face of the young paragon of the invaders, taking place at the heart of his captured town. Further, Priam, who successfully supplicated Achilles, Neoptolemos' father, for his son's body, now fails to supplicate Achilles' son for his own life - and is killed at the very altar at which he poured a libation before setting off to plead with Achilles.

What is important, however, is that at this stage, Neoptolemos is not a war criminal, but simply the sacker of

---


15 Gould, Hiketeia 86-95; cf Vickers, TGT 483-9, with 490f n.20.

16 II.24.305ff. For the juxtaposition of the successful supplication of Achilles by Priam and the unsuccessful supplications everywhere else in the Iliad, see MacLeod, Iliad 24 15f, 33f. Cf Aen.2.469-662.
Troy—the warrior of whom Achilles is so proud in the Odyssey. 17

But as the institution of supplication evolved, the implications of Neoptolemos’ action could no longer be ignored. 18 Poets treating the episode could either show the deed as sacrilegious, or alter it so that it was no longer problematic.

This second strategy is exemplified by the version of the Little Iliad:

\[ \text{Πρίαμου δὲ ἄποδανεῖν ἔφη Λέοχεως ἐπὶ τῇ ἔσχαρῃ τοῦ Ἐρχείου, ἄλλα ἀποσπασθέντα ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ πάρεργον τῷ Νεοπτολέμῳ πρὸς ταῖς τῆς οἰκίας γενέσθαι δύομαι.} \]

\[ (II. Parv. fr.16 (II) B = EGF F 17) \]

This change has been explained as a mollification of the Iliupersis account. 20 But this will not do without further qualification; why should the poet of the Little Iliad wish to "diminish the horror of the scene"? 21 Tosi rightly explains:

---

17 11.506-40; Delcourt, Pyrrhos 51; cf Vermeule, Aspects of Death ch.3.

18 They would have been amplified by the depiction of Priam as a helpless old man.

19 One of the Homeric Beakers is also useful here:

\[ \text{οἰκία Πριάμοιῳ / Νεοπτόλεμος / Δίὸς Ἐρχείου / βωμὸς / Πρίαμος / κατὰ ποιητὴν λέαχην ἐκ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἰλιάδος. καταφυγόντος τοῦ Πριάμου ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ἐρχείου Δίὸς, ἀποσπάσας ὁ Νεοπτόλεμος ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ πρὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ κατέσφωξεν.} \]

\[ (II. Parv. fr.16 (I) B) \]

Note especially καταφυγόντος.

20 Monro, Epic Cycle 33.

21 The question is complicated by comparison with the two different versions of the death of Astyanax: in the Iliupersis,
"al sentimento religioso dei Greci questo massacro di un supplice all’ ara dovevò apparrire così empio ed orribile, che un altro poeta epico tentò di mitigare l’odiosità immaginando che Priamo fosse strappato dal luogo sacro ed ucciso su la porta della reggia." But still we must go further: the deed was avoided not because it was simply too awful to contemplate, but because it was known that Neoptolemos emerges from the sack with honour, instantiated by the award to him of Andromache, and journeys home.

By dragging Priam out of the court, and so out of contact with the altar, and out of the domain of Zeus Herkeios, Neoptolemos renders the supplication invalid. It is the phenomenon manifested by the Iliadic warriors who ensure that physical contact is broken before the supplicant is killed.

Odysseus kills him (Chrest.268) after the Greeks have discussed the matter; but in the Little Iliad Neoptolemos throws him from the tower (II. Parv. fr.21.1-5 B = EGF F 20.1-5) off his own bat (Paus.10.25.9). Is this better or worse? It has no semblance of legality (so Severyns, CE 366f); but, on the other hand, is done without deliberation. The Little Iliad poet does dilate upon Neoptolemos' viciousness - a sign, perhaps, not of the poet's incompetence (cf Griffin, Uniqueness 51f), but of the unexceptional nature of his behaviour (Vermeule, Aspects of Death 114f).

22 Scritti 7; cf Severyns, CE 363 n.4.

23 For the disasters which should follow a mythical death at an altar, see J. Fontenrose, The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations; with a Catalogue of Responses (Berkeley, 1978), 76f; cf Vickers, TGT 449f.

24 Burkert emphasizes how thoroughly the early Zeus Herkeios was concerned only with the domestic zone: "Asylum attaches to the sanctuary, to the altar; elsewhere one may murder" (GR 248).

25 Gould, Hiketeia 78; the most spectacular example of the importance of contact is the case of Kylon's accomplices, who leave the sanctuary but keep hold of a rope which they have tied to the cult statue (Plutarch Solon 12.1).
And, like that, it is only a primitive strategy of evasion. Again, as the institution of supplication developed, physically forcing a suppliant away from an altar became inadequate;\(^{26}\) he could only be persuaded away - by argument, starvation or fire.\(^{27}\) Even these techniques were problematic; whether the forcible removal of a suppliant was ever a religiously satisfactory technique is a moot point.\(^{28}\) What is important, is that the Little Iliad at least provided a plausible and comprehensible account of the slaughter of Priam which did not entail the pollution of Neoptolemos.\(^{29}\)

But the version of the Little Iliad does not rule out alternatives. In general, the Little Iliad did not have sufficient panhellenic dominance to monopolize the tradition; and in this particular, Neoptolemos' evasion of pollution would have seemed increasingly spurious. The way was open for a

---

26 A striking incident occurred on Aegina in the early fifth century. In a time of civil unrest, seven hundred prisoners were about to be executed when one made a run for the temple of Demeter, and held fast to the handle of its door. His pursuers tried to drag him off; failed, and so cut off his hands and left them holding the door. Herodotus comments that the Aeginetans were unable to purify themselves of the pollution they thereby incurred, and so were driven from their island years later in 431 (Hdt.6.91). Note the importance of contact, and the attempt to drag the suppliant away - the technique was still worth a try, even if it failed. This incident is particularly interesting in the context of a discussion of a victory ode for an Aeginetan victor written at some time in the first part of the fifth century.

27 Gould, Hiketeia 82f; Parker, Miasma 183f.

28 e.g. Thuc.1.134; Parker, Miasma 183 n.216.

29 It must by this token represent a stage in the tradition later than that represented by the Iliupersis. This communis opinio has lately been challenged by Nagy, Pindar's Homer 76.
version which exploited the second strategy which I mentioned above, and treated the murder of Priam as sacrilegious.

I suggest that a Delphic moralizing story filled this vacuum; and that it was from this branch of the tradition that Pindar took the narrative of Neoptolemos' death in Pae.6. In this story, Apollo kills Neoptolemos, at Delphi, in punishment for his sacrilege in refusing Priam's supplication at an altar. Delphic Apollo may have acquired a moral dimension as early as the eighth century. I shall argue below that the political implications of this story suggest that it may have originated in the middle of the seventh.

The depiction of the murder of Priam as an act of sacrilege might have appeared in Stesichorus' Sack of Troy. But we cannot know whether it did. If the Tabula Iliaca does show the action of this poem, then Neoptolemos killed Priam on the altar in it. PMG S 115 and 116 might describe Priam's flight to the altar (ἐκτρωμένας, 5). This move back to the altar might indicate that the sacrilege was to be emphasized. But we cannot be sure that the Table does in fact reflect Stesichorus in this.

30 Nilsson, GGR 647-52; but note the caution of Parker, Miasma 138-43.
31 So Sadurska, Tables Iliaqucs 28f.
32 Might Σκιαμανδριο (7) suggest that Astyanax is at hand, as he is in the contemporary iconography (see below)? (For close reflections of Stesichorus' Geryoneis in vase-painting, see M. Robertson, "Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase Painters", CQ 19 (1969), 207-221; D. Page, "Stesichorus: The Geryoneis", JHS 93 (1973), 138-54, here 145.)
33 Horsfall, Stesichorus 35-43. Even if one considers his scepticism excessive, this particular fits the scope of his limited argument that the Table may prefer familiar iconography to its
In fact, the first explicit literary evidence of an account in which the murder of Priam was a sacrilegious act is Pindar's Paean 6, written for the Delphic Theoxenia:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{δι[
\text{μοις θεός,}
\text{γένοις οίνου πρώτος Πρίαμος}
\text{περίδας ἔρχετον ἣμαρη βωμὸν ἐπι-
\text{ευθερότα, μὴ μιν εὔφρου ἢς οίκου}
\text{μὴ ἐπὶ γῆρας ἵεσ-
\text{μεν βίου.}}
\end{align*} \]

(Pae.6.112-7)

It is quite plain that Apollo kills Neoptolemos because he killed Priam, who was seeking refuge on the altar in the court. This is not simply an episode in Apollo's vendetta against the Achaeans, and against the Aiakids in particular - as, for example, is his killing of Achilles, mentioned earlier in the same poem (78-80). Neoptolemos' death is his punishment.

Years later, Pausanias explains the proverbial phrase Νεοπτολέμειος τίσις, unfortunately elsewhere unexempled. It is used to describe what we should call poetic justice:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Νεοπτολέμω γὰρ τῷ Ἀχιλλέως, ἀποκτείνας Πρίαμον}
\text{ἐπὶ τῇ ἐσχάρᾳ τοῦ Ἐρέχειον συνέπεσε καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν}
\text{Δελφοῖς πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος}
\text{ἀποσφαγῆμα, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τὸ παθεῖν δεῖν ὑποτῆς}
\text{καὶ ἐξάσει Νεοπτολέμειον τίσιν ὑμωμοῖοι.}
\end{align*} \]

(4.17.4)

The iconography of the scene is of some limited help in clarifying the literary tradition.\(^{34}\) Pictures of Neoptolemos' behaviour at the sack compress, in timeless fashion, different

\[ \text{stated literary source, proved by its representation of Mene-
laos' confrontation with Helen. But see Davies, Stesichorus}
\text{552-5.}\]

\(^{34}\) Brommer, Vasebilder 466-8.
episodes into the same scene, and so Priam is shown with Astyanax, though in every literary source, they die in different places. But it is important that in the early instances, the killing of Priam is everywhere treated as an act of brutality. The earliest sure example is a temple pediment from Corfu; it shows the suppliant Priam at an altar, and is dated to the beginning of the sixth century. Most extremely, Neoptolemos seems to club Priam with the dead Astyanax.

There is one black-figure lekythos, dated to the beginning of the fifth century, which might even directly evidence the retribution which the bravura brutality of the type suggests. It shows an inexplicable priestly figure observing Neoptolemos about to hit Priam with Astyanax' head. Tosi suggests that he foreshadows the condign punishment that the priests will mete out at Delphi. It is an attractive idea.

In sum, the argument for an early version in which Neoptolemos' murder of Priam was depicted as a sacrilegious act remains a priori. But the principle on which it is founded is

36 But there is a change in the early fifth century, from which time Priam is treated less pathetically (Wiencke, op. cit. 300-6).
37 Wiencke, op. cit. 292, pl.55.
38 This type enjoyed a brief vogue in the middle of the sixth century (Wiencke, op. cit. 293-5).
39 Published by Gardner, JHS 14 (1894) 170-85. Wiencke, op. cit. 299f, pl.59 fig.20.
40 Scritti 10f.
sound: that the archaic Greeks - and the Delphians in particular - could find troubling the religious implications of the killing of a suppliant on an altar. The version of the Little Iliad confirms that the problem was confronted, even though the solution it offers seems likely, from comparative evidence, not to have satisfied for long, as it involves another violation of the suppliant's rights, his forcible removal from sanctuary. The iconography of the sixth century may show, by its universal brutality, that, in that age at least, the matter was tackled in a manner which exploited the seriousness of the deed. Stesichorus may well have shown Priam murdered on the altar. The obvious upshot, that Neoptolemos is punished for the crime, is not evidenced before Paean 6, but there can be little doubt that Pindar is in that poem following a tradition, and not inventing this aspect of the story.

This conclusion prompts two reflections about the difficulties of N.7. First, if Paean 6 is simply presenting a traditional version of the myth, Paean 6 itself might turn out to be relevant to N.7 only inasmuch as it exemplifies a tradition which, in N.7, Pindar is countermanding. One of the simplest objections to Aristarchus' theory - the sheer implausibility of Pindar writing first one version and then, apologetically, another - is thus acknowledged. Secondly, if, in N.7, Pindar is avoiding the traditional version which he narrated in Paean 6, is the narrative which he does present his own invention? I consider this question below, but, for the

41 Slater, Doubts 205; Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 44f.
42 Slater, Futures 91.
moment, note that we have seen that the depiction of Neoptolemos as "the first great war criminal" seems to have evolved from the uncritical image of him as sacker of Troy, presented in the cameo in the Odyssey, and developed in the Little Iliad. So there is in the fifth century a tradition about Neoptolemos, which, although antiquated, is still an alternative to that which emphasizes his sacrilege; and it is entirely plausible that Pindar has drawn upon this in N.7.

The Return from Troy

Neoptolemos’ journey from Troy received its fullest cyclic treatment in its proper place in the Nostoi. But his departure also appeared in the Odyssey, Iliupersis and Little Iliad. These sources present what appears to be a farrago of evidence; but it distills nicely.

The two crucial questions are: how does Neoptolemos travel, and where does he go? Pindar writes that he sails (N.7.36 (and also Pae.6.110)); but, where there is evidence from the cyclic epics, it suggests that he went overland. On the second head, Pindar emphasizes Neoptolemos’ failure to return home; but the Cycle has it that he replaces Peleus as king of Phthia. I shall argue that Pindar’s version in N.7 is not to be entirely explained by appeal to the internal demands of the poem (although it may be satisfactorily described on such terms). Instead, his apparent contradiction of the

---

1 This approach is exampled by Most, Measures 167f; Köhnken, Funktion 69.
traditional version is a natural stage in the evolution of that tradition.

Proclus' resumé of the Nosti account of Neoptolemos' return runs:

Neoptolemos δὲ θέτισκε ὑποθεμένης πετῇ ποληγίται τὴν πορείαν καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς θράκην ὁδυσσέα καταλαμβάνει ἐν τῇ Μαρωνείᾳ, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἀνάει τῆς ὄδου καὶ τελευτάσαντα θολύχα θάπτειν αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς Μολοσσοὺς ἀφικόμενος ἀναγνωρίζεται Πηλέω.

(Chrest.296-300)

Much of Apollodorus' version dovetails neatly:

Neoptolemos δὲ μείνας ἐν Τενέδῳ δύο ἡμέρας ὑποθήκας τῆς θέτισκας εἰς Μολοσσοὺς πετῇ ἀπῄει μετὰ 'Ελένου, καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὄδον ἀποδανώντα θολύχα θάπτειν, καὶ νικήσας μάχῃ Μολοσσοὺς βασιλεύει, καὶ δὲ Ἀνδρομάχης γενοῦ Μολοσσόν. 'Ελένος δὲ κτίσας ἐν τῇ Μολοσσαίᾳ πόλιν κατοικεῖ, καὶ δίδωσι αὐτῷ Neoptolemos εἰς γυναῖκα τὴν µητέρα Δηιδάμειαν. Πηλέως δὲ ἐν βίοις ἐξβιληθέντος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀκάστου παιδῶν καὶ ἀποθανόντος, Neoptolemos τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς παρέλαβε.

(Ep.6.12-13)

Here, Neoptolemos finally gets home to Phthia. Certainly, his arrival there after Peleus' death and expulsion smacks of the conflation of different versions.² Nevertheless, it raises the possibility that Peleus had been chased from Phthia and had fled to Molossia, to meet Neoptolemos there.³ And if this is the case, Proclus does not show that in the Nosti, Neoptolemos successfully reached Phthia; instead, his phrase αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς

---

² For Peleus' expulsion by (the sons of) Akastos, see Eur. Tro.1126-30, with Σ.
³ So Huxley, GEP 166.
Molossia means exactly what it says (and is not simply clumsy). That Neoptolemos met Peleus in Molossia in the Ἅριον might be supported by the bald scholium (V) on Od.3.188, the statement of the Myrmidons' successful homecoming: οἱ νεότεροι τὸν Νεοπτολέμον εἰς τὴν �不间ο προέρχον ἔλθον λέγουσι.

This seems a promising avenue, in view of the version of Paean 6, in which Neoptolemos categorically fails to return. But there are counter-arguments. First, in the stories of Peleus' expulsion by the descendants of Pelias, Neoptolemos always, as one would expect, goes to Thessaly to sort the matter out.4 Secondly, there is no evidence for the aged Peleus going to Molossia or anywhere else in the west, but he does retire to the east: either to Sepias Point, on the coast of Magnesia, and where he wrestled with Thetis, or to the island of Ikos, just off that coast.5 He had a cult there.6

But whatever Peleus' movements were, did Neoptolemos ever go back to Thessaly? Certainly, in the other epics, he does appear to get home. It is so in the Little Iliad:

Λέοχής δ' δ' τὴν μικρὰν Ἡλίαδα πεποιηκὼς Ἀνδρομάχην καὶ Αἰνείαν αἰχμαλώτους φησὶ δοθῶσι τῷ Ἀχιλλέως υἱῷ Νεοπτολέμῳ καὶ δαπαχθῆναι σὺν αὐτῷ εἰς θαρσάλαυ τὴν Ἀχιλλέως πατρίδα.

(IL.Parv. fr.21 (I) B = EGF F 20 init)

4 So e.g. Eur. Tro.1125.
5 Eur. Andro.1265-9; Σ.Α.Ρ.1.582; Hdt.7.188, 191.
6 Callim. fr.178.23ff; Eur. Andro.1265ff is also aetiological. Cf Farnell, GHC 311.
More importantly, Neoptolemos' safe return is a constant in the Odyssey. Nestor tells Telemachos of it (3.188f); and at the beginning of Book 4, preparations are in hand for his wedding to Menelaos' daughter:

\[
\text{τὴν ἄρ' ἐνευ' ἵπποι καὶ ἰμάσαι πέμπτε νέεσθαι.}
\]

Nestor tells Telemachos of it (3.188f) and preparations are in hand for his wedding to Menelaos' daughter.

Of course, this does not necessarily entail that the Nosti also had the safe return - but it is rather more probable that it should follow the Odyssey in this respect than that it should not.\(^7\)

Severyns argues that the following scholium reflects the Nosti:\(^8\)

\[
\text{Νεαντόλεμος κατὰ κέλευσιν θέτιδος ἐμπρήσας τὰ ἱερὰ αὐθάφ χρηστεῖς δὲ ὅπω 'Ελένου. ἐνδιὰ ἐν ἰδιοι οἰκον ἐν αἰθηρῶν θεμελίων, τοῖχων δὲ ἐξόλουν καὶ ὀρόφου ἔρεου, ἐχεῖ μένειν, ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Παμβώτιν λίμνην τῆς Ἡπείρου, καὶ τοὺς ἓγχωρίους ἑδρῶν δόρατα πήξαντας καὶ κλαύνας ἀνωθὲν καταπετάσαντας καὶ οὕτω σκηνοῦντας, συμβάλλει τούρχησιον. καὶ πορθήσας τὴν Μολοσσίαν ἄν'}

\[
\text{Αἰδρομάχης ἢσσει Μολοσσὸν, ἄρ' ὁδὶ καὶ το γένος ἑστὶ τῶν ἐν Μολοσσίᾳ βασιλέων, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἐρατοσθένης (FGrH 241 F 42).}
\]

\[
\text{(Σ.ΕΗΜΟΡΤ. Οδ. 3.188)\(^9\).}
\]

\(^7\) Robert, Heldensage 1454. Cf e.g. the relation between the Nosti account of Neoptolemos' meeting with Odysseus in Maroneia (Chrest. 297f) and Odysseus' light remark that he has been in Ismaros drinking Maron's wine (Od. 9.196ff). Whatever the causality, the Nosti develops an episode from, and thereby explains, this slight incident in the Odyssey (Huxley, GEP 166).

\(^8\) CE 383f.

\(^9\) cf Paus. 1.11.1, of Neoptolemos.
But his argument rests upon the assumption that the whole scholium is to be attributed to Eratosthenes; upon the appeal to the balance of probabilities which makes it not implausible that Eratosthenes should cite the Nosti in this instance; and upon the claim that if Peleus is still king of Thessaly, Neoptolemos cannot go to rule there. This last point is instantly disproved by the example of the Odyssey; and the first is fragile. And so Robert saw in this scholium evidence only of a development of the Nosti story, in which later stage Neoptolemos stays in Molossia, and has good reason so to do.

Whether Neoptolemos finally went to Thessaly in the Nosti or not is, happily, not of central importance in this context. But it does seem as though in the earliest stages of the tradition, as represented for us by the Odyssey, he did get back, but that later sources had him not only pausing in Molossia, but staying there. We cannot know how the Nosti fitted in this scheme.

I shall argue that Pindar reflects a stage in this evolution in which Neoptolemos does not go home to Thessaly. An alternative explanation is that Pindar has interfered with that

\[\text{πρῶτος γὰρ δὴ οὗτος ὀλούσης Ἱλίου τὴν μὲν ἐς Θεσσαλίαν ὑπερείδειν ἀναχώρησιν, ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἡπείρου κατάρας ἐνταῦθα ἐκ τῶν Ἐλέους κρησμῶν ἔμησε.}\]

10 But we note the curious power-share of Eur. Andro. 23f: Peleus rules Pharsalia, and Neoptolemos Phthia (see Hope Simpson & Lazenby, Catalogue of Ships 129).

11 A more reasonable interpretation is that of Hammond, Epirus 39 n.3: only the last sentence is Eratosthenes'.

12 Heldensage 1454.
evolution, and introduced his changes, which are novel, untraditional elements. But the allusive unanimity of the problem passages suggests that this is not so. That intuition would be confirmed if the changes in the myth could be explained in mythopoeic terms. And this is so: the explanation lies in the emergence of the Molossi into the Hellenic world, and their adoption of Neoptolemos as a hero to endorse their social ascent.

I shall turn to this when I have considered the second question I posed above: how does Neoptolemos travel? In the Nostia, he goes overland. There is nothing to disconfirm that in the Odyssey. But he takes Andromache to a boat in the Little Iliad:

N.7.36-40; Pae.6.109f; N.4.51-53; Perret, Neoptolème 7f.

As much as it would be challenged if the changes could be explained satisfactorily by appeal to the internal demands of the poem.

There are six more lines quoted by the scholiast:

There are six more lines quoted by the scholiast:
But this should not worry us: for this excerpt is plainly set at Troy, and from there the Greeks must return to the island of Tenedos, now, after the ruse of the Wooden Horse, their base camp. In the *Odyssey*, Nestor outlines a deal of vacillation by the Greeks between Troy and Tenedos. First Agamemnon and Menelaos argue at Troy, which splits the army: some sail from there to Tenedos with Menelaos, while the rest stay with Agamemnon on the mainland (*Od.3.130-161*). There, another schism sends some back to Agamemnon (162-4), while others — Nestor himself, 

αὐτῶν τ' Ἀρχίλαος κλητὸν γόνου ἰπποδόμοιο
Αἰνείαν ἐν νησίῳ ἐβήσατο ποντοπόροισιν
ἐκ πάντων Δαυδῆς ᾧμὲν γέρας ἔξοχον ὄλλων.

But not only do these seem to repeat the substance of 1-6, but are elsewhere attributed to Simmias of Rhodes:

Σύμιας ἐν τῇ Γοργώνι (fr.6 Powell) Ἀνδρομάχην
φησὶ καὶ Αἰνείαν γέρας δοθῆναι Νεοπτολέμῳ λέγων
οὕτως: [6-11]

(Σ.Eur.Andro.14 = Ili.Parv. fr.21 (V) B)

Fraenkel objects that this cannot be the work of the witty Simmias (*De Simia Rhodio 37-9*); but this is an impressionistic argument (Griffin, *Uniqueness* 51 n.62). Perhaps Fraenkel is right in his suggestion that some words have dropped out of the scholium, which should read something like:

Σύμιας ἐν τῇ Γοργώνι Ἀνδρομάχην φησὶ καὶ Αἰνείαν
γέρας δοθῆναι Νεοπτολέμῳ ἐμολογεῖ δὲ καὶ Λέσχης,

λέγων οὕτως: [6-11]

One could then tackle the problem of repetition not by the superfine interpretation of *ἀπογραφής* as *deducturus erat*, as Fraenkel does (cf Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* 112), but by suggesting that these are in fact two quotations, one to prove each part of Tzetzes' claim that Lesches showed both Andromache and Aeneas as Neoptolemos' prisoners (although the second one, though less memorable, in fact proves both). Finally, one could evade the charge that Andromache is thus put into a boat twice in the *Little Iliad*, by arguing that 1-5 is set at Troy, where she is put into a boat to take her to Tenedos, and 6-11 at Tenedos, after the Greek assembly at which they award all the spoils (see below). There, Neoptolemos puts her into his boat for the journey home, although it turns out that he only sails to the mainland.
Diomedes, and, later, Menelaos—head for home (165ff).

Proclus gives a less confusing account in his resumé of the Iliupersis:

There is, then, nothing in the Cycle to contradict the version of the Nosti, in which Neoptolemos goes home overland.

There are a few souvenirs of his journey.

Maroneia, on the south coast of Thessaly, is only a few degrees west of Troy itself. Phoenix was buried at Eion, by the mouth of the Strymon. Apollodorus reports that Helenos founded a city:

This may well be Elimeia:

16 cf Apollodorus Ep.6.1; this version solves the difficulties of the Odyssean.

17 Lycophron Alex.417-23.

18 Perret, Neoptolème 21f.
We have seen that Aeneas went with Neoptolemos as his prisoner. An odd scholium suggests that he left his mark on the journey:

"After the Trojan prisoners were freed, Aeneas, son of Anchises, went with Neoptolemos, who had already freed him. On the way back from Troy, he left his mark."

This cannot faithfully reflect the Little Iliad; I suspect that only the description of Aeneas as Neoptolemos’ prisoner does. But Aeneas’ location near Mt. Kissos makes best sense in the context of the land journey back from Troy. Hellanicus attests that Aeneas founded Aeane, on the coast in Rhaikelon (FGrH 4 F 31). His head appeared on coins there in the sixth century.20

This is complicated by the existence of a rival tradition in which Aeneas travelled off his own bat. So he is freed instantly by the Greeks in the first part of II.Parv.fr.21 (IV) B above; and elsewhere escapes entirely.21 Indeed, the Hellanicus fragment I cited above properly belongs in this tradition; and Elymos the Trojan (a possible founder of Elimea) was a

---

19 Hammond, Macedonia 1.301 with n.4.
20 Hammond, Macedonia 1.302.
21 Iliupersis fr.1 B = EGF Dub.
member of this party. But the two traditions are evidently not entirely discrete; and so both may cast light on Neoptolemos' journey, although it would be impossible to conclude that any one detail was shared by both.

From Elimea, a main route leads down to Thessaly. It was taken by Xerxes, and is the course of the modern road. It crosses the Cambunian mountains through the Volutsana Pass, near Sarandaporou; descends to the plain of Elassona, and then follows the Titaresios down into Thessaly.

The Encounter with the Molossoi

The question which we must now confront is: why does Neoptolemos ignore this simple route home, and instead fight the Molossoi, whose land Pindar locates on the other side of Greece?

The answer to the first part of this question is suggested by Nilsson's insight: in the earliest stages of this story, Neoptolemos set out from Thessaly to attack the Molossoi; the episode was only later accreted into the plot of the Ností, as

22 Note the confusion between him and the Tyrrhenian Elymas, who is also credited with the foundation of Aeane, just to the west of Elimea. Presumably, this is connected - at whatever remove - with Aeneas.

23 It is detailed by Perret, Neoptoléme 23 n.3, and Hammond, Macedonia 1.117.

24 Hdt.7.113, 173; How and Wells on 7.128.1.

25 cf Hammond, Epirus 385.
Neoptolemos' career became canonized. This is attractive, but unprovable.

Further, the Molossi themselves were originally located in the uplands on both sides of the Pindus range; only later were they confined to the western. So, for example, Hecataeus puts the Orestai, who are firmly situated up the Haliacmon (Strabo 7.7.8), under the umbrella of Μολοσσικῶν ἔθνων (FGKH 1 F 107). The Talares were another Molossian tribe, who lived on Pindus (Strabo 9.5.12). Both Orestai and Talares are described as neighbours of Thessaly, and so on the east side of the Pindus. (For what it is worth, Euripides seems to use the Molossi as the defining western boundary of Admetos' Thessalian kingdom (Alic.590-6).) Under Mt Kerketikon, an outcrop on the east side of the Pindus range, lay (and lies) Pialis, named, argued Nilsson, for Pielos, the ancestor of the Molossian royal tribe of the Pialeis.

That the Thessalian Neoptolemos should fight Molossi on the eastern side of the Pindus range is entirely understandable; at least, these Molossi would have threatened the route to the east down the Haliacmon; at worst, they may have been the Thessalians' upland neighbours, overlooking the

1 See Perret, Neoptolème 16.
2 Perret, Neoptolème 16-19 (who over-states and over-schematizes the case); Hammond, Epirus 411, 462, 465.
3 Strabo uses Hecataeus for this ethnography and a good deal else besides. Hammond's demonstration of this is impressive (Epirus 443ff).
4 Strabo 9.5.11. Thessaly annexed them.
5 Epirus 24f.
enviably rich land of the plain of Thessaly. Strabo records the Thessalians' struggles against such people. Neoptolemos' battle with the Molossoi was the mythical figuring of such a struggle.

On this model, a fight against the Molossoi is not such a detour; indeed, if the Molossoi were threatening the trade route to the east, Neoptolemos would have met them as he returned by it, up the Haliacmon. The Thessalians' success in keeping the uplanders away means that Neoptolemos has to go further west to find his adversary.

This reconstruction may seem speculative; but it fits what evidence there is, and answers what difficulties there are.

Further, Hecataeus' use of Μολοσσικων έδυνος as an umbrella term testifies to the prosperity of the Molossoi. Strabo records:

\[\text{Tων μὲν οὖν Ἡπειρωτῶν ἐδυν ἡμὶν εἶναι θεόποιμως τεταρτακαίδεκα, τούτων δὲ ἐνδοξάτα Ἀχαῖας καὶ Μολοττοΐ διὰ τὸ ἄρεια ποτὲ πάσης τῆς Ἡπειρώτιδος πρῶτον μὲν Ἀχαῖας, ἐστεροὺν δὲ Μολοττώις...} \]

(7.7.5)

Again, this information seems to come from Hecataeus. Hammond dates the Chaonian period of power to the first part of the 9.5.11 — but see Hammond, Epirus 479: this was not until later.

7 Perret points out that the story of the Lapiths and the Centaurs may also be seen as expressive of lowland Thessalian fear of their upland neighbours (Neoptolème 20f).

8 The whole is nicely summed up by Perret, Légende Troyenne 220.
last millennium B.C.; the Molossian follows and continues down to the time of the Persian Wars. 9

Towards the end of this period, the Molossoi seem to have become, to some extent, hellenized. The west coast of Epirus was colonized during the seventh century, and it was then that the oracle at Dodona came into prominence. And although the Molossoi inland were linked with the Macedonians of the north, rather than the Hellenes of the south, the accuracy of Hecataeus’ information about inland Epirus, as preserved in Strabo, suggests that trade had opened up the interior by the end of the sixth century. 10 Herodotus includes a Molossian, Alkon, in his list of Agarista’s suitors, whom Kleisthenes tests, Ἑλλήνων ἀπόντων ἔξευρόν τὸν ἀριστον. 11 But he is the very last on the list, which runs, roughly, widdershins around Greece. This marriage is dated to the early part of the sixth century. A century later, Themistokles took refuge with the Molossian king Admetos: in this exotic episode, the Molossian is again represented as standing at the margin of the Greek world. 12

But elsewhere, Thucydides dismisses the Molossoi as ἐβαρβαροί (2.68; 80.5-6). 13 Our earliest indisputable evidence for the existence of a Greek genealogy of their ruling house is

---

9 Epirus 479f.
10 Hammond, Epirus 476f; he gives some archaeological support.
12 Thuc.1.136-7.
13 The case for uncivilized Molossoi during Pindar’s time is well made by Woodbury, Neoptolemos 121-3.
in Euripides’ *Andromache* (1247ff) of c.425; the earliest Greek inscription found there dates only from the fourth century; and the earliest Greek nomothete to rule Molossia seems to have been Tharrhypas, who was educated in Athens and then ruled at the end of the fifth century:

Θαρρύπαοι πρώτον ἱστορῶσιν Ἑλληνικῶς ἔθεοι καὶ γράμματα καὶ νόμους φιλανθρώπους διακοσμήσαντα τὰς πόλεις δυναστῶν γενέσθαι.

(Plutarch *Pyrrhus* 1.4)

But a passage in N.7 is relevant here:

Μολοσσία δ’ ἐμφασισθεὶπ ἀλήγων χρόνον. ἄταρ γένος αἰει φέρει τοῦτό οἱ γέρας.

(N.7.38-40)

This seems to be evidence, which ante-dates Euripides, for the story of a ruling dynasty headed by Neoptolemos.

But Perret argued that the correct translation was: "Mais, pour toujours sa race conserva le souvenir, glorieux pour lui, de ce règne." But there is no knockdown reason to interpret the phrase in this less natural and less sensible sense. Lloyd-Jones asserts that the word order shows that the dative is attributive; but Carey, that if it were, φέρει of would be more normal. Best to interpret the phrase, with Carey, as

14 Neoptolème 9-11.

15 Woodbury tries to resuscitate Perret’s arguments: Neoptolemos 131ff. But on this interpretation, who are the γένος? If he did not found the dynasty, how can it be “sa race”?

16 Lloyd-Jones, *Modern Interpretation* 131 n.122a; Carey, S *Odes* 151ff. Lloyd-Jones also appeals to the authority of des Places, who is far from certain about the matter, and comments that Perret overstated the case (des Places 31f, cf 27). (Lloyd-Jones’ note may have been an afterthought, for on 132 he writes that “the epinician alludes to the claim of the fifth century kings of Molossia to be descended from Neoptolemos.”)
evidence of a dynastic genealogy of Neoptolemos in the early part of the fifth century.17

And this seems confirmed by Hammond's analysis of Strabo's indebtedness to Hecataeus. We may ascribe the following information - part of which I quoted above - to Hecataeus:18

Τῶν μὲν οὖν Ἡπειρώτων ξένη φησιν εἶναι θεόποποις τετταρεακαὶδέκα, τούτων δ' ένυδρότατα Χάουνας καὶ Μολοττοὶ διὰ τὸ ἄρεια ποτὲ πάσης τῆς Ἡπειρώτητος πρότερον μὲν Χάουνας, ἄτερον δὲ Μολοττοὺς, οἷ' καὶ διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ κλέον ηδέοθησαν (τῶν μὲν Ἀλκιδῶν ἦσαν) καὶ διὰ τὸ παρὰ τούτων εἶναι τὸ ἐν ἀνδρῶν μοντεῖον, πολιαίον τε καὶ ὅνωμαστόν ὄν.

(Strabo 7.7.5)19

I return to this genealogy (below, p.340). For the moment, all that is important is that it provides more evidence that the Molossian ruling family claimed descent from Neoptolemos considerably earlier than Thucydides called their tribe ὁμοθαρναὶ. Whatever the character of the bulk of the people, the royal house claimed to be of Hellenic stock.20

17 cf Most, Measures 168. Ferret's alternative is in fact a necessary adjunct to the main thesis of his book, which was published the year after he interpreted this text. There he argues that the Roman myth of Aeneas' journey to and foundation of Rome is late. This would seem to be contradicted by FGrH 4 F 84, in which Hellanicus describes Aeneas' voyage from the Molossoi to Italy. Ferret works hard to rule this quotation out of court; and part of his strategy is that, as there is no early fifth century attestation for Neoptolemos' staying among the Molossoi, this testimony for Aeneas leaving him among the Molossoi cannot be Hellanicus' work (Légende Troyenne 367-79, especially 370). See Boyancé's review, REA 45 (1943), 275-90, passim and especially 286f.

18 Hammond, Epirus 464f, 479f.

19 cf 7.7.8.

20 Most, Nemean 7.64-7 321 n.26. [Scymnus] calls the Molossi
Consideration of the nomadic life of the Molossoi, ranging over the land which the Vlachs were later to inhabit, eases any contradiction which may be perceived here.

And as they might be called Greeks or barbarians, so might their land be included within, or excluded from Greece. I have cited two fifth-century examples of Molossia included at the margins of the Greek world; two instances of its exclusion are given by Plutarch, who describes Perikles’ invitations to his panhellenic congress reaching out only as far as Ambracia (Pericles 17.2), and by Herodotus, who describes the gifts from the Hyperboreans welcomed to Greece only at Dodona (4.33.1-2). Note that in these examples, Molossia is still at the margin of the Greek world, but now just outside it.

The Molossian genealogy stretching back to Neoptolemos is given by Pausanias (1.11); and reduces to this:

```
Neoptolemos + Andromache
    ____________________________
    | Molossos                  |
    | Pielos                    |
    | Pergamos                  |
    | (12 generations)          |
    | Tharrhypas                |
    | Alketas                   |
    | Neoptolemos               |
    | Arybbas                   |
    | Olympias                  |
    | 'Aiakides                 |
    | Alexander                 |
    | King Pyrros               |
```

Proxenus, the third century historian, confirms the crucial detail:

Πρόξενους δὲ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Ἴπειρωτικῶν Νεοπτολέμου μὲν Πιέλον (Schwartz; πρέλλου 0) φησι

μιχάλες βάρβαροι (Periplus 451).
It is to Pielos that the Molossian kings trace their descent. He is the eponym of the Pialeis, a Molossian sub-tribe. It seems that Neoptolemos has simply been grafted onto the old aboriginal Molossian royal genealogy, which began with Pielos, as a founding father.

Plainly, the shift from Neoptolemos’ fight against the Molossi on his way back to Thessaly, to his detour to the west of the Pindus, domination of them and foundation of their ruling house reflects more than a change through time. It reflects also a change of narrator: what begins as a Thessalian story which figures the repression of their neighbours becomes a Molossian charter. The quotation from Strabo illustrates the charter in transparent fashion: the Molossi διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ πλέον ηυξῆςαν (τῶν γὰρ Ἀλαξιδῶν ἵππων) (7.7.5).

21 Cross makes much of the Pielos/Peleus connection; but it is, I think, just a coincidence which may have eased the process I describe below (Epirus 100f).

22 cf Justin.17.3.8. Molossos does not actually appear by name in Thetis’ prophecy about Neoptolemos’ descendants at Eur.Andro.1243f; only in the character list appended to the play.

23 This is all well set out by M. Nilsson, Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece (Lund, 1951, repr. New York, 1972), 105-108, with reference to earlier literature at 105 n.16. He gives short shrift to the alternative genealogies of Neoptolemos (see Σ.Eur.Andr.32, 24): abounding in children whose names suggest charters to most of Greece (Dorieus, Argos, and so on), they represent "the overdone eagerness of a barbarian house to appear as heroic Greeks".

24 "La légende thessalienne est devenue une légende epirote" (Perret, Légende Troyenne 220; cf Boyancé’s review, REA 45 (1943), 275-90, here 287).
If this genealogy dates to some time before Hecataeus, then it may well coincide with the beginnings of regular intercourse between the Molossi and the rest of Greece.\textsuperscript{25} A priori, this seems to me indubitable. As the Molossi became part of the Greek world, they gave themselves a pedigree — an entrée — by adopting their conqueror as their ancestor. This genealogy dates at the latest to the sixth century.\textsuperscript{26}

In light of all this, I give again a scholiast’s version of Neoptolemos’ return home:

\begin{verbatim}
Neoptolemos kata kæleusis thetidos epideos tα ᾳdia skhph pezdos omente. χρησθείς δὲ ὑπὸ Ἐλέουν, ἐνθα ἐν ἰδιοι αἰκιον ἐν σιδηρων themelw, τοιχων δὲ ἐμιλίων καὶ ὅρφου ἔρευν, ἐκεὶ τέμενι, ἑλθων εἰς τὴν Παιβῶτιν λήμνην τῆς Ἡπείρου, καὶ τοὺς ἐγχώριους εὐρω δόρατα πήςαντας καὶ χαλίνας ἀνωθεν καταπετάσαντας καὶ οὕτω σχηματίσαντας, αμβάλλει τόν χρησίμων, καὶ πορθῆςας τὴν Μολοσσίαν ἐξ Ἡμερομάχης ἵσαε Μολοσσάδω, ἄφ’ οὗ καὶ τὸ γένος ἐστὶ τών ἐν Μολοσσίᾳ βασιλέων, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἠρατοθένθης (FGrH 241 F 42).
\end{verbatim}

(Σ.ΕΗΜΟΡΤ.Οδ.3.188)

We see here evidence of a genealogically concerned Molossian version, along with a providentially ordained reason for Neoptolemos to stay in Molossia and not return to Thessaly — again, a symptom of the Molossian charter.

Now Neoptolemos is established as king on the west of the Pindus, we consider: where was his kingdom?

\textsuperscript{25} That this was the time of widespread genealogical activity throughout Greece is a happy accident (West, Catalogue of Women 6-11); cf Calame, Spartan Genealogies 153 and passim.

\textsuperscript{26} Contrast Farnell, who put it back to the eighth (GHC 314); and Wilamowitz, who brought it forward to the fifth (Pindaros 167).
Pambotis, his stopping place in the scholium quoted above, is identified with what is now the lake of Ioannina; but was swamp.\textsuperscript{27} This location of Neoptolemos' Molossia is confirmed by Pindar:\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{quote}
Neoptolemos δ' ἀπείρω διαπρυοί [sc. κρατείν], βουβάται τόθι πρῶυς ἔξοχοι κατάκειται Δωδώναθαι δρχόμενοι πρὸς 'Ἰόνιον πόρου.
\end{quote}

(N.4.51-3)

The \textit{Prometheus Bound} reiterates the association with Dodona:
\begin{quote}
епεῖ γαρ ἡλθες πρὸς Μολοσσὰ γάπεδα τὴν αἰπύνωτον τ' ἀμφὶ Δωδώνην, ἵνα μαντεῖα θάκος τ' ἔστι θεσπρωτοῦ Διὸς...
\end{quote}

(PV 829-31)

And Hecataeus confirms that the -θεν suffix is right:

\begin{quote}
Μολοσσών πρὸς μεσιμβρίης οἰκεόουι Δωδώναθοι.
\end{quote}

(FGrH 1 F 108)\textsuperscript{29}

Of the \textit{N.}4 passage, Woodbury writes: "It is certain that Pindar extends the kingdom to the sea, but not immediately clear what land-mark he intends."\textsuperscript{30} But there is no reason why Pindar should intend any precise land-mark.\textsuperscript{31} The extent of the

\textsuperscript{27} Hyginus astr.2.23; Hammond, \textit{Epirus} 39.

\textsuperscript{28} This question is well discussed by Woodbury, \textit{Neoptolemos} 115-21.

\textsuperscript{29} cf Strabo's description of Molossian power διὰ τὸ παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι τὸ ἐν Δωδώνη μαντεῖον (7.7.5). I skirt the problems of whether Dodona was under Molossian control: Hammond, \textit{Epirus} 453, 479; Woodbury, \textit{Neoptolemos} 116 n.84. Pindar is not delineating the Molossian kingdom as accurately as Woodbury argues, but, in Dodona, he chooses a famous landmark to the south of central Molossia.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Neoptolemos} 116f.

\textsuperscript{31} Woodbury, and Most (\textit{Nemean} 7.64-67, 318f) are, in their interpretations of this passage, primarily concerned with illuminating \textit{N.}7.64f. A precise referent for "Ionian Sea" in Pindar would, of course, be helpful for that crux. But the sea's limits are not to be found here, there, or at P.3.68,
sea is left vague here, as it is in the Prometheus Bound (836-41).

But this does not mean that the whole reference to Neoptolemos' kingdom is to be written off as vague speculation. I have noted that Aw6w6»w is right, if only as an inland marker. The area was famous for its cattle. But particularly accurate is Pindar's description of the mountains. They do lie in ridges (μπόλακενταυ); and they do stretch right to the sea (πρωνες ἐκοχοι). Most correctly insists that these are not just forelands; they are jutting, mountainous promontories.

These are telling details. Even if they do not delineate Neoptolemos' kingdom, they evoke it precisely.

There is no doubt that this kingdom stretches to the coast. But it seems that, in the historical period, Molossian territory only extended to the sea in the fourth century. [Scylax], the fourth century geographer, mentions a short where the voyage from Thebes to Sicily cuts through it. Woodbury's "land-mark" and Most's confident assertion that "Pindar never refers to any location on the eastern side of the Adriatic more northerly than Dodona and Ephyra" (op.cit. 318), from which he infers that the Ionian Sea is south of Epirus, are groundless.

There is not enough evidence for any sensible judgement of Pindar's geography in general: Macan (Pindar 46) and Starr (Historical Spirit 397) draw contradictory conclusions from the same data.

32 Perret, Neoptolême 14 n.1.
33 Hammond, Epirus 41; cf Pambotis.
35 e.g. II.17.747, 8.557; Nemean 7.64-67 320 n.22.
36 Certainty is impossible. This assumption seems more plausible, and is worse for my argument.
coastline (32); Strabo confines the Molossi inland (they do not feature, for example, in his coasting description at 7.7.5). Again, if we work on the assumption that Strabo is here using Hecataeus, the inference is that the Molossi only later reached the sea; and this tallies with their slow progress west. 37

But it is not simply the case that Pindar is exaggerating the Molossian kingdom by stretching it to the sea, years before it actually gained a coastline. For to Neoptolemos was ascribed the foundation of Byllis, on the coast:

πόλις Ἰλυρίδος παραβαλασσία, τῶν μετὰ Νεοπτολέμου Μυρμιδόνων κτίσμα.

(Steph. Byz. s.v. Βύλλης)

Hammond identifies this as modern Plaka, just north of Arcoceraunia (which Woodbury identified as the terminus of Neoptolemos' kingdom). 38 Certainly, it is the most mountainous jutting promontory there.

Now, this might suggest a detachment of settlers left by Neoptolemos, as he marched further inland with the main party. But Pausanias both records that his kingdom did reach the coast, and explains the reason for it ceasing to do so:

Neoptolemos

πρώτος γὰρ ὅτι οὗτος ἀλούσης Ἰλίου τὴν μὲν ἐς Θεσσαλίαν ὑπερείδειν ἀναχώρησαν, ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἑπείρου κατάρας ἐνταῦθα ἐκ τῶν Ἐλένου χρημῶν ἔκαμε. καὶ οἱ παῖς ἐκ μὲν Ἐρμιόνης ἐγένετο οὐδεῖς, ἐκ τῶν Ἀνδρομάχης δὲ Μολοσσός καὶ Πέλος καὶ νεώτατος δὲ Πέργαμος. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ Ἐλεύσι Κεστρίνου· τούτῳ

37 Hammond, Epirus 453, 523, 469; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 119f.
38 Hammond, Epirus 472.
So, after Helenos' death, Neoptolemos' kingdom was divided. Although ὑπὲρ θύαμων ποταμῶν is not the most helpful indication (the river separates not Kestrine from Molossia, but Kestrine from Thesprotia at Thuc. 1.46.4), Pausanias' description is not inconsistent with Molossian removal from the sea.

From Kestrinos was descended the Chaonian royal house; and it is Chaonia which appears in Strabo where one might expect to find Molossia:

Χάονες μὲν οὖν καὶ θεσπρωτοὶ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτος δέρες Κασσωπαίου (καὶ οὗτοι δ' εἶναι θεσπρωτοὶ) τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Κεραυνίων ὄρων μέχρι τοῦ 'Αμβροσίου κόλπου παραλίας νέμονται χώραν εὐδαίμονα ἔχοντες.

(7.7.5)

Pausanias' story of the partition of Neoptolemos' kingdom fits these data; but what is its provenance? We note that Pausanias also gives here the Molossian genealogy I outlined above, which grafts Neoptolemos onto the tree of the aboriginal Pielos. He is, then, following a Molossian story in those

39 See the genealogy above, p.340.

40 This argument is Woodbury's, Neoptolemos 120f. On the position of Kestrine, Hammond, Epirus 480, 677f.

41 Cross suggested that his genealogy was a late invention (Epirus 101); but see Hammond, Epirus 413. Further, Helenos is not, as we have seen, such a stranger to Molossian myth as Cross implies.
details; and so, we may infer, in this story also.

This seems to be confirmed by his inclusion of the fact that Neoptolemos sailed to Molossia. Once the Molossoi are located in a coastal region to the west of the Pindus, the notion of Neoptolemos encountering them during his overland march back to Thessaly becomes implausible. Once the foundation of Byllis is ascribed to his men, it becomes inconceivable. And so, he was brought by boat to land on the west coast, and thence went east. The notion of survivors of the Trojan War shipwrecked on the shore of Epirus was an old one, and so easily honed to answer the present need. Hammond found Late Helladic III sherds at Plaka (Byllis), "consistent with the tradition of a foundation by the companions of Neoptolemos." This suggests to me that a story of its foundation by Greeks returning from Troy was hijacked to refer to the Myrmidons in particular.

Again, this seems to be a local story. Only the Molossoi would be concerned enough to rule out the geographical inconsistency. Its concerns are nicely matched by another late testimony:

...alii dicunt, [quod] cum Helenus cum Pyrrho ab Ilio navigaret et tempestate iactarentur, Chaonem, unum e Trojanis, amicum Heleni, vovisse ut, si illi periculum evasissent, se pro eorum incolum-

42 The overland route to Byllis is, in fact, charted by Hammond, Macedonia 1.300-2 - but note its circuity (300).
43 Thus Lokrians founded Thronion or Orikon (Paus.5.22.4); and Trojans seem to have packed the area; Hammond, Epirus 384, 412f.
44 Epirus 472.
nitate interimeret; qui se, postquam illi evaserunt, sicut promisit, occidit; unde factum est ut ex eius nomine Helenus, adeptus regnum, Epirum Chaoniam nominaret.

(Serv. ad Aen. 3.335)

Here, Helenos is travelling with Neoptolemos; they are going by sea and suffering in the storm; Helenos becomes king; and calls the coast where he landed not Molossia but Chaonia. There must be a common source to this and Pausanias' sketch of the earliest history of the place.

It is this Molossian tradition which Pindar reflects in his accounts of Neoptolemos' adventures after the fall of Troy.

I recapitulate its evolution. Neoptolemos is originally a Thessalian hero whose struggles against the upland Molossoi reflect the fear the plain dwellers feel for their fertile land. As the Thessalians successfully repulse the uplanders, the threat changes: now, it is the trade route to the east at the head of the Haliacmon valley which is endangered. Neoptolemos' fight against the Molossoi is relocated. It is incorporated into the canon of his adventures: he fights the Molossoi when he travels up the Haliacmon, on his return by foot from Troy. Then more success means that he must chase the Molossoi over the Pindus mountains.

The Molossoi gradually become incorporated into the Greek world; they begin to trade over the Pindus range. They claim, as their ancestor, the hero who, the Greeks tell them, harried them over the mountains. He is introduced to their ancestry. Now his journey must be honed, for it is a matter of importance. His stay in Molossia is divinely ordained, and, finally, his journey is rationalized: he came, like others, to Epirus by boat.
The only part of this which can be dated, and only vaguely at that, is the last. The Molossoi had taken the story and were adapting it, in the sixth century.

Why should Pindar follow what was originally a Molossian story? We are not compelled to believe that he or his patron had a special relationship with the royal house. For this story seems to have become the dominant version: we note, in particular, that in the Paean, also, Neoptolemos is depicted as sailing from Troy (110). There were two alternatives: his successful return to Phthia, allowing a clash between Andromache and Hermione, later exploited by the tragedians, and a return to Scyros. But both of these were overshadowed by the momentous episodes in Neoptolemos' life which preceded and followed. The Molossian story filled this flat spot.

Neoptolemos at Delphi

Only the bare fact of Neoptolemos' violent death at Delphi remains constant throughout the ancient evidence. The details which attend his death - in particular, his reason for going to Delphi, the identity of his killer, and the killer's reason - shift from account to account. So, in Pindar, he goes to

45 A faint tradition, evidenced by Paus.3.25.1.
dedicate spoils from Troy; in Pherecydes, to question the oracle; in Euripides, first to demand satisfaction for the death of his father, but then, to apologize for his presumption; elsewhere, to plunder the sanctuary. The killer is a Delphian or Delphians, a Delphic priest, Machaireus or Philoxenides, or Apollo, or Orestes, or Menelaos. He dies because Apollo was punishing him; because he interfered in Delphic sacrificial practice; or in a brawl over sacrificial meat.

Finally, he is buried within the god's enclosure at Delphi; and is held in honour, or dishonour.

This last detail points up the ambiguities which run through the whole matter: is Neoptolemos a victim, or a criminal? Does he go to Delphi with friendly, or hostile intent? Is his death accidental or divinely endorsed - or simply the result of human machination?

Where Pindar's two accounts deal with these matters, they do so differently. In Pae.6 Apollo vows to kill Neoptolemos, after he has murdered Priam. But in N.7, he goes to dedicate

---

1 For a list of versions, roughly sorted, see Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 212. E.g.: spoils: N.7.40f; query: Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a; satisfaction: Eur. Andro.49-55; plunder: Strabo 9.3.9; cf Σ.Ν.7.58.
3 Punishment: Pae.6.112-7; interference: Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a; brawl: N.7.42.
4 N.7.44-47; Paus.1.4.4: the Delphians ἔχουτες ὁτε ἄνδρας πολέμιον καὶ τὸ μνῆμα ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ.
spoil at Delphi, is killed almost accidentally and mourned there.

As we have seen, Aristarchus and Aristodemus thought this shift Pindar’s deliberate response to Aeginetan outrage at the first version:

δ δὲ Ἀριστόδημος, ἦτο μέμφεθας ὑπὸ Αἰγίνητῶν ἐπὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐπὶ Παιδίσιν εἰπεῖν τῷ Νεοπτολέμου ἐπὶ ιεροσυλίᾳ ἐλημυθέναι εἰς Δελφοὺς, νῦν δὲ περὶ ὑπεραπολογεῖται εἰπὼν, ὡς ὁ Ιεροσύλλη τετελεύτησεν, ἀλλ’ ὁπερ κρεών φιλοτιμηθαίς ἀνηρέθη.

(Σ.Ν.7.150a)

Those who see N.7 as some kind of Rechtfertigungslied may use the shifts in the myth as evidence of the correctness of Aristarchus’ guess. On this model, Pindar’s two versions set off variations in the subsequent mythological tradition: the positive depiction of Neoptolemos springs from Pindar’s concern to please the Aeginetans.

But there is no compelling evidence for this view. We have seen that the positive depiction of Neoptolemos’ behaviour at Troy, which, I have argued, is closely relevant to the manner of his death, existed not only in the Odyssey, but in the Little Iliad also. Further, the notion that Pindar is inventing the story he gives in N.7 leaves various matters unexplained. Neoptolemos seems to have performed some religious function at Delphi in the fifth century (N.7.46f with

---

5 e.g. Carey, 5 Odes 134.

6 Note the implicit exaggeration of the scope of the evidence against a positive depiction of Neoptolemos prior to Pindar’s offered by Most (Measures 165; 208).
I.68a). His tomb lay within the *temenos* of Apollo. These data do not conflict with the account of P.7, in which his honours appear as recompense for his death. If anything, they are puzzling when juxtaposed with the picture of Pae.6, which, presumably, follows Delphic orthodoxy. There, Neoptolemos is certainly punished as a sacrilegious murderer, and depicted, if the alleged Aeginetan interpretation of παρ' θυμῶν is correct, as a temple robber. And yet, he was buried in the *temenos*. This problem is not simply to be solved by appeal to the refrain that heroes are not saints.

To explain the possibility of a story of the burial of a sacrilegist in Apollo's *temenos*, it seems that an appeal to some paradox, or at least ambivalence, in the Delphic tradition itself, is necessary. But once that ambivalence is discovered, it may accommodate the differing emphases in Pindar's two versions; it may show how Neoptolemos' death, as punishment, is reconcilable with his role at Delphi; how the Delphians' grief is reconcilable with Apollo's will; and how the working of Apollo's will is reconcilable with the death in a brawl. If an ambivalence inherent in the mythological tradition can do this, it may render Aristarchus' theory redundant.

7 Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 64. In some sense, the myth is simply its aetiology: Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 1.315; Defradas, *Propagande Delphique* 148.

8 See e.g. Carey's description of the poem's argument (5 Odes 180ff).

9 Carey, 5 Odes 153f.

10 e.g. Van der Kolf, *Quaeritur* 50; Delcourt, *Pyrrhos* 38; Slater, *Doubts* 207; cf Lloyd-Jones, *Modern Interpretation* 136f; Frazer, *Apollodorus* 254ff n.1.
I shall argue that the shifts between *Pae.6* and *N.7* do reflect such an ambivalence. It is the traditional figure of Neoptolemos which is extraordinary, not the relation of the two poems. It furnished material suitable for both a Delphic paean for Apollo and an Aeginetan epinician. Pindar simply selected material appropriate for each occasion. His attitude was ambivalent, because the tradition was.

The problem, of course, is that the earliest sure evidence for any stage in the development of this tradition dates from the first part of the fifth century—be it *Pae.6*, *N.7*, or the testimony of Pherecydes (perhaps a little earlier). Nevertheless, we may speculate.

I present two models which explain the ambiguities of the Delphic tradition. On the first, which I have confined to the Appendix, those ambiguities are resolved by appeal to the paradoxes inherent in the ritual of sacrifice practiced at Delphi. This hypothesis, although it would neatly complement the rest of my argument, is not entailed by it.

On the second model, the ambivalences are the product of political changes at Delphi in the sixth century, and turn on the takeover of the sanctuary by the Anthelan Amphictiony at the beginning of the sixth century. Traditionally, this is thought to have been the result of the First Sacred War, dated to 595-590.\(^\text{11}\) Whether the war actually took place is now a moot point.\(^\text{12}\) But by 548 the Amphictiony, a league of surrounding...

---

\(^1\text{1}^\) Σ. hypoth. P. b, d; inscr. N. 9: Forrest, *First Sacred War*.

\(^1\text{2}^\) Its historicity was thoroughly doubted by Robertson, *Sacred War*; for a reply, see G. A. Lehmann, "Der "erste heilige Krieg" — eine Fiktion?", *Historia* 29 (1980), 242-6.
peoples, including the Thessalians, had taken control of Delphi, for they set about rebuilding Apollo's temple. The Pythian games were first celebrated by the victorious Amphictions, supposedly in the 580s. It seems that the Thessalians were expanding towards the south in the seventh century; and that the Anthelan Amphictiony was dominated by them. The Amphictionic takeover may, then, be dated to the same period as that to which the Sacred War is traditionally ascribed - whether or not the war happened.

It seems highly plausible that the Delphians of the late seventh century may have feared an Amphictionic anschluss before it occurred. That fear, I suggest, found expression in the story of Neoptolemos’ visit to Delphi: the supreme Thessalian hero tries to plunder the temple (or interfere with traditional Delphic practice) and is punished with his death.

13 Hdt.2.180; 5.62.
15 cf e.g. Hdt.8.27; J. A. O. Larsen’s review of Sordi, La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno (Rome, 1958), CP 55 (1960), 230-239.
16 Jeffrey, Archaic Greece 72f.
17 So Forrest, First Sacred War 42f; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 100f; E. W. Kase and G. J. Szemler, "The Amphiktyonic League and the First Sacred War: a New Perspective", Proc. 7th FIEC Congress (ed. J. Harmatta) V.1 (Budapest, 1984), 107-116, here 116 n.41. Robertson too dates the takeover simply to the first part of the sixth century (Sacred War 49f).
18 Whether Delphi was already an important religious centre or not, it, or rather the access to the sea just to its west, was an important strategic point (Kase and Szemler, op. cit.).
19 So, tentatively, Woodbury, Neoptolemos 103. Cf Defradas, Propagande Delphique 155, who dates the enmity of hero and god.
That Neoptolemos represents an actual expansionist force emerges most clearly in this Pindaric scholium:

\[ \text{οἱ δὲ } \text{φασιν } \text{ὅτι } \text{ἐπιτεθέμενος } \text{τοῖς } \text{Πελοποννήσου πράγμασι } \text{διαρράσσει } \text{πρῶτον } \text{ἐπέβαλε } \text{τὸ } \text{ἐν } \text{Δελφοῖς } \text{ιερὸν } \text{ἥτις } \text{χρηστήριον}\]

(Σ.Η.7.58)\(^{20}\)

Two other factors confirm the story.\(^{21}\) Apollo's enmity towards the Greeks who attack Troy, and Achilles in particular, makes Neoptolemos, Achilles' son, who sacks Troy, a plausible victim for Apollo's servants.\(^{22}\) By now, too, Delphic Apollo must have assumed a moral dimension, which enables the antagonism to become even more clear cut. Priam's death is exploited as a crime for which Neoptolemos is punished.\(^{23}\)

Now follows the takeover of the Amphictiony, transparently authorized in the vaticinium ex eventu at the end of the Homeric hymn. Apollo instructs the keepers of his sanctuary:

\[ \text{δεξιερῆ Μόλ' ἔκαστος ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μάχαιραν ἀφάξειν αἰεὶ μῆλα } \text{τὰ δ' ἀφθονα πάντα παρέσται, δοσα ἐμοὶ } \text{ἄγανως περικυλλατά πῦλ' ἀνθρώπως } \text{υἱῦ δὲ προφύλαχθε, δέδεχατε δὲ πῦλ' ἀνθρώπως ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρομένων καὶ } \text{ἐμὴν ἣδιν τῷ μάλιστα}\]
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to the second part of the seventh century, "époque où les Delphiens s'inquiètent des visées des Amphictions d'Anthela sur les richesses de leur sanctuaire".

\(^{20}\) cf Σ.Ευρ.Οτ.1655.

\(^{21}\) I suggest in the Appendix that the story of Neoptolemos' death in Delphi was originally the story of the sacrifice of an aboriginal Delphic character, Pyrrhos. If this is so, then we are dealing here not with the invention of a story, but its adaptation and politicization. The identification of the Delphic Pyrrhos and the Thessalian Neoptolemos is, above all, enabled by the fact that Neoptolemos was also known as Pyrrhos.

\(^{22}\) Defradas, Propagande Delphique 154.

\(^{23}\) The Νεοπτολέμεως τίς - see above, p.321f.
540 ἄν τι τῆς Κυλλον ἔτοις ἔσεσθαι ἵν τι ἔργον,
ὔβρις θ', ἢ δέμις ἐστὶ καταθητῶν διάδοσις,
ἄλλοι ἔπειθ' ὅμιν σημάτωρες ἄνδρες ἔσονται,
543 τῶν ὑπ' ἀναγκαίη δεδημακαθ' ἡμῶν πάντα,
εἴρηται τοι πάντα, οὐ δὲ φρεσί' σχίζει φύλαξαι.

(H. h. Ap. 535-44)

540-43 seem to be grafted into the hymn, and endorse the Amphictyon's behaviour. The Crisaeans' misbehaviour is specified only much later: they cultivated the sacred ground of the plain of Itea; or they too heavily taxed visitors to the site; or they interfered with the visitors' offerings. The authenticity of these charges is even more questionable than the historicity of the war itself. Nevertheless, they do tally with the lines of the hymn, and do exemplify the justification of an attack on a holy place: it is rescued from maladministration for the common benefit.

Neoptolemos fits into this scheme exactly as we should expect. His story is now told by the Thessalians: their hero goes to visit the sanctuary in a friendly spirit; and when there attempts to correct unfair Delphic practice—just as the Amphictyon marches to stop interference with visitors'

24 Forrest, First Sacred War. Cf Robertson, Sacred War 48-50.
25 Paus. 10.37.4; Strabo 9.3.4; Aeschines 3.107.
26 Woodbury, Neoptolemos 100-3, in particular 103. Only he explains contradictions in the story of Neoptolemos by appeal to a change of narrator. Both Defradas (Propagande Delphique 155f) and Fontenrose (Cult and Myth 221f) describe Neoptolemos as a political figure, for the Crisaeans and the Thessalians respectively, but understate the difficulties.
27 H.7.40f; Eur. Andro. 1107: Orestes is peddling the other view (1090ff).
28 Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a.
offerings. In some sense he corrects the mismanagement of the
place: for after his death he is ἁμακότως there.  

I suggest, then, the following scheme. In the seventh
century, when the threat of Thessalian expansionism was felt in
Delphi, Neoptolemos' attack on the temple and death figured
Delphic defiant apprehension of Thessalian influence. The
Delphians' moral advantage was emphasized by the depiction of
Neoptolemos' death as punishment for his sacrilege at the sack
of Troy.

After their takeover of Delphi, the Amphictions justified
their action by depicting it as a crusade against the maladmin-
istration of the sanctuary. Neoptolemos' visit was now
redescribed to exemplify the behaviour of the Crisaeans' regime; he became the precursor of the crusaders.

I have so far ducked the question of Neoptolemos' cult at
Delphi. Pausanias denies that one existed before 278, when
fantastic warriors helped to defend the sanctuary against
Gallic attack:


29 Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 222.
30 N.7.47.
31 To all this, compare Herakles' struggle with Apollo over the
Delphic tripod, a story of rivalry crystalized by the war
(broadly, H. W. Parke and J. Boardman, "The Struggle for the
tripod and the First Sacred War", JHS 77 (1957), 276-82, here
277f and passim.
Some critics reject this testimony as a mistake, appealing to literary and archaeological evidence, and a priori reasoning.

A shrine of Neoptolemos has indeed been discovered. And so Fontenrose "can point to the incontrovertible fact of the peribolos and altar" to prove the cult. But the peribolos and altar date from the fourth century only. Nevertheless, a Mycenaean pithos was discovered there, filled with ash, bones and ceramics. "Il est tentant de reconnaître en lui une sorte de bothros, et peut-être pouvons-nous conclure de sa présence à l'existence d'un culte, dès l'époque mycénienne, à l'endroit où plus tard on montrait le pretendu tombeau de Néoptolème." But the problem is: there is no trace of any activity there between the Mycenaean age and the fourth century.

---

32 cf 10.24.6: καὶ οἱ κατὰ ξύτος ἡμαλήσων οἱ Δελφοῖ.
33 Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 191-205 argues on these and other, specious, grounds.
34 Though no inscription clinches the identification, Pausanias' description identifies the shrine as Neoptolemos' (Paus. 10.24.6; J. Pouilloux, Feuilles de Delphes (Paris, 1960) 2.54f; Fontenrose Cult and Myth 191, 194).
35 Cult and Myth 192f.
36 Pouilloux op. cit. 2.53.
38 Pouilloux, op. cit. 2.55-59 - noting Lerat’s doubts over his earlier judgement quoted above: how could the cult have survived in a vacuum (57)?
This is a real difficulty for those who hold that Neo-
ptolemos was worshipped in cult there from an early date. So
Burkert admits, but claims that Pindar (N. 7.46f) fills the gap,
proving that the cult was continuous: Neoptolemos was fated
φησιν ἣρωίς δὲ πολιταίς θεμιστόποιν οἱ κεῖν ἔδυτα πολυθύτοις.
But Pindar's language cannot easily refer to a cult of
Neoptolemos: it is merely an assertion that he had a role to
perform in Delphi.

Now, the Mycenaean remains might well indicate an ancient
sacred site, older than Apollo's worship. Then, it appears
that it has, far from being cultivated, actually been avoided
until the fourth century. Perhaps this avoidance indicates a
special status. Elsewhere, the temple robber was refused
burial:

οἱ δὲ λοχροὶ τὴν ἀναμνήσειν οὐ συγχωροῦντες ἀπόκρισιν ἔδωκαν ὦτι παρὰ πάσι τοῖς Ἐλληνικοῖς κοινῶς νόμος ἐστὶν ἀδάφους διπτεθαὶ τοὺς ἱεροσύλους.

(Diod. Sic. 16.25.2)

39 See Woodbury, Neoptolemos 98 n.12; Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 191.
40 Pyrrhos 440 n.2.
41 Equally, Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64, which Most claims disproves
"Pausanias' allegation... that Neoptolemos was not honoured at
Delphi until his epiphany" (Measures 163 n.135), does not prove
cult. "Honoured" is not helpful here.
42 So Woodbury, Neoptolemos 98, Burkert, HN 120; but Pouilloux,
op. cit. 2.59f, is cautious.
43 Fontenrose, arguing on an entirely different tack, rightly
points out the unlikelihood of the tomb, being in such a pro-
minent place, simply being forgotten (Cult and Myth 194; cf
Woodbury, Neoptolemos 128).
44 Rohde, Psyche 187f n.33.
On one account, Neoptolemos was a temple robber. In other words, he might have had a tomb inside the tezenos which was known but uncelebrated. This dovetails neatly with the reconstruction offered above of the earliest stage of the mythological tradition, in which the Delphians expressed their fear and defiance of Thessalian expansionism by depicting Neoptolemos as an aggressor who is killed. The tomb identified by the Delphians as his is, naturally, prominent but shunned, a token of successful Delphic resistance to his incursion. This hypothesis tallies with the archaeological and literary evidence; and defeats the a priori argument of the impossibility of tomb without cult. Certainly, it accommodates the apparently contradictory evidence of the tomb existing without cult.

From this hostile beginning starts Neoptolemos’ slow integration towards full cult.

In the third century AD, in the romance Aethiopica, Heliodorus describes a lavish theoria undertaken by the tribe of the Aenianes every four years, in which they offer a heca-tomb at Pyrrhos’ tomb. During early migrations, the Aenianes covered the same ground as the Molossians, chased by

---

45 We recall Pausanias’ description of the Delphians εξουτες οτε ανδρος πολεμίου και το μνημ' εν θεμίσ.

46 Again, Woodbury has most of this (Neoptolemos 128-31).

47 Fontenrose relies heavily on Heliodorus (Cult and Myth 195-8); I extract only a few facts (so also Woodbury, Neoptolemos 128f), and note that they tally with the drift of my argument. Certainly, Heliodorus’ ceremony is extremely lavish; but he does say η ου μυδ θεωρια καὶ πλευκατε τὰς θάλας, άχιλλειδης γάρ εύμοι ανεμόυται δ' τῆς θεωριας εξάρχων (2.34.4). This exaggeration does not rule out the historic kernel.
Neoptolemos westwards. And according to Heliodorus, the Aenianes, like the Molossoi, claimed descent from Neoptolemos.

Now, the Aenianes were original members of the Anthelan Amphictiony, and were thus part of the Amphictiony's takeover of Delphi. It is, then, tempting to see their theoria as a custom which sprang from the new attitude towards Neoptolemos. Certainly, Heliodorus represents it as of high antiquity; and says that it occurs at the same time as the Pythian games — which were instituted, as we have seen, by the Amphictions, to celebrate their successful acquisition of the sanctuary.

This quadrennial festival is the beginning of the move towards cult; it is performed by foreigners who are unencumbered by an ingrained attitude towards Pyrrhos, and it only occasionally challenges his status in the sanctuary — and then at an unusual festival time.

In the fifth century, part of the Delphians' old traditional attitude appears in Paean 6. Neoptolemos' death is divinely ordained as his punishment for his killing of Priam. Although perhaps logically contrary to the new Delphic orthodoxy, the Neoptolemeic τίοις, turning on the symmetry of crime and punishment, and exploiting Apollo's new role of moral arbiter, is too good a twist to be forgotten. This version is

48 Plut. QG.13; cf Woodbury, Neoptolemos 127f.
49 Aethiopica 2.34.5-7; cf 11.2.749f.
50 Paus.10.8.2; Jeffrey, Archaic Greece 73.
51 Antiquity: Aethiopica 3.5; Pythian games: 2.34.3.
52 Carey, 5 Odes 153.
the natural one for the audience. Old details which baldly contradict the new orthodoxy are not used.

N.7, on the other hand, reflecting Aeginetan interest in Neoptolemos, follows the Thessalian line. Neoptolemos' intentions were friendly; his burial fated; and now he is ἀναπλοῦστος in Delphi. This should not be burdened with a specific cultic referent. It - and the function that Pindar outlines at 46ff - is a description of Neoptolemos' role at Delphi, not of any ritual that centred on his tomb. A ritual may have symbolized this role, just as the myth describes it in words. If it did, Neoptolemos' part of observer would have required little symbolic expression. Again, this tallies with the notion of a cautious introduction into the established order. I have suggested that Neoptolemos' tomb had been avoided, as the tomb of a sacrilegist. I wonder if it was not still avoided (a ritual act); but now the explanation was that he was watching carefully over procedure.

A scholium suggests that Neoptolemos performed this role on specific occasions:

γίνεται ἐν Δελφοῖς ἡμών ἐξείην, ἐν οἷς δοξαῖοί ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἔξοικα καλεῖν τούς ἡρώας. εἶναι οὖν μόροιμον ἐν ταῖς ποιμαίας ταῖς ἡρωίαις καὶ ταῖς πανηγύρεισιν, ἐν οἷς ἐκήρυσσον τούς ἡρώας, θυσίαις

53 Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 131f.

54 It is hard to see what this concept could actually be in cult, although many critics use it (Ziegler, RE s.v. Neoptolemos 2454f; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 99); Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 191-4. It certainly does not suggest that Neoptolemos was the recipient of cult (as Carey, S Odes 154, notes).
This cannot be inferred from the text of N.7, and so implies genuine knowledge. But it is hard to interpret exactly. It may mean that Neoptolemos practiced his role of overseer at the Theoxenia. At this festival, it seems that the banquet spread for Apollo was shared out among the sacrificers; a presidential role would, then, be appropriate for Neoptolemos, who died, according to the new orthodoxy, trying to correct the inequitable division of sacrificial meat. This would tally, too, with his prominence in Pae.6, written for the Theoxenia. But the scholium may not be reliable; and we note, also, that Neoptolemos ἐκοπτεύει: the Aenianes' breakfast during their theoría in the Aethiopica.

Neoptolemos' ambivalence in Delphi in the fifth century is shown also in Polygnotus' picture of the Sack of Troy, which covered a wall of the Cnidian Lesche, a little way up the hillside from Neoptolemos' tomb, and which was painted in the middle of the century. Neoptolemos figures prominently:

55 Nilsson, Feste; Radt 83ff.
56 This turns the interpretation on which Neoptolemos' tomb is a stern reminder of the consequences of misbehaviour at a Delphic ritual - although his role is still to prevent a recurrence (Carey, 5 Odes 153f; Ziegler RE s.v. Neoptolemos 2454).
57 Nilsson, Feste 161 n.2; Aethiopica 3.10.1, Woodbury, Neoptolemos 129.
58 Paus. 10.25-7; RE s.v. Polygnotos 1634; in general, Robert, Die Iliupersis des Polygnot (Halle, 1895) for a reconstruction.
The question now is whether the depiction of Neoptolemos here celebrates him, or depicts the brutal behaviour for which Apollo justly punished him - as his nearby tomb might confirm.\textsuperscript{59} The latter, the popular interpretation, is surely ruled out by the fact that Neoptolemos is not shown killing Priam, the deed for which he was punished.\textsuperscript{60} Indeed, the brutality of the common iconographic type which we have seen, in which Neoptolemos attacks Priam, at the altar and cradling the dead Astyanax to boot, is entirely absent here: there is neither altar, nor child, nor old man. We are left simply with the depiction of Neoptolemos as the sacker of Troy.

Again, whatever its exact date, the picture seems part of a deliberate move to ameliorate Neoptolemos’ image at Delphi: juxtaposed with the tomb, it corrects the lingering impression of Neoptolemos’ sins by portraying him as the Neoptolemos of the Odyssey, of the Little Iliad, and of the Amphictiony, in glorious action.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{59} Celebration: Delcourt, Pyrrhos 44; brutalization: Robert, op. cit. 72; Defradas, Propagande 152f; cf Slater, Doubts 207.

\textsuperscript{60} Priam is already dead, and, pace Robert’s reconstruction, not particularly conspicuous: \textit{εἰςοι δὲ καὶ ἐπάνω τοῦ Κορώβου Πρίσμος καὶ Ἀξίων τε καὶ Ἀγήμωρ} (10.27.2).

\textsuperscript{61} Delcourt’s notion of the guides who showed Pausanias around perversely commenting on the picture to Neoptolemos’ disadvantage is along the right lines (“Les prêtres de Delphes ont
The next scrap of evidence is a line from a Delphic inscription which records an Amphictionic law of 380:

\[\text{[τ]λ\ θεός τιμά τού θρώος αικάτων στατήρες Αλγιναίοι (CIG 1688.32)}\]

Sadly, there is no guarantee that this is Neoptolemos; and some doubt what is being priced (the apposition is odd if it is a sacrifice to a hero). But it is tempting to relate this animal (at this price, a prize victim) to the real sacrifice behind Heliodorus' exaggerations.

Finally, Neoptolemos' institution is complete by the time he appears in 278 to help to drive the Gauls from the sanctuary.

\[
\text{...δείματά τε ἄνδρες ἐφίσταντο ὄπληται τοῖς βαρβάροις· τούτων τοῖς μὲν ἐξ ὀπισθὼρῶν λέγουσιν ἠλεθεῖν ὑπέροχον καὶ ἀμάθοιν, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Πύρρον εἶναι τὸν Ἀχιλλέως ἐναγίζοντι δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης δελφοὶ τῆς συμμαχίας Πυρρῷ πρῶτον ἐχοῦσες ἄτε ἄνδρος πολεμίου καὶ τὸ μνήμα ἐν ὀτιμίᾳ. (Paus. 1.4.4)}
\]

This story reflects the happiness of Neoptolemos' cult in the sanctuary, and provides a crisp aetiology which sets the seal on it. Now the Delphians offer him annual enagismata.

obstinément représenté le vainqueur de Troie comme une sorte d'ennemi héritaire d'Apollon") but too late (Pyrrhos 51f).

62 Farnell, GHC 315 n.a; contrast e.g. Delcourt, Pyrrhos 45; cf G. Rougemont Corpus des Inscriptions des Delphes vol.1 (Paris, 1977) 113f, Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 197f.

63 The story must, of course, reflect Delphic attitudes to Neoptolemos, and not his appearance, which is impossible (cf Fehling, Herodotus 13f). The story is modelled on the Persian attack on Delphi (Hdt. 8.31–9).

64 Paus. 10.24.6.
This reconstruction enables us to make sense of the slow changes in, and occasional paradoxes displayed by, Neoptolemos' status at Delphi. We need not ignore Pausanias' testimony, nor the archaeological puzzle of the pithos; nor the juxtaposition of Paean 6, N.7 and Polygnotus' picture.

The Mythological Tradition

At this point, a resumé may be helpful. I suggested that the difficulties of N.7 which have provoked critics to link it to Paean 6 were explicable by appeal to the complex mythological tradition which lay behind the mythical narrative of N.7.

The complexity of the tradition is revealed in the number of instances of variation. Almost no detail in the saga of Neoptolemos, from his success at Troy to his death at Delphi, goes without an alternative. He kills Priam at the altar, or at the palace gate; he kills Astyanax, or Odysseus does; he leaves Troy by boat, or by land; he goes to Phthia, or Molossia; he defeats the Molossi, or founds their ruling house; he goes to Delphi with dedications, or to sack the place; he is killed accidentally, or as he tries to interfere with Delphic ritual; his tomb is held in dishonour, or is the centre of his cult. The reconstruction of the evolution of the saga which I have offered suggests the times and places in which these differences arose, and explains them. And it hangs neatly together.

Neoptolemos was the sacker of Troy, who killed Priam at an altar at the heart of his palace. The implications of such an act were sufficiently disturbing for the Little Iliad to remove
Priam's death from the altar; elsewhere, far from avoiding the repercussions of the suppliant's murder, artists (and Stesichorus?) emphasized its brutality, suggesting that Neoptolemos' punishment was a donnee.

In the early poems of the cycle, Neoptolemos marched home to Thessaly. But at some stage, into the story of his journey there was inserted his battle with the Molossi, previously an entirely discrete adventure, in which he beat back the hill people first from the enviable land of the Thessalians, and then from their trade route to the east, the Haliacmon valley. The Molossi finally ceased to be a problem on the east of the Pindus; but Neoptolemos, now famous for fighting them, was doomed to chase them further west. In the sixth century, when the Molossi were beginning to deal more peacefully with the Hellenic world, they adopted Neoptolemos as their ancestor, grafting him onto the original genealogy of their ruling house. They ascribed to him a greater kingdom than their own, a kingdom which had stretched across Epirus, but been divided after his death.

Midway through the seventh century, the Delphians expressed their fears of Thessalian expansion by identifying the Thessalian Neoptolemos as an enemy of their sanctuary. It seems that it was at this time that the link between Priam's death and Neoptolemos' own was made, confirming the Delphians'...

---

1 This identification may have been enabled by the existence of an aboriginal Delphic character, Pyrrhos, who featured as the victim in a myth of sacrifice, and was consequently depicted as responsible for his own death. The homonymy (with Neoptolemos' childhood name) makes the amalgamation of the two figures easy. See Appendix.
moral superiority, and, incidentally, thenceforward dominating the iconography of Priam's murder.

The Delphians' apprehensions were fulfilled at the beginning of the sixth century, when the Amphictyon, led by the Thessalians, took over the sanctuary. Taking up the identification of Pyrrhos and Neoptolemos which their predecessors had bequeathed to them, the Amphictions turned the tables: Neoptolemos' visit to Delphi was redescribed as a friendly visit; and his death, as a foreshadowing of the Amphictions' own crusade to emend Delphic mismanagement.

Such a change could not, however, be effected instantaneously; Neoptolemos' new role only slowly became institutionalized in ritual. The Amphictions were the first to pay Neoptolemos unequivocal honours; but it seems that not until the early third century was Neoptolemos entirely habituated at Delphi. Certainly, his status in the fifth century was deeply ambivalent.

If this, or something like it, is right, then the obvious need for an Aristarchan theory disappears, and with it the picture of an innovating Pindar. The defensive tone of N.7, and the perceived differences between the stories of Neoptolemos' death told in the two poems, are the product of Pindar's use of the tradition within which he was working. If he appears to countermand Pae.6 in N.7, that is because he countermands particular aspects of the tradition, and not because he apologizes for what he said in the paean.

I have now surveyed the evidence of the scholia, and reconstructed the mythology behind Pindar's accounts. What remains is to check through N.7.
Nemean 7

20-30 Pindar seductively introduces the idea, important for the myth of Neoptolemos, of deceptive reputations, and gives two instances, exemplifying excess and deficiency.¹ The contrast with himself is for the moment only implicit.² This mythic material takes the place of gnomes establishing the necessity for the accurate reflection of worth, and Pindar’s claim to be able to make it.³

30- The first mythic passage is closed into a ring, returning to the theme of the universality of death of 19f.⁴ This ambiguous gnome carries two senses: death comes to the wise who expect it and have secured their glory, and to the foolish, who do not, and have not.⁵ Both oppositions prepare us for the Neoptolemos myth.⁶

31f τιμᾶ δὲ γίνεται / ὦ θεάς ἄβρον αἰέτει λόγον τεθυσάτων. The turning point into the myth of Neoptolemos. This gnome would present no difficulty were it not for θεάς: it would sum

¹ Tugendhat, Rechtfertigung 402f; D. C. Young, "A Note on Pindar Nemean 7.30f", CSCA 4 (1971), 259-53, here 252f, Carey, 5 Odes 147; Köhnken, Funktion 52.

² It is well expounded by Nagy, Pindar’s Homer 423f.

³ For a parallel case of early mythic material taking the place of what would normally be expressed directly, see Carey, 3 Myths 146-51 on H.4.25-32; in particular 150.

⁴ Most, Measures 164.

⁵ See Young, op. cit.; Most, Measures 155. Aias and Odysseus remain paradeigmatic, however the gnome is taken.

⁶ Gentili, Trittico Pindarico 12f.
up the fate of the wise man who invests in his own *kleos*. Formally, it would stand as *kephalaion*, to be recapitulated at 49, to the myth of Neoptolemos, whose honour grows as his repute is maintained.

But ἄριστος appears to add a different dimension: Pindar now seems to be discussing honour which is not bestowed by a mortal poet, but by a divine power. Most contrasts these two; and his analysis becomes qualified and unconvincing. It is prima facie unlikely that Pindar is contrasting his own poetry unfavourably with anything, or implying that his poetry (*logos*) is useless, unless a god nurtures it. ἄριστος is the divine aspect of any egregious human achievement; here, logically, the poet's: good poetry is from the gods.

33-48 The myth of Neoptolemos. It springs from the gnome of 31f by illustrating the maintenance of Neoptolemos' honours after his death: by his descendants (38-40) and through his burial in Apollo's precinct. But, just as the gnome, in its context, applies particularly to the maintenance of honour

---


8 Carey cites this gnome to prove that "the myth was introduced to illustrate the role of divinity in preserving fame" (Pindarica 38).

9 Measures 151; cf 158, 181.


11 cf P.3.108-11; I.3/4.19-21; Od.17.518f. We might identify the god as the Muse, following the scholiast (Σ.Ν.7.46a); cf Farnell 2.292. Cf 0.9.25-9; Verdenius, *GLC* 39f; Komornicka, *L'Attitude de Pindare* 199. But perhaps Apollo should not be entirely excluded.
through poetry, so the myth is paradigmatic of the veracity and power of Pindar's epinician poetry. These themes have been gradually introduced: the power of poetry to preserve honour at 8ff; the necessity for truth at 20ff. Pindar has been as yet only implicitly involved; after his narration of the story of Neoptolemos, he will bring himself explicitly to the fore.

Neoptolemos is a convenient subject for the myth because his story is confused - the truth has been lost - and some say that he was a sacrilegist - his honour is in question. If Pindar can produce an authoritative version which restores to Neoptolemos the honour proper to an Aiakid, his claims for his own poetry are proved. In turn, his encomium of Sogenes is confirmed as truthful and valuable.

The story of Neoptolemos' adventures is thus not directly related to the victor's experiences. The relation is through the story-telling. Pindar will generate authority for his version by using traditional material in a coherent fashion. Where he confronts a controversial point, he will prove his version with some circumstantial evidence. He cannot falsify...

---

12 This, I have suggested, is the core of Pindar's use of myth; and nowhere is it clearer than in this poem.

13 The exemplum of Aias prepares us for the myth of Neoptolemos both by providing an example of re-evaluation of reputation which is publicly endorsed, and also by allowing Pindar to be the mouthpiece of that public endorsement. He arbitrates first on an easy case, before, having won our confidence, he proceeds to a harder.

14 See e.g. Köhnken's treatment, culminating in the claim that the difficulties which Neoptolemos encounters, and his descend-ants' prosperity, reflect Thearion's failure in the games, and his son's success (Funktion 59).
the story, for that would spoil the claim of truth; but he will manipulate the focus to his best advantage.

33-6 A clear statement of the difficulties here is given by Farnell; a survey of the various solutions, by Most. There is no completely satisfactory solution. Least problematic, I think, is to follow Farnell and read ποιεῖται with μολέυ, as Bowra does. The Thessalians described their annexation of the shrine as action helping the god: the Athenians who helped swore μονήσειν τινὶ ὃνὶ ἔστι τὴν γην ἱερᾶν. I have suggested that they adapted the story of Neoptolemos' visit to the shrine so that it stood as precursor to their takeover. So it is not impossible that Neoptolemos should also be described as helping the god: he tried to correct the malpractices of the priesthood. The emphatic position, and τοι, immediately controvert the alternative stories about his visit. The long delay of the subject of μολέυ is not merely for a surprise, but, given that the audience may know alternative stories, enables Pindar to be well on his way before any objection can be raised. The donnée of burial at Delphi confirms ποιεῖται.

---

15 Farnell Works 2.291-5; Most, Nemean 7.31-36 262-5.
16 Aeschines 3.109; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 107. For the phrase "helping a god", see Parker, Miasma 165; cf Woodbury, Neoptolemos 107. Plato Apol. 23b7, which D. E. Gerber ("Pindar, Nemean 7.31", AJP 84 (1963), 182-8, here 187 n.18) quotes to show that μολέυ can have a weak meaning, is in fact an ironic distortion of this sense: Socrates is saving Apollo bother, by deflating those who think they are wise, but are not.
17 τοι: cf I.3/4.55; Denniston, GP 537.
18 Long delay: cf 0.10.24-30, and Gildersleeve ad loc.; surprise: Most, Nemean 7.31-36 269 n.33.
19 cf Most, Measures 166. The technique is familiar: cf Gerber on 0.1.44, where mention of Ganymede confirms Pelops'
The burial is the first piece of circumstantial evidence for Pindar's account.

34f Hayden Peliccia notes that in aetiological explanations of present states, a present main verb sits happily with a past subordinate clause introduced by ἐπεί, which makes their relation somewhat more than temporal, and somewhat less than strictly causal. If such a relation can be discovered between Neoptolemos' sack of the city of Priam and his burial at Delphi, we may reject the clumsy parenthesis of ἐν Πυθλοίσι ὂς ἔδεινναϊ ἐπαίταϊ, which will become the apodosis of the ἐπεί clause. And, indeed, we have seen the causal link: Neoptolemos lies buried at Delphi - in other words, was killed there - because he killed Priam at Troy. This is the detail of the ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΕΙΟΣ ΤΙΟΣ whose stylish symmetry lay behind the dominant iconography of the scene and resisted immediate Thessalian reformation. ΠΡΙΑΜΟΥ ΠΟΛΙΝ is not simply elegant variation for Troy, but the lightest possible acknowledgement of another level of explanation for Neoptolemos' death.

As with the mention of the death of Phokos in N.5, the critic must explain the incidence of a detail which is supposed

abduction: "the reasoning is that if one myth is true, so must the other be."

22 Köhnken, Funktion 63 n.132.
23 Most, Measures 166; cf Kirkwood, Vicissitude 82.
to be embarrassing to the audience. As in that case, the detail cannot be altered, because it is a datum in the story. Here, the periphrasis and ambivalence of ἐπειδ' draw a veil over the death of Priam - the emphasis is on the glorious sack of the city - but the old king still lurks there, for Neoptolemos' death, however positive in other ways, was the upshot of Priam's. If Pindar is to produce a true account of Neoptolemos' career, he cannot entirely ignore Priam.

36 ἀποκλέω Emphatically placed at the start of the sentence. Pindar controverts the version of the epic cycle in which Neoptolemos walks, and follows instead the Molossian version in which he sails, which naturally accords better with what is known elsewhere of the Molossoi: their territory, and the datum that Neoptolemos ruled them.

Köhnken points out that these lines echo the opening of the Odyssey. This familiarity reassures: although in other versions Neoptolemos may have walked from Troy, sailing is not unprecedented.

37 Συμπο Αt Paus. 3.25.1 Neoptolemos has returned to Skyros, where he was brought up in Achilles' absence. This weak tradition is denied outright. We have seen that, in the few cases where Pindar does flatly deny an alternative version, that version is never part of a strong tradition. So here.

---

24 Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 45. Most, Measures 166; contrast Carey, 5 Odes 134.
25 Funktion 69.
26 e.g. N.3.34 (above, p.101); N.6.50, N.3.62f (above, p.252).
The right harbour for Pambotis and Dodona, which, as we have seen, is a helpful focus for Neoptolemos' Molossia, although it goes unmentioned here.

42 Lloyd-Jones' "one difference of hard fact" between the story of the Paean and that of N.7: in the Paean, Apollo kills Neoptolemos; in N.7, it is a man with a knife. But Apollo is not thereby ruled out. To see more than a shift of focus is to approach the odd notion of implicit rejection. Pindar concentrates on the new orthodoxy, which favours the Aeginetan hero.

μάχας... ἀντιτυχόντα certainly suggests that Neoptolemos did not go to fight, and did not start the fight; but as in no version of the story does he do either, this cannot be related to the Aristarchan theory.

43 A detail from the new orthodoxy which integrates proper Delphians (rather than those who opposed Neoptolemos) with the new administration. Again: the incidence of this detail in this poem is a matter of focus, not of correction. Ξενογείται suggests the ritual context.

27 Modern Interpretation 132.
28 cf Pae.6.78-80; Ruck, Marginalia 4.144.
29 cf Most: "there is no mention of any god's activity and the murder is charged entirely to a man" (Measures 170): in the jump from "no mention" to "charged entirely" lies the problem. Cf Radt 170.
30 cf Köhnken, Funktion 71f.
31 Perhaps, also, a detail from the old sacrifice myth of Pyrrhos. See Appendix, p.455f.
32 And the killer's other name, Philoxenidas; see below, p.450.
We cannot capture the force of the first limb of this line. There was an oracle which told of Neoptolemos' burial at Delphi. But this is more likely simply fatalistic: "his fate is a debt to be paid in full." It is given a spurious content by what follows, which implies that Neoptolemos' death at Delphi satisfied the sanctuary's need for an Aiakid to act as θεμισκόπος. The further implication is that any Aiakid would have satisfied the need - in other words, the need was not for a sacrilegist or a temple robber, but for a member of a great clan, specifically connected, via Aiakos, with justice.

τὸ λοιπὸν emphasizes that we have here another variation: after Neoptolemos' death, his honour is preserved not only through his descendants' rule, but also through his burial at Delphi.

I have suggested that these lines, and in particular θεμισκόπον, cover Neoptolemos' status at the time Pindar was writing. They describe what was symbolized by the relevant aspect of Delphic ritual, and perhaps refer to the Theoxeny.

---

33 It seems to explain the movement of the tomb:

δείκνυται δὲν τῷ τεμένει τάφος Νεοπτολέμου κατά χρηματός γευδμένος...

(Strabo 9.3.9)

34 Carey, 5 Odes 153. μόραωμος is typically used of a force higher than the Olympians (e.g. Pae.6.94; but N.4.61).

35 Most, Measures 172.

36 Σ.Ν.7.68a; see above, p.362f.
The three words are ὁ ψεύτες ὁ μάρτυς ἡγήσατο ἐπιστατεὶ. Even if it is not literal, τρία ἔπειτα must refer to a very few words - not to the myth of Neoptolemos that we have just heard.

The witness must be either Pindar or Apollo - they are both better candidates than Neoptolemos. The best arguments against Pindar are Carey's. He argues for Apollo, and sees the myth, introduced by 31f, as illustrative of "the role of divinity in preserving fame" - and so this summary, which looks to Apollo's role in the present case, forms a neat ring. Now, Apollo cannot be entirely ruled out. 31f suggests that the myth is, broadly, an illustration of logos preserved: Neoptolemos' honour still lives through his descendants' rule of Molossia, and his tomb in Delphi. In this sense, Apollo is Neoptolemos' witness. But, more specifically, as the θεός of 32 is immanent in proper praise poetry - the most relevant means of preserving logos - the myth illustrates proper praise poetry. It is a test case of extreme difficulty, in which not only is Neoptolemos' logos confused, but sporadically insulting.

37 cf Carey, Pindarica 37.
38 Farnell, Works 2.296; cf Woodbury, Neoptolemos 113 n.74; Ar. Nub.1402 with Dover's note.
39 Neoptolemos cannot be definitively ruled out - especially if the punctuation of these lines is altered. But, once it is established that 48 looks to 49, if Neoptolemos is the witness, 48f follow 44-7 too naturally to bear the portentous change of pace which 48 announces. Farnell, Works 2.296f and Bowra, Pindar 73, argue for him.
40 See also Woodbury, Neoptolemos 110 n.64; Most, Measures 176f.
41 S Odes 154f; Pindarica 38.
Pindar successfully navigates his way through the story, rediscovering the true version and saving Neoptolemos' honour. He stands back in triumph - he prepares us for his summary (48) - and claims: he is a true witness for the Aiakids' deeds (49). The contrast is with Homer, who exaggerated Odysseus'.

50-2 It is now broadly agreed that ἐρατά μοι τόδε εἰμεν must mean "I make bold to say this". The interpretation of the next line should, then, reflect that it has been marked by this vaunt: it must explain why the line is audacious. A perfectly acceptable interpretation is to see it as an elaboration of 49.

So, with Carey, I take δδδον in apposition with τόδε, and supply εἰμεν. The δδδον... λόγων is the course of Pindar's poetry, as laid out by the deeds he describes there. ꞉ρην must mean, broadly, "right", whether it functions within the road image ("high road") or outside it ("legitimate",

42 Carey's formal arguments ruling out Pindar as the witness (5 Odes 154f; Pindarica 38) do not go home: Pindar's entrance does not break a continuous whole, but forms part of that whole; and 49 refers to him and is a summary. We have a neat kephalaion ring.

43 cf Ruck, Marginalia 4.148; Hubbard, Subject/Object 66; Race, Negative Expressions 114.

44 Woodbury, Neoptolemos 113; cf Carey, 5 Odes 155; Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 133.

45 cf Carey, Pindarica 36; Bundy, SP 1.30-32.

46 Pindarica 36f.

47 cf I.3/4.19-21; N.6.45-9, with Lefkowitz, ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ 197; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 114 (although he over-emphasizes the importance of the divine, which is incidental rather than central); Fogelmark, Nemean 7.50-52 126f.
"valid"). 48 Whichever, ἀξιόθευ connotes authority: this is the proper road to be on. The ἀρεταῖς are those of the Aiakids: the deeds of excellence by which the road of words is led. 49 They are shining: both egregious and famous. 50

The difficulty with ὀξοθεὺ is in establishing whose "house" is involved. It may refer to the Aiakids' home of Aegina; then the sentence means "the right version of the song about the Aiakids' deeds is that of the Aeginetans." 51 Or it may refer to Pindar: "I know the right version of the song." 52 The problem is that the sense of ὀξοθεὺ boils down to "here". 53 It might be marked by Ἀγνω or μοι. But perhaps the problem is illusory: for Pindar's song gives the version of local saga in a performance at Aegina: his song is the home version. 54

---

48 Within: Carey, Pindarica 37, after Fennell ad loc., comparing ὀξοθεὺ ἀμαζῖτόπ (N.6.53). Outside: id., 5 Odes 156. Neither can be ruled out: Silk, Interaction § 37, with 238.

49 S. Fogelmark, "Pindar, Nemean 7.50-52", C.Ant. 45 (1976), 121-32, here 129.

50 On light/fame see Verdenius, Comm.2.37.

51 Köhnken, Funktion 75-7, using N.3.31: ὀξοθεὺ μάτευς. Carey claims that in that poem a host of polarities suggest the meaning "from local saga" (see 26-30); in this, nothing does (Pindarica 37). But we do have Ἀγνω at 50.

52 cf Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 134; cf Woodbury, who refers ὀξοθεὺ to the inborn qualities of the Aiakids.

53 Carey notes that ὀξοθε替补, coupled with a destination in 0.3.45f and I.4.11f, "is best taken as a starting point" (5 Odes 156); so here, where it is the start of a road. Cf Woodbury, Neoptolemos 113 n.77; cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 12-14 and 33ff.

54 83 binds us to Aegina. This is so even if his story of Neoptolemos is a novelty: I have suggested that N.7 is bravura handling of difficult mythical material; whatever attempts at the story were current in Aegina before it, N.7 supersedes them.
This interpretation gives sense to the vaunt. Pindar has claimed that he is a true witness; now he continues: "I make bold to say that the proper road for the song furnished by their famous deeds is the one that starts here". In other words: I tell for you the right version of Aiakid myths. He has just exemplified this, and would proceed, but breaks off (52f).

It seems plausible that the Aristarchan theory sprang from an attempt to explain the interest of the Achaean man here. This in turn provokes the question of his identity, to which the two most plausible answers are: Neoptolemos, or a Molossian. Most has thoroughly confirmed the communis opinio that Ιονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκεῖων means "dwelling on the hills overlooking the Ionian sea", and so may, topographically, refer to a Molossian. Lloyd-Jones suggests that Achaean may stress Molossian claims to be descended from the Achaeans of the Trojan War; and this must be so, in the immediate context of a poem which uses a Molossian genealogy that goes back to

55 This is closest to Fogelmark's version (op. cit. 129).
56 χυρίων thus restates οὐ̣ ψεῦδος ὁ μάρτις; we note that the two words are contrasted also at P.9.42, 44.
57 Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 40; cf Smith, Seventh Nemean.
58 Woodbury argues for Neoptolemos, following Σ.Ν.7.94 (Neoptolemos 121-5; at 121 n.115 he notes less plausible theories).
59 Nemean 7.64-67 316-21. This remains so even if, as I have suggested, the Molossians did not have a coastline at this stage, for ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκεῖων encompasses the notion of hills a little inland from the sea, also (op. cit. 320 n.23).
Neoptolemos. Why, then, is a Molossian's approval important in a poem for an Aeginetan?

Finding no obvious answer, critics suggested that the Molossian's approval was important not for the poem, but the poet: Pindar was the Molossians' proxenos in Thebes. In a variation, Carey suggests that Pindar here speaks for Thearion. Rejecting such speculation, Bundy proclaimed that προέωνικ here is metaphorical; and this is attractive. But in this case we still need an explanation of the grounds for the metaphor: why does Pindar claim "friendship" with the Molossians here?

Most has made a good case for the irrelevance of προέωνικ to the Molossian's approval: where three items are linked thus - A καὶ B C τε - their relation is A + (B + C). So προέωνικ will go with what follows, and not explain what precedes.

His explanation is convincing in most respects. καὶ... τε has divided the audience into two main groups, Molossians and Aeginetans, of whom the latter are subdivided into the

60 Modern Interpretation 135.
61 οὐ μᾶλλον με is a relatively straightforward litotes for "approve"; cf I.2.20, where "did not find fault with" would be grudging (Slater, Futures 93; Köhnken, Litotes 63).
63 5 Odes 160-4.
64 SP 2.89 n.122; cf Most, Nemean 7.64-67 324-6. Carey's objections do not hold up: Εὔνικ is not a "neutral term" (loc. cit.).
65 Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 135.
66 Nemean 7.64-67 322f, after Fennell on P.1.42.
laudandus, with whom Pindar claims a relation of "proxenia", and the other citizens. "The two larger audiences correspond to the two primary topics that Pindar has discussed in the course of the poem: the Molossians represent the myth of Neoptolemos, the Aeginetans the epinician occasion of Sogenes' victory.... Pindar is stating, in effect, that he has so far dealt successfully with both topics." 67

Pindar has just used the Molossian story of Neoptolemos sailing to Epirus and founding the ruling dynasty there as part of his authoritative version of the myth of Neoptolemos. The Molossian is invited to approve of N.7 because he knows the facts of the matter - it is for him, traditional material. He will confirm Pindar's claims of veracity; and so Pindar calls him as a witness. This is the appeal to the man who knows, which is to become explicit at 68f.

67-69 Sandwiched between Pindar's claim that his praise hits the mark, 68 and his appeal to the man who knows to confirm 69 that he is not off the track, 70 the prayer for the future must suggest the motif of the ultimate revelation of the truth. 71 So

67 Nemean 7.64-67 327-31; here 321.
68 Carey, 5 Odes 164; on Köhnken, Funktion 79, see Komornicka, ΑΛΑΘΕΙΑ 244f; Köhnken, Funktion 33.
69 On the future άνερει, see Most, Measures 190.
70 See Miller, Phthonos 116f.
71 Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 135.
72 cf 0.10.53-5; see below, p.424.
There is too little evidence on the pentathlon to be certain what is going on here; but enough for us to understand the text. It is most satisfactory, with Carey, to understand that Pindar here denies making the kind of throw which would disqualify him from taking part in the wrestling — in other words, he has made a winning javelin throw, through which, as a victor, he will take place in the final event.

But how much of this metaphor refers directly to Pindar's poetic activity? He might be denying that he is like someone who has made / is making / will make a bad throw, and expresses the quality of the throw by describing it as disqualifying him from the final of the pentathlon. Then the claim is simply that his praise is accurate; and the metaphor the familiar equation of athletic and poetic success, here given a piquancy by the use of the victor's own discipline as the vehicle of the comparison. Alternatively, he might be denying that he is like someone who has made / is making / will make a bad throw, and who cannot take further part in the pentathlon. This

73 On the evidence for the pentathlon, see G. E. Bean, "Victory in the Pentathlon", AJA 60 (1956), 361-8; Harris, GAA 78f and "The Method of Deciding Victory in the Pentathlon", G&R 25 (1972), 60-65.


75 Carey, 5 Odes 166-9.

76 Carey, 5 Odes 169f; Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 43; and in general, her "The Poet as Athlete", SIFC Ser.3 2 (1984), 5-12.

77 So, broadly, Most, Measures 194f.
neatly fits with both broad and immediate context. The winning javelin throw is Pindar's treatment of Neoptolemos (which contrasts with the reputations of Aias and Odysseus). His success in that matter enables him to proceed to the next: the wrestling, signifying the praise of Sogenes. The division of subject matter corresponds to the division of audience at 64f. 75f Another passage which seems to offer support for the Aristarchan theory, by seeming to oppose the praise of the victor and what Pindar has been doing. 78 Instead, the line should be taken as explaining any apparent excess on Pindar's part as symptomatic of his readiness to praise the victor. 79 We compare:

εἰ δ' ἐγώ Μέλησιος ἐξ ἀγνείησιν
κάθος ἀνέδραμον ἵνα
μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φαύνος.

(0.8.54f)

Here, the fear is that if Pindar rehearses the whole catalogue of Melesias' victories phthonos will follow: "I trust that no one would harshly begrudge me praise of Melesias". 80 So here: if I seem to go too far (to ἀνέκραγον, cf ἀνέδραμον), at least I do not begrudge (you cannot say that I begrudge) his praise (to τραχύς cf λίθῳ τραχεῖ). 81

78 e.g. Schadewaldt, Aufbau 320f.

79 Apparent: the conditional does not actually admit that there has been any; cf τι (B. L. Gildersleeve, "Studies in Pindaric Syntax" AJP 3 (1882), 434-55, here 435, 438). Excess: this is the force of τέρατον and ἀνέκραγον.

80 cf Carey, Two Transitions 288; Race, Negative Expressions 110, 108f.

81 Phthonos makes praise stinting; contrast ἀρσάνητος σίνος (0.11.7) (Schadewaldt, Aufbau 278 n.1); cf Ν.4.39 (Bundy, SP
The problem with this interpretation is that it torpedoes any hope there is of reducing N.7 to a neat and manageable polar schema. For Pindar, having stressed the importance of the accuracy of praise, now, it seems, absent-mindedly introduces the possibility that his own praise may have overshot the mark, and adds that, if it did, it simply reflected his good intentions. One solution is to construct a schema of complexity sufficient to accommodate the differences; so, partly, Most.

But the problem is simply that Pindar claims both that his song equals the achievement of victory (however splendid his praises, they are deserved) — and so is bought at a fair price — and also that victory is worth achieving because it is rewarded by his song, which achieves more than the victory itself (e.g. it immortalizes, while the deed itself evanesces) — thus his song is a good bargain.

N.7 is about the preservation of honour. The subject is treated in various ways throughout the ode. The variations

1.3n.11 (and index s.v. φθόνος)). Fennell glosses τραχύς with "niggardly".

82 cf Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 43f.

83 e.g. Measures 196: "By contrast, Odysseus had the (specious) τερματωθείς πλέον but lacked the πόνος..." But even he seems to give up (e.g. 203 on 98ff / 56f).

84 For other relative values in Pindar, cf Miller, Digressive Leisure 205f; Bundy, Quarrel 59 n.60.

85 This is not a Grundgedanke; even Young concedes: "one may with impunity say that a poem is "about" something, but that does not even begin to say what the poem has to say about the subject" (PC 89; cf 72 n.149). (N.7 is about other things, too — e.g. Sogenes' victory in a pentathlon competition.)

86 cf broadly, Greengard, Structure 107 n.66.
hang together to form some sort of unity, which is thus complex and elaborate - ποικίλον. But need this unity imply complete logical consistency? It need not, if we cleave to the notion of the linear, rather than static, poem, which is to be heard (or read) through time, and not perceived synchronically. So here: as various facets of the architectonic theme surface through the ode, including those I have just suggested are logically inconsistent, so is the logical consistency of the whole marred. But the movement renders the inconsistency unobjectionable.

In this case, the movement is easily identified. Pindar has gone from the defensive to the offensive. He has begun the poem in negative strain - emphasizing the inescapability - in both the mundane and mythical worlds - of the obscuring wave of death, and the iniquity of inaccurate repute (11-31). Then he turns to set the record straight in a mythical instance, and rescues Neoptolemos from obscurity and inaccuracy (33-52). Then he turns to claiming he will save the laudandus from

---

87 "The poem makes sense as a whole" (Young, PC 2f n.3; 35; 89; and passim). At 35 he claims that unity lies in "the interconnection and interdependence of recurrent and developed ideas, thoughts, words, and images." On ποικίλος and its cognates, see Young, Pindar, Aristotle 168f; "they concern inherent complexity, elaborateness, or intricacy of essential argument, not decoration"; Richardson, Pindar 389.

88 As Young's "cohere" suggests (see last note). Heath criticizes this view (Modern Criticism 97f) and Young's explanation of ποικίλος (Unity 28 n.1, index s.v.); but his own conclusion is not so far removed: "Diversity is one constituent of coherence" (154) (he defines coherence as "the quality of their [sc. the different parts of the text] conjoint effect" (loc. cit.)) of Young, Pindar, Aristotle 163, on "episodes... subordinate to his [Homer's] major, simplex theme."

89 Slater, Doubts 196, answering Young, PC 87; Race, Style and Rhetoric 6f.
obscurity and inaccuracy (54-69). Now he is about to go further and lavish upon the laudandus the reward of unstinting praise. It may well be that, in the new tone of exuberance, details may appear which are logically inconsistent with the earlier negative slant. We are not thereby compelled to adopt the Aristarchan theory.

So, Pindar announces that το τερπυνο πλέου πεδέρχεται; and that, if he has been carried away, it simply reflects his readiness (prompted by the deed) to redeem the χάρις laid up by the victory.90

In fact, the first inkling of this positive slant was as early as ἀβρὸν ὄξει λόγου (32), which goes rather beyond the simple notion of recording achievement.91 Now, Pindar is beginning to emphasize the transmutation his poetry offers; and the role of the divine, symbolizing the egregious quality of Pindar's work, is to be emphasized.92

77-9 Norwood's "Triple Diadem".93 Pindar's image for his own poem emphasizes its diversity, and exemplifies the shift of subject which is taking place.94

90 Schadewaldt, Aufbau 320; Verdenius, Comm.1.105f.
92 0.10.91ff exemplifies the notion that deeds without record are valueless; P.8.92ff shows the new thrust.
94 Most, Measures 199: "it asserts the ποιμνία of this poem in the disparateness of its constituents... yet asserts with the 'verb their... unification." Cf R. D. Griffith and G. D'Ambrosio-Griffith, "La Couronne Chryselephantine de la Muse (Pindare, Ném.7.77-9)", AC 57 (1988), 258-66, here 264-6.
83ff 93f must refer to a particular topographic fact, which Pindar has used in his poem. The context validates Bury's observation that Sogenes' position in the sanctuary of Herakles echoes Neoptolemos' in Apollo's at Delphi. Neoptolemos is, after all, the particular instance of Aiakid excellence upon whom Pindar has focussed in this ode; Sogenes should, then, grow up like him. This parallel iterates the link of their shared homeland.

98-101 ευπεδβοδενεκα recalls εμεθοδο (57); note also ευεδομου' / ευεδομονιαν (56); βιοτον / βιοταν (54). These echoes point up the inescapable and, for the critic, potentially embarrassing fact that here Pindar is praying for what he declared impossible at 54-58, continual, utter eudaimonia. 100f, on the other hand, unmistakably echoes 39f: ατατρ γενος αει φερει / τοιτο τι γερας. That line demonstrated the theme of the preservation of honour: the Neoptolemids uphold Neoptolemos' geras through their accession to the kingdom of Molossia.

So here: Sogenes' descendants will preserve his geras after his death. And during his lifetime, may Herakles...

95 Sogenes' father's house must have been flanked by a sanctuary of Herakles: Bury, Nemeans 143. Cf Bundy SP 2.70; J. Rusten, "ΓΕΙΤΩΝ ΗΡΩΣ: Pindar's Prayer to Heracles (N. 7.86-101) and Greek Popular Religion", HSCP 87 (1983), 289-97; and on the impingement of such details into epinician, see Lee, Historical Bundy 65f.

96 46 / 94: Callistratus (Σ.Ν.7.150a); Bury Nemeans 124.

97 This becomes transparent at 100f.

98 cf Rose, Paideia 155.

99 Bury Nemeans 125.

100 Carey, 5 Odes 176.
preserve the quantum of happiness (καιρῶν ἀλβουν 58) into a continuously happy life. Their roles are analogous to that of Pindar’s poetry, which preserves the moment of victory beyond the tomb.

The vocabulary recalls 54ff because the subject is the same - the prolongation of the happy moment. There, in the defensive context, in which poetry offered the only sure buttress against the tide of fate, prolonging the moment into a lifetime was deemed impossible. But now the mood is more enthusiastic: εἰ πόνος ἡμῖν, τὸ τερτοῦν πλέον πεπερχεται. Poetry does not simply reflect, but transmutes. Sogenes’ children will not only uphold his geras, but may improve it (καὶ δρειον δικλεον). Again, the movement of the poem makes the internal inconsistency unobjectionable.

102ff Pindar apparently says that he has not attacked Neoptolemos. The only passage in the poem which, under Tugendhat’s examination, still seemed to refer to Paean 6 - but one is enough. 101 Under its influence, other passages, which may be interpreted as referring to, for example, general questions of poetic propriety, acquire a special point. 102

The Aristarchan position is attractive because it offers solutions to two real problems: why is Neoptolemos suddenly reintroduced here, so long after the myth, and why is 102 couched in such earnest language? 103 Pindar finally,

101 Rechtfertigung 404.
102 Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 136.
103 For a defensive formulation of each problem: Most, Measures 204; Crotty, Song and Action 136.
emphatically, declares himself innocent. Appealing interpretations of two difficult words, ἀτρόμοιοι and ἑλκύοσαι, follow.

The Aristarchan position was openly attacked by Slater; but his brisk article, dogmatic on matters where doubt would have been appropriate, gave the Aristarchans a straw target.104 Further, it fostered the impression that the Aristarchan position was a well-founded and well-rounded argument, deservedly the domain of the conservative critic.105

Slater countered by questioning how well-rounded the apology theory really was. If N.7 is an apology for Paean 6, Pindar should not deny that Paean 6 was offensive (as he does at 102ff); but if N.7 is a denial that Paean 6 was an attack, then either it should not follow a myth which is cunningly reworked so as not to offend (a tacit admission of guilt), or it should not follow a myth which is substantially the same (which will be just as offensive).106 This argument is logically correct; but whether it is an appropriate tool for this debate is another matter.

It does, nevertheless, encourage consideration of how well-founded the Aristarchan position is. And, indeed, the linguistic support for it turns out to be illusory: ἑλκύοσαι will not, on its own, mean "worried by dogs".107 We cannot be sure

104 Slater, Futures 91-4, published in 1969, and attacked by Fogelmark (Studies ch.4) in 1972; Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 136) in 1973; Carey (5 Odes 179) in 1981.

105 See Fogelmark, Studies 41f n.13.

106 Slater, Doubts 203-5.

107 cf Köhnken, Funktion 81 n.197. In the word itself, there is nothing to suggest dogs (Σ.Ν.7.150a), "dragging Neoptolemos' name in the mud" (D. E. Gerber, "Pindar, Nemean 7.31", AJP 84
what the rare word ἀτροπός means. 108 Tugendhat’s “starrsinnig” is popular, but only because the context, which is what we need to establish, seemed to suggest it. 109 Theocritus calls Endymion ὁ τοῦ ἀτροποῦ ὅσιον ὁσίων (3.49).

Giving up the attempt to identify the precise meaning of these words, the commentator falls back on the sure knowledge that they are pejorative. 110 At 102ff, then, Pindar denies that he has done Neoptolemos badly, in some sense, and at some time. This might, of course, refer to a maltreatment previous to this ode; but is scarcely a sure foundation on which to found the whole theory — as, following Tugendhat, we are asked to do.

There is almost no firm ground here. The whole question is confused by the phrase ὃς ποτε φάσει... ἐλεύσαι. Is the future conventional, or should it be taken at face value? 111

(1963), 182-8, here 185), wrestling (Slater, Futures 93), "extreme violence" (Carey, 5 Odes 178), putting Neoptolemos down (Gentili, Poetry and Its Public 143) or "drastic violence" (Most, Measures 204).

108 Because it is both rare and neutral. See Silk, Interaction 202, 203 nn.16, 17.

109 Rechtfertigung 404f. Note Anth.Pal.10.74.5f: η δ' ὄρετη σταθερόν τι καὶ ἀτροπόν, ἢς ἐπὶ μούνης κύματα θαρασσέως πουτοπόρει βιότου.

Unshakable (by earthquake) may be the sense at Callim.h.Del.11; but see W. H. Mineur, Callimachus’ Hymn to Delos Introduction and Commentary = Mnes. Suppl.83 (Leiden, 1984), 61: some unpleasant quality should be indicated here. The ethical trans­lations, stemming from Dissen’s imrope (cf Farnell’s "improper") may spring from Apollonius’ application of ἀτροπόη to Jason, as he cruelly ignores Medea (e.g. at 4.387).

110 Carey, 5 Odes 178; Most, Measures 204 on ἐλεύσαι.

111 Slater, Futures 92; Carey, 5 Odes 178.
Does ὁ ροτε modify φῶςει or ἐλέγοςει? If the latter, is it an illogical litotes?

The firm ground seems to me to reduce to the following. 102-4 is an earnest statement (κέορ). ἀτρόπος means, basically, "that which is not / has not been / cannot be turned". ἐλκεῖν means, basically, "to drag"; and that cannot be a good thing. Διὸς Κόρινθος denotes "something being said tiresomely again and again"; and it implies that the repetition is getting one nowhere. This fits neatly with ταῦτα τρῖς τετράχι τ' ἀμπολεῖν und ἀπορία.

We have seen that Pindar has radically renovated the myth of Neoptolemos - specifically, in his mollification of the murder of Priam, in his use of Neoptolemos' glorious stay among the Molossians, in his amelioration of Neoptolemos' death, and in his emphasis on his glorious role at Delphi. Each of these details, although mythologically valid, challenge known elements in the traditional stories of Neoptolemos.

It is most reasonable to see the last lines of Ν.7 as a reference to this mythological revisionism. The opposition at


113 Race, Negative Expressions 114f.

114 Most, Measures 205f; cf Carey, 5 Odes 179 (he then rephrases as inflexible and finally follows Lloyd-Jones' "ruthless", "remorseless" (Modern Interpretation 136)).

102ff is between Pindar and the other versions. These, less favourable stories, Pindar presents as hackneyed: on ἀντίποις, Most concludes that "applied to words it can only mean "unchanging" and designate language that always stays the same and is not adapted to new circumstances." He refers both 102-4 and 104f to the story of Neoptolemos: "both sentences will in effect be rejecting the notion of telling the same old story over and over again".117

So 102ff distances Pindar from the old and offensive stories about Neoptolemos. But the form of the lines remains enigmatic. The explanation may lie in the fact that we are at the end of an epinician.118

"The purpose of an epilogue is to surrender one's theme without giving offence to one's audience."119 By comparing the end of Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo with other epilogues in hymns and epinicia, both at the end of poems and at the end of sections within poems, where they function as the first part of Abbruchen, Bundy showed that it was a witty and dramatized instance of an entirely conventional feature: the poet apologizes for cutting short his praise by appeal to the principle

116 Slater, Doubts 205, 207; Lefkowitz Autobiographical Fiction 44f; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 133 and, tentatively, Most, Measures 208.
117 Measures 206; cf Silk, Interaction 203 n.17.
118 cf Race, Negative Expressions 115, who also compares the end of N.7 to the hymnal envoi.
119 Bundy, Quarrel 83.
that selection from a theme is better than an exhausting, complete treatment: a lot is too much.\textsuperscript{120}

The epilogue of N.7 seems broadly similar.\textsuperscript{121} A prayer precedes.\textsuperscript{122} Going over the same things is ἀπορία;\textsuperscript{123} and so Pindar stops short.\textsuperscript{124} μαψυλάκας and τέκνοις accord neatly: the former is typical of the unmeasured speech of the crass eulogist;\textsuperscript{125} the latter typify a lack of judgement.\textsuperscript{126} Central to the break-off is the notion of excessive length, which is avoided.\textsuperscript{127} At N.7.103, ἐλαύνει naturally suggests "drag out" (LSJ s.v. A II 6); and there is a good parallel:

\textsuperscript{120} Quarrel.

\textsuperscript{121} Slater, Futures 93f compared N.7.104f to 0.2.92-5; see Bundy, Quarrel 89n.111. This clarifies "Slater’s fanciful attempt to conventionalize these verses" (Carey, 5 Odes 179). Carey claims that Fogelmark has refuted Slater’s attempt; he didn’t, but only queried Slater’s "genealogy of abstract nouns" and asked who the children were, and whether Pindar was μαψυλάκας. Lloyd-Jones adds nothing (Modern Interpretation 136).

\textsuperscript{122} cf I.1.64ff, following the break-off of 60-63 (on the tethmos, see Miller, Digressive Leisure 206); 0.13.115, a single line of prayer following the break-off of 114, explained at 93ff.

\textsuperscript{123} cf the avoidance of repetition at 0.13.101f.

\textsuperscript{124} cf Most, Measures 206f.

\textsuperscript{125} cf λαλαγήσας in the epilogue of 0.2 (97); the λάβροι παγγυλωσαί κόρακες of the same poem (86f); τὸ καυχάσθαι παρὰ κατηρῶν at 0.9.38 (cf 40); άνέκραγον (N.7.76); contrast N.10.21.

\textsuperscript{126} cf P.2.72f – where the monkey is the eulogist here, appreciated by his dull (cf P.1.82) audience. Contrast the wise at P.9.78.

\textsuperscript{127} In an epilogue: 0.2.95-100; see Bundy, Quarrel 89f; Slater, Futures 94 n.2; cf Race, Pindar and the Vulgus, dealing with the problem of dealing with the whole – in particular, 254f, 259. Not in an epilogue: P.1.81-4; P.8.29-34 (Miller, Digressive Leisure 212); P.9.75-9 (Young, Pindar, Aristotle); N.4.71f; N.10.19f; see Schadewaldt, Aufbau 288 n.2; Bundy, Quarrel 81f, 87f.
In N.7, then, Pindar seems to have used the formal device of the epilogic break-off not only to perform its normal function of finishing the poem, by its normal appeal to the avoidance of excess, but also to draw attention to his avoidance of the unpleasant stories of Neoptolemos.

The epilogue which appeals to satiety must always involve an element of dialogue. The poet must break away from his poem and directly address the audience, or god to whom the hymn is dedicated, or himself. A common device is the rhetorical question: so 0.2.99f: καὶ κεῖτος δος χάριμας ἄλλοις ἐσθενέω, τίς ἄν φράσαι δύνατο; It is exactly paralleled by Callimachus: χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη παισπέρτατε, δότωρ δόων, δότωρ ἀπημονίης, τελά δ' ἔργατα τίς κεν ἀέβδοι, οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Δίδος ἔργατ' ἄείσει; (Hymn to Zeus 91-3)

The answer to this question is οὔδείς. But once the device has become sophisticated, with the notion of satiety replacing that of impossibility, the answer becomes: "only a crass poet who will bore his audience and thus harm his theme." Alternatively, Pindar will answer: "I will not."

This is the sense of N.7.102f. But Pindar has replaced the question and answer with a single affirmation. His heart

128 Three lines of prayer follow before the end of the hymn.
129 Bundy, Quarrel 85.
speaks as though an interlocutor in a dialogue extrinsic to the poem. 130

Now we may unravel 102. We discard the notion that the negative governs ἀτρόποιοι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι ἔπειτι in a litotic expression; for Pindar is saying, in effect, "I stop because I am not like this." ποτε introduces the notion that Pindar is not the type of encomiast who would ἀτρόποιοι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι ἔπειτι; he is not referring to a single occasion, but denying that he is an incompetent logorrhoeic who would ever drag on past satiety on the topic. It becomes of secondary importance whether οὐ ποτε governs φάσημι or ἐλκύσαι; if the former, φάσημι must be a genuine future; if the latter, conventional. Wilson's evidence for the transfer of the adjacent or almost adjacent negative compound from φημι to the infinitive is attractive (Xenophanes 1.5; Eur. Alc. 238); but there is not enough for confidence. 131 On the model of the answer to a rhetorical question (τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργατ' ἄεισθε;), I suspect that we should understand "My heart will never say..."

102ff gives, then, the answer to the implicit question "will you rattle on, heart?": "My heart will never say that I have dragged out Neoptolemos with hackneyed words." Pindar has adapted the epilogic form to encompass the extra dimension peculiar to N.7; the tedium he has avoided is his audience's

130 cf Pindar's address to his thumos in a break-off at N.3.26; Gentili, Poetry and Public 42.

satiety not simply with his poem, but with the old stories about Neoptolemos.

I noted above that the Aristarchan theory solved two real problems in 102ff—the sudden reintroduction of Neoptolemos, and the earnestness of the appeal. Bundy's model of the hymnal envoi also goes some way toward the solution of both difficulties. On the first head, he remarks that "between the hymnal envoi and the main body of a hymn no linear connection exists other than that implied by the sequence: invocation, praise, and prayer with salutation." On the second, the asseveration is a formal vaunt of Pindar's own excellence, which must come from a voice other than that of the poem, for it breaks off from it. It is pleasant to note that Bundy's critique of the end of the Callimachean hymn was a retort to a critical construct very similar to that involving N.7: misled by the lack of connexion, and degree of engagement, in the envoi, critics saw evidence of a personal literary debate.133

But, as with any purely formal explanation, the question is now: why this example of the typical form here? Why is Neoptolemos specified, when the formal function of closure would have been as well served by any other encomiastic

132 Bundy, Quarrel 86.

133 What would Bundy have made of N.7 102ff, had he developed the dark hints he dropped, or written the second part of Quarrel, which should have dealt with "a discussion of literary polemic in Pindar" (93)? We note his endorsement of Slater's Futures (Quarrel 89 n.111); and his cryptic note at SP 1.28f: the concluding foil of N.7 "by its declaration of impatience with further elaboration, adds force to the laudator's confident assertion that N.7, his "hymn to Neoptolemos," has done justice to this hero and the other laudandi of the ode."

134 cf Young, PC 88.
feature? Stressing that the envoi need have no linear connexion may make Neoptolemos' sudden reappearance here unobjectionable, but it does not explain it.

That reappearance, and the earnest tone in which it is couched, reflects the importance of Neoptolemos in the poem. In N.7 Pindar moves freely between mythical and sublunary worlds to build his argument; and then sets the story of Neoptolemos and the praise of Thearion and Sogenes side by side in the division of his audience (64f) and his description of his labour (71-3). Now, at the end of the poem, he prays for his laudandus (98-101); and having dealt with that, naturally returns to the other main theme of the poem. Further, his prayer for Sogenes is for continuous prosperity - the equivalent of the poetic prosperity that Pindar has won for his mythical subject. Finally, Sogenes' future is in the lap of the gods. Pindar turns to something he can guarantee.

Ultimately, the reason for Neoptolemos' prominence is simply stated: he is an important figure for the Aeginetans; and so an important theme an an epinician for an Aeginetan. But he is also a controversial figure: ambivalent in the Delphic orthodoxy; admirable in his cameo in the Odyssey, and in the Little Iliad; but a brutal killer in the Iliupersis.

Bundy began to explain Neoptolemos' privileged mention at 103 by describing the poem as a "hymn to Neoptolemos" (SP 1.29).

We note the assimilation of the prayer to the mythical treatment, through the the use of Aiakid ancestors' as a referent; the image of the road; and the echo of 39f.

Cf Peliccia, Pindarus Homericus.

Cf Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 136f.
perhaps also in Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy*, and in the popular iconography.

We have seen how Pindar tackles this welter of confusion and opprobrium with a strategic blend of selection, focus and renovation. His treatment is a *tour de force*; a seriously formulated attempt to controvert the pejorative depictions of Neoptolemos. It provides the Aeginetans with an authoritative account of their hero - which account can now, on Nagy's model, make its bid for panhellenic dominance. As we have seen, it is in the relation between Pindar's version in *H.7*, and these other pejorative depictions of him, that the explanation of the unusual tone of various passages in *N.7* lies. In particular, 102ff dogmatically distance Pindar from the less favourable versions of Neoptolemos' story.

Complementing the conclusions of Neoptolemos' importance for the Aeginetan audience are rich implications for Pindar's art of encomium. It is the renovation of his myth which drives the argument of the poem. Before the myth, Pindar juxtaposes various considerations on the relation of poetry / *logos*, death and achievement, in both real and mythical worlds. His narration of the story of Neoptolemos proves his ability to circumvent death and disgrace and preserve achievement. He returns to the laudandus, for whom the same experience is therefore guaranteed. So Neoptolemos' story, confused and difficult, offers an extreme test case for Pindar's abilities for clarification and selection. He uses his authoritative, myth of

139 Tugendhat, Rechtfertigung 399.
Neoptolemos to establish his own credentials as a true witness to the Aiakids' greatness, and so as encomiast to the wisest of their descendants.
In my discussion of Aiakid myths in the epinicians, I have concentrated on one principal determining factor: the necessity that the narrated myth be traditional, known to the first audience. But we have also seen the pressure of rationalization, manifested in the exclusion of the magically supernatural. I have understated the impingement of the drift of the poem, which, certainly, can be important in the selection of a myth, and the selection of details therein.

These various demands can collide. This is a phenomenon we have already seen. Herakles' vulcanization of the infant Aias is traditional material, and yet magical. In his version of the story in I.6, Pindar teasingly includes it (note especially ἀπρημτον 47) but also carefully rationalizes it. On a larger scale, I explained the break-off in N.5 as the product of the collision of the demand to include important local material - the death of Phokos - and the demand to exclude the same story, on the basis that fratricide could not exemplify laudable action.

In this chapter, I discuss three similar, large-scale instances: P.3.27-30; the myth of 0.1; 0.9.27-41. These famous instances of Pindaric innovation in myth might seem obvious counter-examples to the hypothesis, suggested by my examination of Pindar's treatment of Aiakid myths, that the mythical material in epinician is typically traditional. In each case, however, it turns out that the hypothesis not only holds, but also illuminates various difficulties.
Pythian 3: Apollo's Raven

In P.3, Pindar tells how Koronis, pregnant with Asklepios by Apollo, is foolish enough to sleep with a man, Ischys, from Arcadia:

εἰς τοῖς ταῦτα μεγάλαυ διώταυν
πελεπλεύνων λήμα χορωνίδος ἐλθόμιν
τοὺς γὰρ εὐνάσθη ξένου
λέκτροισιν ἄπτ' Ἀρχαδίας.
οὔτε εὐλαβείς αὐτῶν ἐν δ' ἀρα μηλοδόχῳ
Πυθών τόσανς ἵναν ναοῦ βασίλεας
λοξίας, κοιμάν τις εὐθυτάτως γυνώμων πιθών,
πάντα ἵσαντί νῦν
ψευδών δ' οὐχ ἄπτεται, κλέπτει τέ μιν
οὐ στράς ὅβε βροτος ἐργος οὔτε βουλαῖς.

(P.3.24-30)

The story of Koronis' infidelity occurred somewhere in the Hesiodic corpus, but in a significantly different fashion:

tὸν δὲ περὶ τῶν κόρακα μοῦδιαν φησὶ καὶ 'Ἡλιόδου

μνημονεύοντα λέγειν οὕτως (fr. 60):

τῆμος ἄρ' ὁγγελος ἤλθε κόρακ, ἑφής ἀπὸ δαιτος
Πυθώ ἐς ἡγαθέν καὶ β' ἐφρασεν ἐργ' ἄτιδηλα
ὁμίθω ἀκροεκομῆ, ὅτι Ἠσίων γῆμεν κόρων
Εἰλατίδης, ἐλεγόα διαμνήτοιο θύγατρα.

(Σ.Π.3.52b)

1 But where, we do not know. Wilamowitz thought the Catalogue of Women, and constructed a Koronis Ehoie in detail, telling how, as in P.3, Apollo fathered Asklepios on Koronis (Isyllos von Epidaurus (Phil. Untersuchungen 9, 1886), 57-77, especially 70-72; cf Schwartz, Ps-Hesiodeia 397-403). But frs. 50-54 from the Catalogue tell a different story of Asklepios' birth, in which his mother is Arsinoe. It is implausible that both genealogies occurred in the same work (West, Hesiodic Catalogue 69-72, 123; cf E. J. and L. Edelstein, Asklepios 2.26 n.13). The story of Koronis must have occurred in another poem of the corpus.
The raven, conspicuously absent from P. 3, also appeared in Pherecydes' version (FGrH 3 F 3a). The scholiast on Pindar reports that Apollo δισχεράνας τὴν ἁγγελίαν αυτῇ λευκοῦ μελάνα συνέν [sc. the raven] ποιήσα (Σ.Ρ.3.52b); and this detail features also in Callimachus (Hecale fr. 74.15ff Hollis) and Ovid (Met.2.534ff).

This story smacks heavily of folklore. The motifs of the animal revealing a woman's infidelity to its master, and being punished for its pains, and of the raven turned black in punishment for some misdeed, are both common.

Why does Pindar lose the raven? Scholars were content to see here "the aggrandizement of Apollo, both as a god of infinite capabilities and of moral justice: Pindar is writing a polemic to correct Hesiod." But our doubts of the Greekness of such an explanation are immediately confirmed by the massive act of destruction over which Apollo presides over a few lines later:

---

2 The raven was Apollo's bird: E. J. and L. Edelstein, Asklepios 2. 29 n.27.
3 G. Méautis, Pindare le Dorien (Langages, 1962), 140 n.1, suggests that Apollo also changed the raven's song to a croak.
4 Stith Thompson, Motif-Index A.2237.1; J.551.1; cf B.131.3. See e.g. H. Oesterley (ed.), Gesta Romanorum (Berlin, 1872), no.68 (p.381f); J. Teit, "European Tales from the Upper Thompson Indians", Jnl. Am. Folklore 29 (1916), 301-29, here 328f; E. L. Handy, "Zuni Tales", Jnl. Am. Folklore 31 (1918), 451-71, here 464-7.
5 Young, 3 Odes 34; so Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 17: spreta igitur fabula Hesiodea diviniorem et perfectiorem Apollinis imaginem Pindarus depingit; Illig, Erzählung 63.
6 Young, 3 Odes 39.
But Young, whose avowed aim was "to show how [Pindar's] changes contribute organically to the composition of a coherent poem", in turn failed to provide a satisfactory explanation.  

Now, Pindar immediately follows the surprising revelation that Apollo's informer was his own omniscient mind with a declaration of Apollo's infallibility: αἰτὶ ποιήσας τὸ μὲν ἀφ᾽ οὗ Θεὸς ὁ θυρσὸς ἐργοὺς ὁτὲ βουλαίς (29f). This is a development from the commonplace that you cannot hide your behaviour from the gods, particularly appropriate in the case of the god of the Delphic oracle.

And the scholiast records that Artemon of Pergamon, in approval of Pindar's disposal of the raven, made explicit the connexion of thought implicit in those lines:

7 ibid. 34. His two explanations were that the introduction of the raven would commit Pindar to an extravagant digression; and that the mention of a κόρων might be confusing, in the proximity of Koronis (op. cit. 38, with n.2; cf 108, 54).

8 e.g. Hes. Op.268, Theog. 613 with West's notes; cf. 0.1.64.

9 cf Ρ.9.42.
The raven is lost because it is παράλογον that the god of Delphi, who prophesies to others, does not know about his own affairs. It is not that Pindar is writing a polemic to contradict Hesiod and honour Apollo, but that the image of Apollo as an Olympian - an incontrovertible donnée - makes it impossible that he should require a little bird to tell him things.¹¹

But this is not all. The manner of the raven's exclusion remains enigmatic: we must explain "the curiously emphatic and super-abundant phraseology" of 27ff.¹² Pindar misleads his audience into expecting the traditional story: οὐδ' ἠλάθει αὐτόν: immediately, we think of the raven. That suggestion is reinforced by ἀκοῦ, which usually means "hear", implying the dialogue between Apollo and the spying raven; and by παρειβαι, which again suggests Apollo's accomplice.¹³ The active participle παρειβαι is the first hint that anything is different, and the raven is definitively lost at the start of 29: Apollo's straight-talking confidant was nothing other than his own

¹° cf Σ.Ρ.3.46a.
¹¹ Komornicka, ΑΛΑΘΕΙΑ 256; Lefkowitz, Victory Ode 145.
¹² Burton, Pythian Odes 84; cf Wilamowitz, Pindaros 281.
¹³ Note also the insistence on Apollo's absence (27), as if to prepare us for the need for the bird.
omniscient mind, after all. And now we retrace our steps over the last couple of lines, and realize that the ἀποκόρος was Apollo himself; that θάνευ had a weaker meaning, of "perceived"; and that ἔμπνευ was being used in a figurative sense.\(^{14}\)

So, Pindar builds up the expectation of the raven; and then subverts that expectation. In a broad analogue to Gärtnér's explanation of the break-off in N.5, Cairns argues that the rejected version counterpoints and so highlights the new story.\(^{15}\) But this fails to confront the fact that there is only one account in P.3; there is no rejected version.

The solution is, I think, to see here conflicting determinants at work. In N.5, Phokos' murder demands a mention qua traditional material; and yet qua fratricide, cannot be included; and so Pindar calls it to his audience's mind even as he insists that it should not be mentioned. Here in P.3, the raven demands an appearance because it is traditional; but cannot feature, because it contradicts the datum of Apollo's status of omniscient Olympian: and so Pindar pretends to introduce it - but at the last moment, disingenuously insists that it has no place in the story.

The case is, then, very like the treatment of Aias' infancy in I.6, where his invulnerability is at once suggested and denied. Whatever contribution the new story, in which the raven does not figure, makes to the composition of a coherent

\(^{14}\) Silk, *Interaction* § 55.

\(^{15}\) Tibullus 189; Gerber, *Comm.* 69f; on N.5: Gärtnér, *Siegeslieder* 34. At the root of Cairns' explanation is the thesis that the poet deceives his audience into a response, and when he undeceives them, it is "into a doubly powerful opposite response" (166).
poem, the change, and its manner, are grounded in principles which do not seem to be particular to P.3 only.16

The failure of Apollo’s omniscience is at the centre of another correction, that works on identical lines, and which I outline here.

The story of Apollo’s amour with Kyrene which Pindar narrates in P.9 was taken from the Hesiodic Catalogue.17

Scholars have been puzzled by the dialogues between Apollo and Chiron, in which Apollo asks the centaur about the girl he sees fighting a lion, and asks how he should behave (30-7); and Chiron, in his answer, points out the absurdity of Apollo, τον ου θεμετον ψευδει θυγεων (42), asking for information and

---

16 Young argued that Pindar innovated in two other respects in P.3, also: he made Ischys, Koronis’ lover, not a Thessalian, but an Arcadian, “so that the myth of Koronis provides manifest evidence of the truth of the general statement in vv 20-23” (3 Odes 36); and he makes Koronis’ sin sleeping with Ischys – without waiting for a wedding song (16f) – rather than marrying him, as in the Hesiodic original ([Hes.] fr. 60.3): “thus he establishes the absence of song as the primary motif in the disastrous nature of Koronis’ new union” (3 Odes 35).

But, on the first head, there is some evidence for an Arcadian setting for the story (Hom. h. Ap. 209f), and for a genealogy in which Elatos, Ischys’ father, was Arcadian (Paus. 8.4.5) (H. Gregoire, R. Goosens, M. Mathieu, “Asklepios, Apollon Smintheus et Rudra”, Académie Royale de Belgique Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoirs 45 no.1 (1949), 21, 114). Pindar’s version is a product only of selection, and not invention (Lefkowitz, Victory Ode 163 n.39).

On the second: certainly, a marriage featured in [Hesiod] – Ισχυς γαμης Κορωνιον (fr.60) – and is not mentioned in P.3 (on γαμον 13 see Carey, 5 Odes 69f). But this does not entitle us to conclude either that Koronis’ sin in [Hesiod] was only marriage, or that Pindar’s account precludes it. Parallels suggest that Apollo is angry because Koronis has slept with Ischys (I. Lévy, “La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine”, Bibliothque de L’École des hautes Études fasc. 250 (1927), 297f; the story of Semele, as suggested by Janko, Aktaion 301f n.12). The difficulty of supplying an alternative explanation is exemplified by E. J. and L. Edelstein, Asklepios 2.28ff. Again, the perceived innovation by Pindar need be nothing more than his change of focus.

advice (39ff). Kohnken swept away much of the difficulty by showing that Pindar's model was the Διός ἀμάτη of Iliad 14. Apollo is knocked witless (43) by his desire for Kyrene - just as Zeus is by Hera, wearing Aphrodite's wonderful girdle: ἡς ὦ ἱδεν, ἡς μὲν ἔρως πυχινὰς φρένας ἀμφεχάλυψεν.

If we remove the Iliadic elements from Pindar's account, we are left with a dialogue in which Apollo asks Chiron who Kyrene is, and Chiron answers. But, of course, Apollo should know these things, as he should know about Koronis in P.3; and so Pindar edits the story. By using the model of the Διός ἀμάτη, he retains the traditional element - the question and answer - but produces a new version in which that traditional dialogue conforms with the incontrovertible datum of Apollo's omniscience.

18 Illig, Erzählung 35-45 presents a gamut of explanations; cf Carey, 5 Odes 74.
20 Illig, Erzählung 40f.
21 Kohnken argues for a number of Pindaric innovations in P.9, of which the most important is the shift of the locale of the marriage to Libya (51ff, 67ff; Meilichos Orga 98-101). But even if the move to Libya did not take place in the Catalogue (and West is inclined to think that it did (Hesiodic Catalogue 87, 132)), it is most improbable that it had not been suggested long before Pindar by a colonist who lived in a city called Cyrene, founded c.630, of which Apollo was the major deity (F. Chamoux, "Cyrène sous la Monarchie des Battides" Bibliothèques des Écoles Francaises D'Athènes et de Rome 177 (Paris, 1953), 301). That it was traditional Cyrenean material is suggested by Herodotus, who presents the story of Apollo and Kyrene's retreat unobtrusively embedded into a Cyrenean foundation myth (4.157.2). In other places P.9 uses traditional Cyrenean material (98, 102; also the depiction of Antaios: W. T. MacGrath, "The Antaios Myth in Pindar", TAPA 107 (1977), 203-24). (On the name Cyrene for the city, see Chamoux, op. cit. 126f: it seems to have meant "the place where the asphodel (χύρος) grows").
Olympian 1: Pelops' Cooking

In 0.1, Pindar appears to reject a traditional story about Pelops being cooked by his father Tantalos, and served to the gods. The gods, the story went, realized—but after Demeter had eaten the shoulder; and so, when they restored Pelops to life, they gave him a new shoulder made of ivory. But Pindar explains Pelops' disappearance as his rape by Poseidon, who snatched him from a picnic and took him up to Olympus.

In this poem, as in P.3, the division of old and new stories remains unclear. Pindar begins his mythical account:

\[ έν εὐάνορι λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποκλίσις
τοῦ μεγαθενής ἔρασοντο Γαίδοχος
Ποσειδάνιν, ἐπεὶ νῦν καθαρὸν λέβητος ἔξελε Κλωθή,
ἐλέφαντι φαῖδομοι ὄμην χειδημένου. \]

(0.1.24-7)²

If these lines refer to a new Pindaric version which describes Pelops being born with an ivory shoulder—that is, if the presence of the Fate Klotho and the odd adjective καθαρὸς are enough to signal this change³—then ἐπεὶ cannot be temporal.⁴ But if it is causal,⁵ then it not only does not give a satisfactory reason for Poseidon falling for the babe,⁶ but also

---

1 Traditional: αὐτὰ προτέρων (36).
2 A convenient review of the difficulties here is given by Gantz, Darkness 31f.
3 Wilamowitz, Pindaros 234f.
4 Farnell, Works 2.6.
5 Kakridis, Pelopssage 188-90; Gildersleeve 131.
6 Verdenius, Comm. 2.17.
provokes the question: what is this ivory shoulder? If, on the other hand, the lines refer to the traditional story of the cooking, then they are narrating the story denied in 37ff. But there is no warning that these lines are not true; and if they are "true", then Pindar is being extraordinarily inconsistent. If this is the old, rejected story, why does it resemble straight narrative; and if it is new, straight narrative, why does it so much resemble the old story?

Any simple explanation of the lines runs into an insurmountable difficulty. Scholars seem now to have accepted this, and appeal to ambivalence and ambiguity in their explanations. So Cairns explains that Pindar misleadingly implies that επει is temporal, but later shows that it must have been causal; Köhnken admits that the audience will have been baffled by the επει clause; and Howie suggests that ἀποκροὴν λέβητος is a deliberately ambiguous phrase, resolved by the identification of Klotho.

I suggest that these lines sum up what was, in Pindar's time, a traditional story: when Pelops was revivified and pulled out of the cauldron, Poseidon fell for him.

On this model, επει (26) is temporal; we note that Pindar concentrates on the timing of Poseidon's love in his corrected

---

7 Köhnken, *Time and Event* 68ff.
8 Howie, *Pelops* 283.
10 This is, then, as yet, an innocent kephalaiōn (Köhnken, *Time and Event* 68f; Hamilton, *Epinikion* 63f).
version (διότε 37, τότε 40). The καθαρόν λέβητος (26) is the stew pot from which he was resurrected. Gerber offers "purified", and this gives the correct slant. We note that Pindar is here speaking unequivocally of the second use to which the cauldron is put: Pelops is pulled out, with his new shoulder, and Poseidon falls for him. And so the cauldron has been rid of the taint of the cooking; certainly, its present role is in contrast to its function as kitchen utensil.

The scholiast suggests that there are two cauldrons; and although this may be a guess, it is not a bad one. For the meal which Pindar describes at 37ff is an eranos; and this, primarily a service in a sequence of reciprocal favours, is used by Pindar in its later sense to describe a meal to which participants contribute (P.12.14). We know that Pelops was not the first course (δεύτερα 50, with Gerber’s note). The pure cauldron, then, might be the cauldron which the Olympians

11 Slater, *Pindar’s Myths* 65 n.7.
12 λέβητος limits neither the pot’s type nor its use. R. Ginouves, *Balaneutike* (Paris, 1962), 57f. But it does mean the type of pot which needs a tripod; indeed, τρίποδος might be used for λέβητος (ibid. 59 n.3). So even if it does not mean cooking pot, it still suggests the tripod necessary for boiling up the Pelopid stew: it is not a neutral word which hangs awaiting clarification (Howie, *Pelops* 286).
13 cf Howie, *Pelops* 285f, arguing that, while the adjective is deliberately vague and will ultimately demand reinterpretation, on its first hearing it stresses the positive aspect of the traditional story.
14 Σ.0.1.42d; Slater, *Pelops at Olympia* 500; Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymn* 174.
15 Σ.0.1.40e. Howie’s objections are not knock-down (*Pelops* 282f).
brought to cook the first course. In sum, the scholiast's solution is simple and attractive, although it remains unevidenced.\(^\text{17}\)

Burkert points out the importance of the "big tripod kettle" in Olympic sacrificial customs and the prevalence of tripods there;\(^\text{18}\) in this context, the description of the cauldron as ἀπαρός is less difficult.\(^\text{19}\)

The presence of Klotho has been thought to signal a literal childbirth.\(^\text{20}\) But the Moirai are present at the inception of the Olympic Games (0.10.52) - a birth more metaphorical than this. I doubt that her appearance alone would be strong enough to signal the change.\(^\text{21}\) As she is appropriate to a birth, so is she appropriate to a rebirth.\(^\text{22}\)

Pelops' ivory shoulder (27) must be the one he was given to replace the one Demeter ate.\(^\text{23}\) It was kept at Olympia,

---

\(^\text{17}\) But both Vondeling (op. cit. 7) and Gerber (Comm. 74) understand from 39 that the whole meal is Tantalos' reciprocal gift to the gods.

\(^\text{18}\) HH 100f; Slater, Pelops at Olympia 495ff.

\(^\text{19}\) Slater, ibid. 500f.

\(^\text{20}\) Wilamowitz, Pindaros 235; Kühnken, Time and Event 71.

\(^\text{21}\) As Fehr, Mythen 103 suggests - with the rider that it would to anyone who approaches Pindar's account with no previous knowledge of the story. This cannot be the right way to approach Pindar's mythologizing.

\(^\text{22}\) Krummen, Pyrsos Hymnon 174. (Bacchylides fr.42 mentions Rhea as healing Pelops; but entitles us to infer neither that that was the canonical version nor that Klotho did not pull Pelops out after Rhea had reassembled him.)

\(^\text{23}\) The alternative - that 27 must refer to Pelops at the time of his birth, described in 26 - means either that the ivory shoulder should be thought of figuratively (Howie, Pelops 287; Kühnken, Time and Event 71), or that Pelops was born with an ivory shoulder: "that might seem strange, but "there are many
separate from the rest of his remains (Paus.5.13.4ff, 6.22.1; Pliny HH 28.34). Parke dates the story to the sixth century; the time of a number of charters for which the warrant was a hero's bones. It is reasonable to infer that the story of Demeter eating the shoulder blade predated the identification of the relic.

This interpretation of 25-7 runs counter to the scholarship which sees Pelops' rape by Poseidon as Pindar's innovative substitution of his cooking by Pelops. One pillar of this argument is the perceived novelty of Poseidon's appearance in the narrative. His absence from previous accounts is evidenced, it is argued, by Myrtilos' role in the story of Pelops' winning his bride, the daughter of Qinomaos. Myrtilos was Qinomaos' charioteer, and seems to be an early feature of the story - possibly appearing in the Alcaeanis. Pelops' marvels" (Verdenius, Comm. 2.17). These alternatives seem to me to be bankrupt: there is nothing in the text to suggest either of them. Lefkowitz, Victory Ode 82, points out that Odysseus, too, had a ἀλέφιναν ἄλον (Od.11.128); but this does not help with ἔλεφωτι.

24 The whole question is elegantly discussed by Parke, Bones. He infers the existence of the relic from the fact that Pelops' shoulder blade and other remains were not kept together; from the unusual but insignificant name of Damarmenos for the fisherman who found the bone; and from the late attempts to combine the inorganic story of its necessity for the fall of Troy with other more traditional features (e.g. Σ.LV.II.6.92 claims that the Palladion was made of Pelops' bones). Also Burkert, HN 99; Slater, Pelops at Olympia 492.

25 e.g. Orestes': Hdt. 1.116.1; Parke, Bones 160. But see the caution of Gerber, Comm. 56.

26 Parke, Bones 160.

27 Köhnken, Time and Event 75 n.42.

28 Howie Pelops 279; L. Lacroix, "La légende de Pélops et son iconographie", BCH 100 (1976), 327-41, here 332 n.50. For a
victory through his assistance - he sabotages Oinomaos' chariot - is thought unsuitable for encomium; and so the need for a story more creditable to Pelops.\textsuperscript{29}

But both he and Poseidon appear in combination in Euripides and Pherecydes.\textsuperscript{30} Their assistance is not logically exclusive: Poseidon gives Pelops the chariot which will enable him to outrun Oinomaos, and Myrtilos is in charge of the murder of his master.\textsuperscript{31} Further, the manner of the assassination - either the removal of the linchpins, or their replacement with pins of wax - means that Oinomaos must drive far enough for the wheels to work loose from the axle. While the race is still on, Pelops must outrun him.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{29} K\text{"o}hnken, \textit{Poseidon Hippios} 203. He also brings unpleasant reverberations: he attempts to rape Hippodameia; is killed by Pelops; and as he falls to his death, curses the Pelopids. Apoll. \textit{Ep.2.7}; \textit{S.A.R.1.52}; \textit{S.Eur.0r.998}.

\textsuperscript{30} Or.982ff; Pherecydes \textit{FGrH} 3 F 37b. Sergent, \textit{Homosexuality} 66 asserts that Sophocles' description of Myrtilos falling from a golden chariot (\textit{Elec.509-11}) shows it to have been a gift from a god, and this seems reasonable (so too Jebb ad loc.).

\textsuperscript{31} A satisfying parallel appears in the running race in the \textit{Iliad}. Odysseus, behind Aias, prays to Athena: \textit{τοὺς δ’ ἔκλυε Πάλλας Ἀθηνή, γυῖα δ’ ἔσηκεν ἐλαφρά, πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐπερεῦν. ἄλλ’ ὦτε δὴ τάχ’ ἐμελλὼν ἑπαξέσθαι ἔσθελον, ἔνθεραῖς μὲν ἐλικοδέ σέων – ἐλάπεν γὰρ Ἀθηνή...} (\textit{Iliad} 23.771-74)

Odysseus is rejuvenated and his opponent is nobbled.

\textsuperscript{32} In any case, Pindar might simply have omitted Myrtilos, by glossing over the mechanics of the victory - as, in fact, he
Further, there is other evidence for Poseidon's early presence in the story, which must be ignored if Pindar is to be credited with his introduction. The race between Oinomaos and Pelops is shown on the sixth-century chest of Kypselos; Pausanias describes Pelops' horses as winged (5.17.7). Surely, this suggests that, as at 0.1.87, Poseidon has provided wonderful horses. Although this need not imply a liaison between the two, we know of no other explanation for these horses than that they are a lover's gift from Poseidon.

The following story about Pelops' son, Chrysippos, is suggestive:

δ δε [Λάιος] ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ διατελῶν ἐπιξενοῦται Πέλοπι, καὶ τοῦτο πατ' Χρύσιπποι θρυματοδρομεῖν διδάσκων δρασθείς ἀναπάτει.

(Apoll. 3.5.5)

does, anyway (Gerber apud Hurst, Aspects du Temps 202 (cf 186)).

33 See also Hubbard, Cooking 16 n.2.

34 To match Oinomaos', a gift from Ares: Apoll. Ep.2.5; Hyg. fab.84.

35 But Köhnken attempts to explain them away (Time and Event 75 n.42 - endorsed by Verdenius, Comm. 2.17). Idas and Bellerophon, who also received winged horses from Poseidon (Bacch. 20; [Hes.] fr. 84ff), were his sons (Howie, Pelops 280).

36 cf Athen. Deipn.13.603A, citing Praxilla of Sikyon (PMG 751) as making Zeus the rapist (cf, probably, Hyg. fab.271); Σ.Eur. Phoen.1760; Hyg. fab.85. There is no sure evidence for this story before the fifth century: Dover, Initiation 128. Lloyd-Jones, Justice 120f, argues for this story in Aeschylus' Laios and shows the impossibility of either tracing it back further - i.e., to the Oedipodia -, or ruling that source out. See Kamerbeek's 0.T. 1-8, for what little we do know on the matter. The most helpful version of the oracle to Laios is given in the argument of Euripides' Phoenissae: he is told that it is fated that he die at his son's hands because Zeus was swayed by Pelops, οὗ φίλοι γιρκάσας νιόν.
Though the precise nature of the connexion between this story and that of Pelops is not clear, it at least confirms the association of chariot horses and homosexual love which is manifested in 0.1 by Poseidon's gift. The simplest explanation for this is that eromenoi are typically of an age when they learn how to drive chariots; and so it is an appropriate field for the generosity of an important erastes.

Pindar's innovation of Poseidon's role is also evidenced, it is argued, by his use of the description of Ganymede's rape in the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite as a model for Pelops'. The linchpin of this argument is Pelops' destination: Poseidon takes him to the θώμα Διός (42). Pelops goes to the house of Zeus because that is where, more appropriately, Zeus took Ganymede:

* η τοι μὲν Γανυμήδη ζεύς
* ἔφασεν δὲ διὰ κάλλος ἐν ἀθανάτοις μετείη
* καὶ τε Δίὸς κατὰ θεός ἐπιοινοχεύοι, θώμα ἢδειν...

(Hom. h.Aphr.202-5)

37 Unconvincing answers are offered by Lefkowitz, Victory Ode 101 n.16 (see Hubbard, Cooking 18 n.22) and Sergent, Homosexuality 67-70. R. Caldwell, "The Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Greek Myth", in L. Edmunds (ed.), Approaches to Greek Myth (John Hopkins U.P., 1990), 344-89, here 372, considers the myth only from Laios' perspective.

38 cf Ephorus FGrH 70 F 149; and the horses which Zeus gave Tros in exchange for Ganymede (11.5.26ff). (But was Ganymede at this time stolen as an eromenos or simply a wine-pourer? See Sergent, Homosexuality 205-13; Dover, Greek Homosexuality 196f.)

39 Dover, Initiation 123.

40 Kakridis, Pelopssage 175-88.

41 Kakridis, Pelopssage 177f.
But Verdenius points out correctly that δῶμα Διός means Olympus; even in the hymn, Ganymede is amongst the gods as their wine pourer there. It is, then, not an inappropriate destination for Pelops. In fact, the allusion does not guarantee the story of the rape of Pelops, but informs χρέος, delicately giving it an erotic tone: Ganymede is the pattern of the eromenos. Certainly, also, the implicit comparison of the young Pelops and Ganymede is to Pelops’ credit.

Another area in which critics have seen the poet’s innovation is his version of Tantalos’ crime: now Pindar has lost the traditional crime of his cooking of Pelops, he must invent a new one – the theft of ambrosia. He neatly ties this in with the fact that Pelops must be returned to earth to win

42 Verdenius, Comm. 2.24, comparing e.g. II.1.221f. This considerably weakens the explanation of Köhnken, who finds significance in the fact that Pelops goes to the palace of the “supreme Olympian god” (Poseidon Hippios 204).

43 See Gerber, Comm. 80f. The earliest treatment of Ganymede’s rape in which its sexual aspect is explicit is Ibycus’ (PMG 289); but it seems implicit in the Homeric hymn, where it appears in a catalogue of sexual incidents (Sergent, Homosexuality 208); and even, perhaps, in the Iliad, which emphasizes Ganymede’s beauty (20.233, 235). We note that the chronology in 0.1 given by δευτέρω χρόνω (43) implies the genealogy of the Little Iliad (fr.29 B = E6F F 6), in which Ganymede is Laomedon’s son, rather than that of the Iliad (20.231-6), in which he is Laomedon’s uncle (Gerber, Comm. 79). So in the matter of Ganymede’s genealogy, at least, Pindar is following the Little Iliad, in which the rape seems to have been sexual (Σ.Α.II.20.234; Severyns, CE 346f).

44 Gerber, Comm. 78.

45 Bacch. fr.42; Eur. I.T.386-88; Ovid Met.6.404-411; Hyg. fab.83f.

46 Hubbard, Cooking 9-12, suggests that it is a conscious echo of the story of Prometheus’ theft of fire (Hes. Theog.565f).
Hippodameia. That he should be punished for his father's crime by expulsion from Olympus was admired by the scholiast and has been seen even by Köhnken as the mainspring for the narrative of Tantalos' crime.

But, in fact, it was not generally agreed that Tantalos' crime was his treatment of Pelops. In the Nosti, he was a hedonist punished for asking Zeus to let him live like the gods (fr. 4 B = EGF F 9). Sophocles may have used a story of his having concealed a golden dog stolen from Zeus, and denied to Hermes that he was doing so. Interestingly, the Epitome of Apollodorus shares Pindar's version, and gives a little more:

κολάζεσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν οὐτὼς λέγουσι τινες, ὅτι τὸ τῶν θεῶν δεξιόλησεν ἀνθρώπων μυστήρια, καὶ ὅτι τῆς ἀμβροσίας τοῖς ἠλικίωταις μεταδίδον.

(Ep.2.1)

47 Köhnken, Poseidon Hippios 202.
48 Σ.0.1.105:
δαιμονίως τὴν ἱστορίαν μετεχειρίσατο, καὶ φησιν ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν τοῦ Ταντάλου οἱ θεοὶ πάλιν ἐξ οἰδονοῦ τὸν Πελόπην ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ἀνθρώπους.
49 Poseidon Hippios 202. So too Sicking, First Olympian (67f), who adds that it also answers the question suggested by the denial of the cooking crime - why was Tantalos punished? Slater, Doubts 200f, gives a sensible and more sophisticated explanation for Tantalos' presence.
50 J. E. Hylén, De Tantalo (Diss., Upsala 1896), 103f.
51 Alcman fr.79 PMG seems to show this scene; R. D. Griffith, "The Mind in its own Place: Pindar, Olympian 1.57f", GRBS 27 (1986), 5-13, here 7. Cf Σ.0.1.91.
52 In the Tantalus (fr.572, 573 R); the story is given by Σ.0.1.91; Σ.0d.19.518, 20.66.
Might both Pindar and Apollodorus reflect the Hesiodic *Catalogue* here?\(^{53}\)

Whether this is so or not, it is plainly perfectly possible that the story of Tantalos stealing the ambrosia was traditional.\(^{54}\) The thematic parallels between this story and the story of his cooking Pelops might have been the product of the early mythopoeic imagination, rather than of Pindar's care that his new story is appropriate to Tantalos.\(^{55}\)

What is impossible, however, is that Tantalos could have cooked his son and remained in the company of the gods, to be expelled later, for the theft. As I am suggesting that in the story Pindar knew, Pelops was both cooked and snatched, I must here see some Pindaric innovation. It may be that in the original, Pelops did not become immortal.\(^{56}\) Then Poseidon simply returned him when he reached adulthood (5.1.67f); and so there is no need for a second crime of Tantalos. In this case, ...

---

\(^{53}\) Apollodorus' two crimes also seem to be lurking in Hyginus *fab.* 82; see Schwartz, *Ps-Hesiodeia* 308-13 for speculation about the implications of this. The fourth book of the *Catalogue* covered the Pelopids (fr. 195 with *argumentum* [Hes.] *Scutum*; Lobel on P.Oxy. 2355).

\(^{54}\) For a plausible model, see Nagy, *Pindar’s Homer* 131 n.84. There is no sure evidence. See Hylén, op. cit. 22f and 35f, with Howie, *Pelops* 296, and Gerber, *Comm.* 104.

\(^{55}\) Tantalos was perceived as the right man to serve inappropriate food. Howie, *Pelops* 297, imputes exactly this kind of thinking to the myth-makers who feature in Pindar's implicit account of the spread of the traditional myth: Pindar implies that "the two feasts [Tantalos'] feast for the gods from which Pelops was taken and his feast for men at which ambrosia was served] were confused, and a story arose in which the gods were the guests and the wrong food was the flesh of Pelops."

\(^{56}\) Maybe he was not taken to Olympus. Then Pindar's allusion to Ganymede guarantees Pelops' destination: the house of Zeus is the proper place for the *eromenoi* of the gods.
Pindar is here tidying up the eschatology: if Pelops was with the gods on Olympus, he was immortal.57

Finally, I have not seen an explanation sufficiently convincing to account for the massive scale of invention perceived in the poem.58

There is, on the other hand, an argument, of an entirely different nature, which is highly suggestive of the antiquity of the story of Poseidon's involvement - quite apart from the suggestions of it I have outlined above. This turns on the identity of structure of the stories of Pelops' rape and cooking; and the fact that that structure, and elements in both stories, are typical of the initiation which marks the stages a youth passes through on his way to maturity.59

57 As was Ganymede at 0.10.104f.

58 Köhnken, Poseidon Hippios is held up as a satisfactory interpretation (e.g. Dover, Initiation 129; Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 73 n.7). But his identification of "the theme of divine horses ...[as] one of the most important unifying elements in the structure of the ode" (202) is, on reflection, not particularly helpful - compare the importance of horses in his analysis of 0.3 ("Mythological Chronology and Thematic Coherence in Pindar's Third Olympian", HSCP 87 (1983), 49-63, here 61f. "The motive of divine favour is a leitmotif in all three parts of the myth" (204); but resurrection at the hands of the gods is itself a clear example of divine favour. The problem is that innovation here must mean that the story is changed to become a more suitable paradeigma; but Pelops as Poseidon's boy lover is not a suitable paradeigma for Hieron. And so Gerber must write "since Pelops is an analogue of Hieron, the implication is that Hieron too enjoys divine love, although this love is of course not on the same physical level" (Comm. 54) (but cf. F. Cairns, "ἘΡΩΣ in Pindar's First Olympian Ode", Hermes 105 (1977), 128-32, for an attempt at least to iron out the anomaly; Krummen, Pyrsos Hymnon 204). In general, see Verdenius, Comm. 2.1-4; Hubbard, Cooking 4; and Sicking, First Olympian 60-62, attacking Young, 3 Odes 121-3.

59 The threefold rhythm of expulsion, isolation and reintegration is given by van Gennep, Rites of Passage 10. But it is a model which must be used with care: it might be applied to the behaviour of a baby in a cradle (the Freudian fort-da game;
Both Pelops stories transparently display the tripartite scheme of expulsion, isolation and reintegration. In the cooking story, Pelops is dismembered, cooked ready to be eaten, and reborn, marked with his ivory shoulder. In the rape story, he is snatched up to Olympus to pour the wine; is missed by his mother; and returns marked by his growing beard, and the gift of a chariot.

The connexions between the two stories are striking. One might argue that Pindar had deliberately constructed the rape story so as to resemble the cooking story, but that the simil-

---


A detail featured also at Hom. *h.Dem*.44. It is more likely that this is because it is a typical feature of the story of a mortal snatched by a god (Richardson on *h.Dem*.19; Howie, *Pelops* 310 nn. 132, 133) than that it reflects more sophisticated tensions (Howie, ibid. 294; R. D. Griffith, "Pelops and Sicily: The Myth of Pindar 01.1", *JHS* 109 (1989), 171-3).


Sergent *Homosexuality* 64.

Arities are revealed only by an analysis of their structure. Pelops' disappearance up to Olympus is not a simple substitute for his comparatively short cooking time.

On this argument, both are likely to be traditional myths, expressive of Pelops' transition to maturity. Has, then, Pindar cobbled these two discrete (because equivalent) stories together?

Now, Pelops' chariot race against Dinomaos has also been seen as symbolic of his transition to manhood: not only is he winning a bride, but he is killing the old king.\(^{65}\) We have seen that he seems to have traditionally used the horses given to him by his old erastes Poseidon - from which we may infer that these stories were contiguous. Now, if we put all three together, we have a neat progression beginning in his childhood with his cooking;\(^{66}\) then ὁρειότερος ἐν τῇ ἀναζωσίᾳ γέγονε (Apoll. Ep.2.3);\(^{67}\) so Poseidon falls for him, snatches him and returns him when he is beginning to grow a beard and think of marriage (0.1.67ff); and finally he kills the king and marries his daughter. Three rites of passage myths are run together to form a single narrative.\(^{68}\) Such trebling is typical of

---

65 Hubbard, *Cooking* 5; cf Burkert, HN 95-103, GR 105-7; Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* 122; Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnion* 201.

66 Young children are the standard ingredients for cannibalistic meals (Henrichs, *Human Sacrifice* 225 nn. 1, 4).


68 Sergent, *Homosexuality* 67 (but not 65).
folklore. 69 There is no reason to suppose that Pindar was the first to combine the stories.

For all these reasons, then, it is on balance more probable that these stories had already been combined, and, accordingly, that 0.1.25-7 is an innocent-looking kephalaion which sums up the known story of Pelops cooked and saved, and loved by Poseidon.

But by line 52, Pindar has dissociated himself from the story: ἀφύσταμαι. Two principles have driven this rejection. 70

The first is the model of untruth which Pindar presents at 28ff:

η θαύματα πολλά, καὶ ποῦ τι καὶ βροτῶν
φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγου
δεδαφισμένοι ψεῦδει ποικίλοις
ἐξαπατώντι μύθοι.

30 Χάρις δ’, ὑπὲρ ἀπατα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θυατοῖς,
ἐπιφέροισα τιμᾶν καὶ ἐπιστοὺ ἐμόσατο πιστῶν
ἐμμενη τὸ πολλάκις
ἀμέραι δ’ ἐπίλοιποι
μάρτυρας σοφῶτατοι.

(0.1.28-34)

Verdenius has an excellent note on ὑπὲρ: "It is misleading to say (Hubbard, [Pindaric Mind] 103) that "the myth is declared 'false'": Pindar uses "beyond" instead of "against" in order to

69 Propp, Morphology 74f. For trebling in initiation ritual, see van Gennep, Rites of Passage 80-2. Achilles provides a ready mythical parallel: as an infant he is cooked but saved; as a child he is entrusted to the wild where he learns to hunt; and he dresses as a girl on Skyros; which culminates in his amour with Deidameia and the birth of Pyrrhos (Jeanmaire, Couroi 298; E. Crawley, "Achilles on Scyrus", CQ 7 (1893), 243-6; cf Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis 153f).

70 cf Pini, Correzioni 364; Griffith, Contest 199.
suggest that his dissenting view (36 ἄντια) does not completely 
contradict the traditional story, but returns to its true 
kernel, the fancies of others having gone too far. Similarly 
N.7.20-1 πλέουτα... λόγων.” 71 Pindar represents “mythoi as if 
they were additions to the kernel of truth as formulated by 
aletheia.” 72

But time will reveal the truth (33f); the model must be 
that it will find out the kernel, winnowing the falsehoods of 
generations of mythoi aside. 73 The implication is that it will

71 Comm. 2.19; on N.7.20f, see above, p.218-20; cf Richardson, 
Pindar 385f. See also Hippolyta’s lies to her husband: they 
are not a complete fabrication—there was an attempt at 
seduction—but a distortion of what actually happened: τὸ δὲ 
ἐναντίον ἔκχειν (N.5.31; cf 0.1.36): Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 105f 
with n. 104.

72 Nagy, Pindar’s Homer 66; cf Veyne, Did the Greeks? 14, 59ff. 
Cole argues that the word aletheia originally included the 
notion of the exclusion of “irrelevant or misleading 
inclusions”—pseudea, which, though fuller, are “based on 
guess-work and invention” (Archaic Truth 10-12; but see too 
24-6). On mythos, see Köhnken, Funktion 49 n.62; Verdenius, 
Comm. 2.30.

73 Richardson, Pindar 386f; cf 0.10.53-5: 
ὅ τε ἔξελέγχων μόνος 
ἀλάθειαν ἔτητυμον 
Χρόνος. τὸ δὲ σωφρονὲς ἵνα πάροικα κατέφρασεν...

D. Furley, "Truth as what Survives the Elenchos: an Idea in 
Parmenides", in P. Huby and G. Neal (eds.), The Criterion of 
Truth (Liverpool University Pr., 1989), 1-12, here 8. On 
ἐξελέγχων as "bringing to light by examination", see Verdenius, 
Comm. 2.73; J. H. Lesher, "Parmenides’ Critique of Thinking", 
Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 2 (Oxford, 1984), 1-30, 
here 6. On the attribution of this role to Time, rather than 
to the successive versions which will take place through time, 
see Bowra, Pindar 32; D. E. Gerber, "What Time Can Do (Pindar, 
Nemean 1.46-7)", TAPA 93 (1962), 30-33, here 30f; id. Comm. 
67f; differently, P. Vivante, "On Time in Pindar", Arethusa 5 
(1972), 107-31, here 110, 125.
show Pindar’s version to be the true one – but in this poem, Pindar does not make the claim explicit.⁷⁴

Having brought to the audience’s attention the possibility of exaggeration, Pindar introduces the neighbour’s lie (47-51). It is based on a kernel of truth (Pelops’ disappearance at a picnic attended by the gods), but is embroidered with falsehood. When the genuine account of what happened – the simple story of Pelops’ rape (39-42) – is contaminated with the neighbour’s lie, it becomes the traditional version summarized at 25-27: Pelops is cooked and eaten and then abducted.⁷⁵

But why should Pindar’s audience accept the tacit claim that Pindar’s is the true account, and the neighbour’s lie just a lie? Because Pindar has in turn exaggerated the neighbour’s lie so that it no longer reflects any known version of the story: Tantalos does not kill Pelops, but all the gods do (ἢμου); and they all eat him, too (φάγον)⁷⁶ – which makes the business of the revival, and the shoulder, difficult.⁷⁷ It is not enough to say simply that the changes exaggerate the horror

⁷⁴ Implication: Slater, Hypothekai 80; not explicit: Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 103, contra Gerber, Comm. 67.
⁷⁵ cf, broadly, Howie, Pelops 296-8 who also suggests that "the neighbour’s lie developed into the myth".
⁷⁶ See below on γαστρίμαργον, also.
⁷⁷ Kakridis, Pelopssage 187 n.44; Howie, Pelops 296. Gantz alone confronts this point with the vigour it deserves: "he refutes a literally unheard of story, that the gods themselves cooked Pelops, cutting him limb from limb, and devouring him down to the last tasty morsel" (Darkness 33f). (He follows Gildersleeve’s translation of δεύτερα, "the last morsels"; Gerber points out that it is always temporal (Comm. 87); but Pelops must be eaten all up anyway.)
of what happened; for they radically change the story. He has sabotaged the alternative version, manipulating it so that it is no longer traditional, in order to give spurious authority to his own.

The particular form of exaggeration is also significant; and this brings us to the second principle which enables the rejection of the traditional story. The truth is as yet hidden from us; meanwhile:

εστι δ' ἀνθρώ πάθεν ἰδιωκάς ἀμφ' θαλ'-μόνων καλά' μείων γὰρ αἰτία.

(0.1.35)

The notion of seemliness is given more content by Pindar's recoil from his exaggerated version:

εμοὶ δ' ἁπάρα γαστρίμαρ-γου μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν' ἀφίσταμαί·ἀκέρδεια λέογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους.

(0.1.52f)

The crucial word is γαστρίμαργον - not "cannibal", nor yet simply "gluttonous" (Gerber): rather the brutal "belly-crazy" given by Howie. Plato describes the function of stomach and entrails: men have them.

78 As does Wilamowitz, Pindaros 236.
79 Gantz, Darkness 34. Furley, op. cit. 9f, suggests that the form of argument was a typical archaic thought pattern; certainly, it is polar reasoning (see G. E. R. Lloyd, Polarity and Analogy; Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought (C.U.P., 1966), 106ff, 125f).
80 This is an interim tactic of caution (Gerber, Comm. 71; Richardson, Pindar 387): it does not evidence piety.
What is important about ἱερόμαρμος is: how unlike a god.

And this highlights what is wrong with the first story: it is ungodlike for an Olympian - even the grief-stricken Demeter - to unthinkingly eat part of Pelops at a picnic; just as it was ungodlike of Apollo to rely on the raven to find out about Koronis. And the old story features a magic cauldron and a magic prosthesis - neither of which are congenial elements for Pindar. The incident is shot through with the paralogon.

In 0.1, then, Pindar begins by summarizing the traditional myth (25-7). He then introduces the notion of exaggeration, and urges that one speak well of the gods, in lieu of a secure insight to the truth (28-35). Then he introduces an exaggeration of the traditional version, which not only lacks the authority of tradition, but is incontrovertibly absurd, because it reduces the Olympians to the level of animals (48-51). From this he distances himself, uncontroversially, leaving his new version - which includes none of the dramatically absurd elements of the traditional version of 25-7 - unchallenged (52f).

---

82 Craik, Olympian 1 and 9 139; cf Hubbard, Cooking 13.

83 This argument is very like Woodbury's reconstruction of Stesichorus' palinode (Woodbury, Helen, in particular 166 with n.16, 170, 173f); but Pindar has sabotaged the traditional version to lend credence to his apostasy. See too Griffith, Contest 197f; 206 n.52 on the myth of Ixion (with Grant, Folk-tale 81f).
So why does Pindar open the mythical section of 0.1 with an account of a myth which he then expends a good deal of energy in rejecting? Because it is traditional material; and this, as has become increasingly obvious, is of intrinsic value in epinician. In this case, it is especially traditional, because the ivory shoulder, which has no part in the new myth, was a known relic at Olympia. It physically exists as a datum which Pindar must include. So too with the cauldron, “the primary permanent cult object”. As in P.3, Pindar’s dilemma is that the traditional material is absurd; and as in P.3, he manages both to include it, and subsequently to exclude it from his formal narrative.

The technique by which Pindar sabotages the traditional story demonstrates the complement of the hypothesis that traditional material has intrinsic value in epinician: untraditional material is worthless. Pindar’s distorted exaggeration of the traditional story, which lacks the authority of tradition, is easily dismissed. This technique is central to the narrative of 0.9, which I now discuss.

Olympian 9: Herakles’ Fight with the Gods

In 0.9, Pindar follows the statement that men are good and wise ἄριστον ἴμων (27) with a rhetorical question about Herakles fighting Poseidon, Apollo and Hades (29-35). The scholiast explains:

---

84 Nagy, Pindar’s Homer 134f.
85 Slater, Pelops at Olympia 498, and passim.
But now Pindar breaks off:

\[
\text{ἀπὸ μιὸ λόγου}
\]
\[
\text{τοῦτον, στόμα, εἴπων·}
\]
\[
\text{ἐπεὶ τὸ γε λοιπὸν ἦν θεοῦς}
\]
\[
\text{ἐξερᾶ ἁλφα, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν}
\]
\[
\text{μανίασιν ὑποχρέει}.
\]
\[
\text{μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοι—}
\]
\[
\text{αὐτ’· ἢ πόλεμον μάχαν τε πάσαν}
\]
\[
\text{χωρίς ἀθανάτων.}
\]

\[(0.9.35-41)\]

And on this view of the myth, it exemplifies the gnome which appears towards the end of the poem:

\[
\text{ἀπευ ἔδε θεοῦ, σειγμένου}
\]
\[
\text{οὐ σκαλότερον χρῆμ’ ἔχαστον}.
\]

\[(0.9.103f)\]

Heraclēs’ fights with gods are, by definition, exploits done ἀπευ θεοῦ, and so they are best kept silent.

This is a familiar tension. If the story is best kept silent, why does Pindar mention it? The break-off in \(N.5\) is plainly similar: there, too, Pindar claims that this story had best hide itself, but emphatically alludes to it. We may compare his exhortation to himself in \(0.9\): τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν μανίασιν ὑποχρέει. / μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοι— to the sentiment in \(N.5\), its complement: τὸ σιγὰν πολλὰκας ἐστὶ σοφώτατου ἀνθρώπων μοῆσαι \((N.5.18)\); and \(0.9.103f\), to \(N.5.14, 16-18\).

---

1 cf Σ. 44b, 48.
There are two approaches to the problem in 0.9. Farnell argued that the scholiast was mistaken: the paradeigmatic material of 29ff is in fact negative. The question that Pindar is asking is, "Given that men become good ζάντα δαίμονα, how could Herakles have fought these gods?"

Alternatively, one might argue that Pindar first uses the material as a positive paradeigma, and then rejects it on other grounds. On this model, ἐπελ...πώς δὲν introduces the question "how else could Herakles have fought these gods...?"

I shall consider this passage by comparing it to 0.1. There is plainly a broad similarity between the treatment of mythical material in these poems, but some have thought that it is ultimately to be contrasted, rather than compared.

2 Works 1.52, 2.68-70; Molyneux, Herakles 302f.
3 For ἐπελ...πώς δὲν in this sense, the closest to a parallel is πώς and the aorist indicative with δὲν at Demosth. 37.57: πώς δὲν ὑμῖν ὁ μηθαρδομένων ἔγγορ τί εἶ ἡδίκησα;
4 Molyneux, Herakles 302, 327; Carey, 3 Myths 151-3; Peliccia, Pindaros Homericos 47.
5 ἐπελ and the aorist indicative with δὲν means "otherwise, it would have been":

οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἀμετέρα γνώμῃ λυράς
κάπαις θέσιν δοιλόν
ζοτροφος ἀγήτωρ μελέων: ἐπελ ἀντάχθησα δὲν ἔμνον
ἀραίων γέγυνε.

(Eur. Med. 424-6)

This is cited by Stinton, Si Credere 67, as the solution to the problem; but ἐπελ...πώς δὲν, for which there are no exact parallels, will not provide the solution (Molyneux, Herakles 313-5, Huxley, Pindar's Vision 18).

6 Craik, Olympian 1 and 9 137, sensibly identifies the fundamental grounds for comparison: unlike the rejection of a version of a myth implied in the selection of an alternative, common throughout the Pindaric corpus, in these poems the "adaptations are overt and documented."
Stinton argued that in 0.1, the myth was denied, but in 0.9, simply hushed. But we have seen that the denial in 0.1 is only ever implicit: Pindar suggestively introduces the model of exaggeration (28-34), advises cautious treatment of the gods (35), exaggerates the old version to make it paralogon (49-52), and presents a replacement (36ff) - but he never explicitly says that the old version is not true. In fact, the explicit rejection of the traditional story in 0.1 is couched in similar terms to that in 0.9:

\[\text{ἐστι δ’ ἀνδρὶ φάμεν ἐσοκός ἀμφὶ δαί-μόνων καλὰ μεῖων γὰρ αἰτία.}\] (0.1.35)

\[\text{ἐμοὶ δ’ ἀπορὰ γαστρίμαρ-γον μακάρων τιν’ εἰπεῖν’ ἄφισταμαι. ἀκέρδεια λέλογκεν θαμίνα κακαγόρους.}\] (0.1.52f)

\[\text{ἀπὸ μοι λόγον τοῖτον, στόμα, ἄφισω. ἔποι τὸ γε λοιδορῆσαι θεοὺς ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχάσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν μανίασιν ὑποχρέει. μὴ νῦν λαλάγει τὰ τοι-αὐτ’. ἔδα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν χωρίς ἄθανάτων.}\] (0.9.35-41)

Pindar disassociates himself from the stories (ἄφισταμαι / ἀπὸ... ἄφισω); cannot call an immortal belly-crazy, for ἀκέρδεια λέλογκεν θαμίνα κακαγόρους - an example of the ἔχθρα σοφία of λοιδορῆσαι θεοὺς (0.9.37f). And ἔδα πόλεμον μάχαν τε

---

7 Si Credere 67-9, after Norwood, Pindar 235 n.36.
8 Verdenius, Comm. 2.27.
9 Molyneux, Herakles 326; Carey, 3 Myths 153.
Now, I have argued that in 0.1, we are seduced into accepting this rejection through the various acts of sabotage which Pindar has performed on the old story, and on our inclination to accept it. And, indeed, the mythical material of 0.9 reveals a similar phenomenon.

The scholiast cites Didymus:

Didymus' opinion is a reliable guide to what was extant in the first century. And we have no evidence to disprove his claim

---

10 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 276f.
that the battle between Herakles and Poseidon, Apollo and Hades at Pylos is Pindar's invention. 11

The Iliad has Herakles fighting Hera and Hades:

τλή δ' Ἡρη, ὅτε μιν κρατερὸς πάις Ἀμφιτρόωνος δεξιερόν κατὰ μαζὸν δίστοι τριγλάχινι
tóte kai miν ἀνηκέστον λάβειν ἀλγος.

τλή δ' Ἀδῆς ἐν τοίσι πελώριοις ἄλοι δίστοιν,
eπετε miν ωτὸς ἀνήρ, νίδος Διὸς αἰγιάοχοιο,
ἐν Πολὺ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ἀδύνησιν ἔδωξεν.

(II.5.392-97) 12

Panyassis also has Hera and Hades wounded in Pylos by Herakles using arrows; 13 Lycophron has Hera fighting him there (39f, with Σ ad loc.); at Apoll. 2.7.3 Hades is helping the Pylians against Herakles, who wounds him. That Herakles wounded Hades when carrying off Kerberos (Σ.Α.ΙΙ.5.396; Σ.0.9.46) seems to be just guesswork to explain II.5.397. Pausanias (6.25.2f) infers from that passage Hades' presence at Pylos, and adds that Athena helped Herakles - as she does at [Hes.] fr.37.22ff. In that passage, Herakles is still using arrows - which have been given to him by Apollo (29) - and fighting the polymorphous Periklymenos, whose ability to shift his shape was the gift of Poseidon. 14

---

11 Molyneux, Herakles 307-9 surveys the material.

12 ἐν Πολὺ ἐν νεκύεσσι might be ἐν πολὺ ἐν νεκύεσσι; both are hard. But what is important is that the line could easily be understood - rightly or not - as referring to a fight in Pylos.

13 fr.25 B = EGF F 6°, fr. 21 B = EGF F 6°, fr. 24 B = EGF F 6°; V. J. Matthews, Panyassis of Halikarnassos (Mnes. Suppl. 33, 1974), 53f n.3; but see Hoekstra's review (Mnes. 30 (1977), 195-7, here 196): we cannot be sure that Hades figured in this fight.

14 cf Apoll.2.7.3, where this detail is given, along with Hades' involvement.
Poseidon is a natural ally for the Pylians, as Neleus' father; but he is not mentioned as fighting with them in the Iliad (11.690), but only by Σ.Α.ΙΙ.11.690 (Dindorf) and scholiasts on 0.9 (43, 44c). The former passage also names Hera and Aidoneus as Herakles' adversaries, and Athena and Zeus as his allies.  

Apollo never appears at Pylos or in a mass battle against Herakles; but he does appear in the iconography at least from the sixth century wrestling with Herakles for the Delphic tripod, or over the Kerynitian Hind.  

So, beyond 0.9 and the scholiasts' comments upon it, no evidence that Poseidon fought at Pylos, alongside the Pylians, apart from Σ.Α.ΙΙ.11.690. The scholia on 0.9 seem to be no more than guesswork: but their authors are united in their ignorance of a source for Pindar's story. Panyassis did have Hades fighting Herakles at Pylos; but with Hera, not Poseidon and Apollo, and facing Herakles' arrows, not his club. Everywhere, Herakles fights with arrows at Pylos, not his club. The whole point of the Iliadic description of his fight against Hera and Hades is to demonstrate their endurance of the pain his arrows caused. There is no evidence that Apollo fought at Pylos; the tripod locates his fight securely at Delphi.

15 Molyneux also suggests that an amphora by the Kleophrades painter (ARV² 183 no.10 = LIMC 5.1 p.168 (no.3370)), which has Herakles firing an arrow on one side and Poseidon on the other, might reflect the battle at Pylos.

In this passage, then, only the location of Hades at Pylos is guaranteed by reasonably good evidence. It seems that Didymus was right; that this combination of gods at Pylos was Pindar's innovation of three separate traditional stories of Herakles fighting individual gods.\(^{17}\)

Molyneux cannot accept this, because he believes that it is impossible that Pindar could have invented this story and then denied it;\(^{18}\) but on the other hand also doubts "that it is much more reasonable to invent a legend and then quote it in illustration of a general statement."\(^{19}\)

But on the model of 0.1, it makes sense. It is the analogue of the exaggerated traditional version, in which the gods all have Pelops for pudding. As in that case, the distortion enables the rejection, although the rejection is made on different grounds. In these cases, what Pindar rejects, he first caricatures and robs of the authority of tradition. Here, he rejects an unknown story in which Herakles is absurdly fighting three gods at once.\(^{20}\)

---

\(^{17}\) Σ.0.9.43 maintained that Pindar meant three fights (followed by Fehr, Mythen 33); but ἰνίκα naturally refers to one incident (Molyneux, Herakles 311f, Carey, 3 Myths 151 n.36.

\(^{18}\) "[Pindar] might incur the charge of inventing a phantom" (Farnell Works 1.52); Molyneux, Herakles 304f.

\(^{19}\) Herakles 305f; cf Young, Isthmian 7 45. Σ.0.9.44a, followed by Carey, 3 Myths 151 n.36, argues that the change is to aggrandize Herakles.

\(^{20}\) Σ.0.9.56, on λοιδοφοβοι: διότι δινότα δινα τῶν Ἡρακλέα τριῶν θεῶν ἀπεδείξεν διυτα βελτίων; cf Craik, Olympian 1 and 9 40.
Does this mean that the stories of Herakles fighting the gods are, like the story of Pelops' cooking, untrue? It does not: "Pindaro tace soltanto, non nega." The notion of truth does not enter into 0.9, as it does into 0.1 - in which Pindar emphasizes the possibility of falsehood and exaggeration, explains the neighbour's lie, and provides an alternative version. By speaking of Pindar's "rejection" of the story, I mean only that he excludes it from his epinician - as he does the story of Phokos' death from N.5 (n.b. αἰδέομα... εἴπειν... (14-19)), and as he explains at 0.9.103f: ἰδεῖν δὲ οὖν, ἀρομακένων / οὔ οἰκουτέρων χρῆμα ἔχοντο. Then we must accept that it was originally introduced for a positive reason, and not, on Farnell's model, as an untrue and so defeasible counter-example. Carey suggests that the myth provides an "elaboration of the principle of inherited excellence which Pindar discerns in himself and Epharmostos"; Wilamowitz notes that both Herakles and Epharmostos might be said to be fighting against opponents who are a class above

21 "Herakles cannot possibly have been so unwise or impious as these stories suggest... To drive home his point and to make his story an example of something so extreme as to be impossible Pindar combines three stories into one" (Bowra, Pindar 55; cf M. Simpson, "Pindar's Ninth Olympian", GRBS 10 (1969), 113-24, here 120 n.31).

22 Pini, Correzioni 342.

23 Carey writes: Pindar "appears to reject the tale of Herakles as impious...[but] that Pindar is really rejecting it is unlikely, for it is thematically relevant, as has been noted" (3 Myths 152f). In fact, Pindar literally does reject the story - ἀπὸ μοι λόγον / τοῦτον, στόμα, βίγω - but could not really reject the story unless he had erased it from his manuscript.
them. These qualities might be illustrated by many myths; the selection of the myth of Herakles fighting gods may owe more to its negative implications, which enable it to also act as an example of that which is ἄνευ ἄκου, and thus not the stuff of epinician - in marked contrast to Pindar's talent, Epharmostos', and the myth of Lokris which Pindar does narrate. The comparatively long break-off (35-41) is necessary to accommodate the change in attitude towards the mythical material. That change is not objectionable in a poem of Pindar. Further, πορὰ καίρου, if it is not to be a vacuous expansion of καυχόςαθι, may be informed by the length of the break-off: Pindar must return to his proper theme.

24 Carey, 3 Myths 151f; Wilamowitz, Pindaros 350: whatever actually happened at the competition at Marathon, this is the implication of 89f.

25 Pindar's: 25f (contrast Archilochus (1-5; cf P.2.49ff)); Epharmostos': 100ff, especially 109-11; Lokris: 51-3, 59-61; cf Bundy, SP 2.74; Carey, 3 Myths 151 n.43.

26 Carey, Nemean 8 34f, also suggests that the length accommodates a change of tone - but he makes the change the other way. Race suggests that the break-off is enabled by the mention of death at 35 - which he sees as a feature of Pindaric Abbruchen (Style and Rhetoric 55; ch.2). Certainly, Pindar will break off at an extreme moment, but one should not make too much of this: as Race notes, death is a "natural theme for poetic closure" (ibid., 43 n.3).

27 cf the shift between the opening of P.3 and 77f: Peliccia, Pindaros Homericus 47. See too R. Lattimore, "The First Elegy of Solon", AJP 68 (1947), 161-79, here 171-3; Woodbury, Helen 175. See above, p.386. Such inconsistency is possible when the poems are considered on a linear model (Slater Doubts 196; Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 2).

28 cf G. A. Privitera, "Il Criterio della Pertinenza: Pind. 01.9, 35-41", RFIC 114 (1986), 48-54, here 53f; Carey, 3 Myths 153 n.43; Wilson, Kairos 187. For this sense of πορὰ καίρου ("off target", ibid. 183), cf P.10.4. See above, p.394.
The model, then, is this. The story of Herakles fighting gods, which has a specious familiarity, is introduced as an elaboration of the notion of divinely ordained innate virtue. As god is heaped on god, the story becomes an absurd exaggeration. This enables its rejection: it becomes an example of man and god fighting, and is as such rejected from the epinician, as unsuitable. But the note of discord thus produced serves to counterpoint the blessings enjoyed by Lokris, which immediately follow the break-off.

The three myths I have examined in this chapter have all featured the divine in ways which are apparently uncongenial to Pindar's epinician. Artemon noted that Apollo's need for an informer in P.3 was paralogon; it is also in P.9; and we may compare the failure of the Olympians' omniscience, and their gluttony, in O.1; and their pathetic performance against Herakles in O.9. Each of these illogicalities Pindar rejects. We are not entitled to call this piety: it is instead a reflection of what is ἀκομφάτος in the context of epinician.29 "Das mythologische Subjekt wird von Pindar verändert, wenn das traditionelle Schema seiner Grundkonzeption von den Göttern entgegensteht."30


30 Tonia, Mythen-Interpretation 41; cf Pini, Correzioni 342, 381f; Gerber, Comm. 70. For another small example, see L. L. Nash, "The Theban Myth at Pythian 9, 79-103", QuCC N.S. 11 (1982), 77-97, here 95f, on Herakles' birth; but cf also I. Rutherford, "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo", CQ 38 (1988), 65-75, here 73. In the Introduction (p.12 n.50), I raised the question of H.10.68f, in which, contrary to tradition, Polydeuces is not wounded. Now we see why: he is, in the
There are two immediate implications for my argument. Not only does the hypothesis of the importance of traditional material for Pindar hold good, but also each of these three myths serves, in different ways, to confirm it, by providing problems which it resolves. In P.3, the audience's expectations of traditional material demand the inclusion of the raven in the story of Koronis, although it is an un congenial feature for an epinician. In O.1, the traditional story of Pelops' cooking is riddled with absurdities; but again, it is included. The un traditional nature of the treatment of Herakles in O.9 marks out these lines as unusual; the fact that the audience expects traditional material is exploited to facilitate the rejection of the myth from the ode. In the first two cases, although we may posit plausible motivations for the selection of the myth, we note that, once the myth is chosen, its traditional features must be used. Pindar's freedom in his treatment of myth, it seems, lies only in their exploitation.

But the description of Pindar's changes affecting the gods as matters of decorum, rather than piety, has another, important, implication. We have already seen a number of examples of what is, on the other hand, not seemly for mortals - invulnerability, for example. The conjoint effect of the two

Cypria, which Pindar is following here, an immortal (fr. B.2 B = EGF F 6.2).

31 cf Hubbard, Aïakos 7 n.5.

32 P.3: because of the reverberations it offered (Young, 3 Odes 34-44); O.1: because of its importance for the ritual connected with Pelops at Olympia (Slater, Pelops at Olympia).
strategies is to eliminate the whimsical and spurious from the myth of epinician. It is impossible to delimit what type of mythical material is proper to epinician any more precisely than with the explanation that men behave like men, gods, gods; just as Pindar's myths accord with traditional versions, so do they also accord with vaguer traditional notions of what is appropriate for gods, and what is possible for heroic man. What is inappropriate is sloughed off, leaving a version which is at once traditional (we have seen that the rejected version leaves its shadow) and rationalized. The model of the false myth that Pindar makes explicit at 0.1.28ff is in fact the antithesis of Pindar's own mythologizing, not only in that poem, but throughout the odes I have considered.

33 This latter, Veyne calls the doctrine of present things (Did the Greeks? 14, 73f and ch. 6 passim; cf Griffin's review, TLS 82 (1983), 398. See too Artemidorus Oneir.4.47; Σ.βΤ.Π.14.342–51.
A good deal has been written on the role of truth in Pindar's poetics. I simply point out that, whether one argues that άλάθεια is that which is not forgotten, or that which is transmitted without addition or omission, Pindar's myths, traditional and refined, are άληθεις.

What does the true myth offer epinician, which an invented myth would not?

If the myth is paradeigematic, then, as I noted in the Introduction, it must be publicly accepted in order to make its point. On this model, true myth offers epinician agreed premises from which its argument proceeds. But I have also suggested that the assumption that the myths are all paradeigematic is

---


2 Detienne, *Maîtres*; Cole, *Archaic Truth*, especially 7f on the objective interpretation, and 12: "what is involved is strict (or strict and scrupulous) rendering or reporting - something as exclusive of bluster, invention or irrelevance as it is of omission or understatement" (note that even in N.5, the truth that should hide its face is conveyed to the audience); Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* 58-67.

a step of faith for the critic, which he is impelled to make because, if he believes that the myths must have some rationale, the paradigmatic relation seems the most plausible candidate. Might the importance of the truth of a myth suggest another explanation?

Slater writes that the audience of epinician could think of Hesiod where the Muses are said to inspire truth or lies like truth. The audience were then perfectly aware that they could be listening to lies, and like a good orator the poet will do his best to raise this issue and lay their suspicions to rest. That is the whole point I am sure in the elaborate recusatio in Olympian 1; it is designed to make us feel that Pindar is honest and religious unlike previous bards.... His audience contained potential sceptics. 4

I have suggested that the recusatio in 0.1 in fact simply documents the strategy which runs throughout Pindar's mythologizing. The primary function of the true myth in epinician, then, is to convince the potentially sceptic audience of the poet's veracity.5 It is a warrant for the praise of the victor.

This neatly complements the notion, suggested by the absence of the Homeric and the preference for the local, that the myth, special to a particular occasion, marks that occasion.

4 Hypothekai 80.
5 cf Harriott, Poetry and Criticism 58; Bundy, SP 2.60 n.66, 65. The sceptics' examination: N.8.19-21; cf 0.10.53-5 (p.424 above).
One might formulate the notion of myth as proof of praise at a more precise level. We saw how in N.7 Neoptolemos' fame was a guarantee of Sogenes'; and this is a dynamic present throughout the corpus: Pindar's claim to preserve his patrons' *kleos* is confirmed by his preservation of the *kleos* *aphthiton* of the heroes of the myths.6

These are speculative remarks, suggested by the review of the Aiakid myths. It may be that the Aeginetan odes are not representative of the corpus.7 What is needed is a survey of the myths of all of the epinicians.8

---


7 The strong sense of community evidenced by the broad reference of *Aieaxidai* and, perhaps, the peculiar form of the odes, might suggest that they are not.

8 An immediate counter-example to my thesis is I.3/4.63-73, in which Herakles is described as μορφαύ βραχύς (71), like the laudandus, Melissos (οι γάρ φύσιν ομοιωμένου έλοχεν (67)). It seems to be a spectacular example of the innovation of the traditional to suit the context (see Farnell, *Works* 1.260; Bowra, *Pindar* 48; Thummer 2.77f; Davies, *Thetis and Helen* 260). One cannot circumvent the problem (Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 340; Lloyd-Jones, *Justice* 40).

But even on the innovative paradigma model, the passage is extraordinary: why does Pindar not compare the two on some more laudable basis (Bowra, *Pindar* 47; Thummer 2.76)? It seems certain that we are missing something. Perhaps μορφαύ βραχύς is here a *sermo technicus*, and refers to a pancratist whose technique is προσπαλατευ (71b) - close-in wrestling, rather than fighting at arm's length (πολλάκια τίνα ταύτα; Plato, *Alcib.1* 107e; Suidas s.v.; E. N. Gardiner, "The Pankration and Wrestling 3", *JHS* 26 (1906), 4-22, here 15; Harris, *GAA* 103). Such a style is naturally that of the smaller man, who must negate the advantage of his opponent's longer reach. The iconography, unusually for a wrestling scene, shows Antaios in a tight body hold (Gardiner, op. cit. 10f) - hence, perhaps, the later
I am not suggesting that there is no paradeigmatic myth in Pindar. Such myth will, in fact, provide a more compelling warrant for the encomium of the victor - as well as enriching the poem in more nebulous ways. I do, however, question the inference that myth in Pindar is paradeigmatic, from the analysis of one particular paradeigmatic myth. Instead, on the model I propose, we may see how some myths are paradeigmatic; and others, not. If a generalization can be drawn from the present study, it is that Pindar's myths are monuments to his patrons' achievements: they mark their deeds, and prove his praise.

---

story in which Antaios had to be lifted off the ground (Roscher s.v. Herakles 2207). Pindar's other use of προσπολούσε has a technical nuance: it describes Atlas, with a body hold on the heavens (P.4.290). For physical description as a classification of fighting style, see Philostratus Gym.36. I suspect that μορφάν Βραχύς refers to the fighting style that Herakles used to beat Antaios, and that Melissos used to beat his opponent; and which is described at 65. It was characteristic­ally Melissos', and on this occasion, because of the size of his opponent, it was Herakles'.

9 I return to Lee's contrast between the study of a Pindaric ode as poetic encomium and as encomiastic poetry (Historical Bundy 67).

10 Equally, it explains how some elements in a myth may function in a paradeigmatic relation, and others - allusive touches which anchor the narrated myth in a known body of tradition - may not. The critic is thus released from the too-demanding challenge of incorporating every element of the myth in his interpretation of its paradeigmatic function (see p.7f above).
The Sacrificial Myth of Pyrrhos/Neoptolemos

Before I consider the death of Neoptolemos as a myth of sacrifice, I should first acknowledge the problem of his other name, Pyrrhos:

τοῦ δὲ Ἀχιλλέως τῷ παιδὶ Ὀμηρος μὲν Νεοπτόλεμον οὔνομα ἐν ὀμόνη ὁ Τὰ θάνατος τῇ ποτὴρ. τὰ δὲ Κύπρια ἔτη φησὶν ὅπως Λυκομῆδος μὲν Πύρρον, Νεοπτόλεμον δὲ οὖνομα ὅπως ξοινικος αὐτῷ τεθήμιαι, ὅτι Ἀχιλλέως ἡλικίᾳ ἐτὶ νέος πολεμεῖν ἔπεσατο

(Cypria fr. 21 (I) B = EGF F 16)

In poetry, only in the Cypria is the name Pyrrhos used in preference to Neoptolemos, until Theocritus. It is plausible that such double naming is associated with initiation into adulthood; the adolescent takes the second name as he leaves his childhood. This seems transparently so in this case; in the quotation above, the two names are used by foster-father and then educator; and elsewhere, it is not Achilles’ youth in his first battle but, more plausibly, Neoptolemos’ own which is the spring for his new name.

But it also seems that Pyrrhos was the name used to refer to Neoptolemos in Delphi; it recurs there in various forms


2 e.g. Serv. Aen. 2.13 = Cypria fr. 21 (III) B (cf (II)). Cf Dowden, Death and the Maiden 53-5; Bremmer, Heroes, Rituals 7f. For war as initiatory activity, Vernant, Myth and Society 31-5.
(Pyrrhos, Pyrrhias, Pyrrhinos), whereas Neoptolemos does not. This is faint evidence; but it is not inconsistent with the hypothesis that Pyrrhos was originally a Delphian character, and Neoptolemos the hero from the Trojan saga, and that they amalgamated only at a later stage, exploiting the homonymy which involved Neoptolemos' childhood name. I use this hypothesis in what follows.

In *N.7*, Pindar records how Neoptolemos is killed in the course of a sacrifice at Delphi:

```

A little more detail is supplied by two testimonies:

(Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a)

fασι τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμον ὃδοντος τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀρπάζειν τὰ ὅματα, ὅς ἵθος αὐτοῖς· τὸν δὲ Νεοπτόλεμον

3 An argument accepted reluctantly by Burkert as the best argument for Pyrrhos' Delphic bias there is (Pyrrhos 437). Cf Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 119 § 2 n.1.

4 So e.g. Defradas, *Propagande Delphique* 154-6, Fontenrose *Cult and Myth* 206f.

5 Farnell attempted to unify the two figures, and ended in aporia (GHC 317-21). He had objected to the unification of the figures on the grounds of the homonymy alone (GHC 321). I shall suggest two other grounds for the identification - Apollo's enmity, and political expediency.
Neoptolemos' fight with the Delphic priests was not provoked by a unique incident, but by his interference in a habitual practice taking place in a ritual context.

The ritual is described in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus:

This description informs various aphorisms which had previously been thought simply to criticize the Delphic clergy for their greed. But the specific rapacity which these

---

6 Delcourt, Pyrrhos 39f; cf Athenaeus Deipn.4.173a-174b.
7 A corollary is Δελφοῖς θύσας αὐτὸς ὑψωτεὶ κρέας (Com. adesp. 460).
8 Fontenrose, Cult and Myth 222 n.13.
jibes evidence now seems, in the light of the papyrus, to be part of Delphic ritual.

Neoptolemos' death can be more tightly associated with the ritual through the weapon, the machaira, or the killer, Machaireus.

The machaira is the Delphic knife: Apollo tells his priests


\[ \delta e \xi \iota e r \eta \ \mu \alpha l' \ \varepsilon k a s t o s \ \varepsilon k w o n \ \varepsilon n \ \kappa \varepsilon i r i \ \mu \acute{a} k h \acute{a} r a \nu \ \sigma f \acute{a} z e u n \ a i e i \ \mu \eta \lambda a. \]

(Hom.h.Ap.535f)\(^9\)

It was a particular sort of knife; but what exactly was special about it, is unknown:

\[ \Delta e \lambda f i k h \ \mu \acute{a} k h \acute{a} r a \varepsilon \ \acute{a} p \delta \ \kappa a t a s \kappa a y h \zeta \varepsilon, \ \lambda a m \beta a n o u a \ \varepsilon m p r o o s e h e n \ m \acute{e} r o s \ a i d h r o u \nu, \ \acute{a} z \ \" \acute{A} r i s t o t \acute{e} l \acute{e} h \acute{e} s. \]

(Hesychius s.v.)\(^10\)

It seems connected with the Delphic sacrificial practice outlined above by more than association:

\[ \Delta e \lambda f i k h \ \mu \acute{a} k h \acute{a} r a \varepsilon \ \varepsilon p i \ \tau \acute{o} w \ \phi i l o k e r o d o w \ \kappa a i \ \acute{a} p \delta \ \pi a n t o s \ \lambda a m \beta a n o u a \ \pi r o s i r o u m \acute{e} n o w, \ \pi a r d o s o u \ \acute{a} z \ \Delta e l f o i \ \tau \acute{o} \ \mu e n \ \tau i \ \tau \acute{o} w \ \iota e r e i \acute{w} \ \acute{e} l \lambda \beta a n o u, \ \tau \acute{o} \ \delta e \ \tau i \ \acute{u} \acute{p} e r \ \tau i \acute{h} s \ \mu a k h \acute{a} r a s \ \acute{e} p r a t t o u n t o. \]


It is, then, not simply a symbol of Delphi and thus Delphic clerical greed, but is connected with the Delphians' practice of taking the whole of the victim from the sacrificer.\(^11\)

---

\(^9\) cf Aristophanes PCG fr.705.

\(^10\) See Wilamowitz, Pindaros 130 n.1; Delcourt, Pyrrhos 39f n.1. I should think, from Ar.Pol.1252b, that its shape was that of a knife suited to the whole business of sacrifice and division of a carcase - like a small cleaver? (but see e.g. Fennell on N.7.42 for an entirely different idea of its shape).

\(^11\) And not simply part of it; Meuli, Opferbrauche 218 n.2.
This is confirmed by the identification of Pyrrhos' killer as Machaireus, first in Asclepiades of Tragilos, the fourth century mythographer:

| perι μεν ου του θανατου αχεδων απαντας οι ποιηται συμφωνοια, τελευτησα μεν αυτον ωπο Μαχαιρεως, ταφησαι δε το μεν πρωυν ωπο το οδιον του νεω, μετα δε ταυτα Μενελαου ελθοντα ανελευ, και του ταφου ποιησαι εν τοι τεμενει. του δε Μαχαιρεα φησιν υνων ειναι τοιον Δαιτα. |

(FGrH 12 F 15 = Σ.Ν.7.62b)\(^{12}\)

Machaireus, son of Daitas, plainly embodies the Delphic knife.\(^{13}\)

(I shall suggest in what sense below.) The name of his father suggests the sacrificial feast, for which the machaira divided the meat, however unfairly.\(^{14}\) His own name suggests, again, that the use of the machaira as the weapon by which Pyrrhos dies is not simply a reflection of its handiness.\(^{15}\)

Setting the death of Neoptolemos within Delphic custom may also suggest an explanation for an alternative name for his

---

\(^{12}\) Machaireus is also identified by Strabo, who makes him an ancestor of Branchos, founder of Apollo's oracle at Didyma (9.3.9) and the scholiast on Eur. Andro.53; cf Callim. fr.229.7. And, if we accept Leopardi's correction, by Pherecydes also: Pyrrhos ἀφαιρείται τα κρέα αυτούς, αυτον δὲ κτείνει Μαχαιρες δ τούτων ιερως. 'και' κατορύσσει υπο του οδιου του νεω. (Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a)

But even if we emend out the suggestion of Pyrrhos' suicide (which is elsewhere unevidenced), this is, plainly, a speculative alternative.

\(^{13}\) "Porte-Couteau fils de Festin" (Delcourt, Pyrrhos 39).

\(^{14}\) Meuli, Opferbrauche 213.

\(^{15}\) Η.7.42; cf Eur.Œr.1656: θανειν γαρ αυτω μονηια Δελφικωι Ειφει.
killer, Philoxenidas. Even if killing Neoptolemos was not itself a hospitable act, it was nevertheless done within the frame of Delphic practice, which was maintained for visitors. As a functionary of the institution, the killer was Philoxenidas.

During Delphic sacrificial ritual, then, the attendants standing round the sacrificer hold machairai concealed. They chop up the animal amongst themselves with these special knives; the sacrificer is lucky to keep any. In the myth of Pyrrhos, he, interfering with this ritual when he is sacrificing, is killed by the embodiment of the knife, Machaireus. There is clearly some relation.

The death of Pyrrhos does not seem to be an aetiology for the sacrificial custom. He is killed on the altar by the priest with the sacrificial knife; or the priest who is the sacrificial knife. "Der Heros ist das Opfer κατ’ ἑξοχήν, Urbild der ungezählten Opfer, die nach eben diesem Ritus in

16 Σ.Ευρ.Ανδρ.53. For an alternative explanation, see Woodbury, Neoptolemos 99f n.18.
17 cf e.g. Ν.7.42: Δελφοί ἔναγέται; Η.θ.Αρ.535ff. Cf 0.1.93.
18 Σ.Καλλ.Πρ.191.27; cf δφ’ ἐνυτοις (P.Oxy. 1800 fr.2.36); Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 126. On the concealment of the sacrificial knife in general, see Burkert, Greek Tragedy 107 n.46.
19 We shall see that the parallel story told of Aesop at Delphi is an aetiology not for the sacrifice, but for his own cult there (P.Oxy.1800 fr.2.33).
Heiligtum des Apollon fallen." The myth figures the sacrifice of Pyrrhos himself.

Argument by analogy may strengthen this argument. Burkert argues that Pyrrhos' death is just one more reflection of "the ideology of the predatory animal pack at its sacrificial meal". In particular, Pelops seems to be the victim of a myth of sacrifice: he is chopped up and boiled in a cauldron. This is especially suggestive because he seems to stand in the same relation to Zeus at Olympia as does Neoptolemos to Apollo at Delphi.

---


21 "The heroic myth that reconstructs the action as a human tragedy" (Burkert, *HN* 119); "we may see in the death of Pyrrhos the official Delphic myth that integrates the ideology of the ritual. However, the myth has the sacrificer himself, Pyrrhos, becoming the ultimate victim of the sacrifice - butchered at the table of the god by the very knives that sliced the meat to be shared in the ritual" (Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* 126f); cf M. Detienne and J. Svebro, "The Feast of Wolves, or the Impossible City", in M. Detienne and J-P. Vernant (eds.), *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (Chicago, 1989), 148-63, here 162. "Figures" at least has no pretensions to explain the relationship.

22 *HN* 83; other examples passim. Cf Detienne and Svebro, op. cit.

23 Burkert *HN* 93ff; cf Meuli, *Opferbraüche* 262; Hubbard, *Cooking*; Lloyd-Jones, *Artemis* 88f. Arkas is not such a good example (*HN* 83-103); for a less artificial version of his story see W. Sale, "The Story of Callisto in Hesiod", *Rhh* 105 (1962), 122-41.

24 Burkert, *HN* 96f; Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 194f points out that the relation of heroon and temple in the two cases is the same. For the antagonistic side of the relation, Woodbury, *Neoptolemos* 98; Nagy, *Best of the Achaeans* passim (e.g. 62, 121: "antagonism between hero and god in myth corresponds to the ritual requirements of symbiosis between hero and god in cult"; ch.17).
The insight which identifies the story of the death of Neoptolemos as the story of a sacrifice can be honed so as to illuminate several features of N.7 and Pae.6. For various features of the comedy of innocence that frequently features in the rituals and myths of sacrifice, occur in the story of Neoptolemos.

Sacrifice demands the destruction of something of value—mostly, a living animal.\(^{25}\) It emerged from Meuli’s study of Greek sacrifice that many of its features were expressive of guilt at the killing of the sacrificed animal.\(^{26}\) Such features demonstrate the value of what has been destroyed.\(^{27}\) So, for example, the responsibility was transferred onto the animal itself. One strategy was to make it volunteer for its own death.\(^{28}\) It might be provoked into nodding by the sprinkling of water on its head.\(^{29}\) In a sacrifice of a goat to Hera at Corinth, the goat itself dug up the knife with which it was to be slaughtered.\(^{30}\) In a sacrifice of an ox to Zeus Polieus on Cos, it seems that twenty-seven bulls were driven through the market place, ὑπεράντες οὖς, αἱ μὲν καὶ ὁποίωσιν τῇ ‘Ἰστιᾷ.\(^{31}\)

---

25 Versnel, Polykrates 37.
26 The Unschuldskomödie (Opferbraüche 261-81).
27 Ritual as action redirected for communication: Burkert, S&H 35-9.
28 Meuli, Opferbraüche 264ff.
29 Ar. Pax 960, with Σ., which comments on the sprinkling of water: ἵναι αἰλεύς τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ ἐπινεύσων τοῖς ἱεροῖς δοκῆς. 
30 Burkert, Greek Tragedy 118 n.71.
31 Nilsson, Feste 16-19; Burkert,HN 138 n.10.
The most impressive performance of a comedy of innocence occurred in the Bouphonia at Athens. 32 A group of oxen were driven round the altar, and the one which stopped to eat a cake of meal on it thereby selected itself for sacrifice. The ritual was explained by appeal to the disruption of an early grain sacrifice:

ἐν γάρ τοῖς Δικαστείοις φασὶ βοῶν τὸ πόλανυν καταφαγεῖν τὸ παρεκκευασμένου εἰς τὴν θυσίαν, ἢκαὶ τούτῳ χάριν βοῶν θύσασιν, ἐν τοῖς Δικαστείοις διὰ τοῦ βοῶν τῶν φαγόντα τὸ πόλανυν καὶ τυδέυται]. θύλωμα δὲ τιμα, ὡς εἶχο, τῷ πελέκει ἀποκτείναι τὸ βοῦν, καθαύ οἱ Ἀνθρωπίνων μέμνησι διὰ τῆς τετάρτης.

(Androtion FGrH 324 F 16) 33

The ox was killed by the Boutrýmos, who then dropped his axe and ran away from the killing. A show trial followed:

κρίσιν δὲ ποιοῦμεν τοῦ φόνου πάντας ἐκάλουν εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοὺς τῆς πράξεως κοινωνήσαντας. δὲ δὴ αἱ μὲν ὀδροφόροι τοὺς ἀκούσαντας αὐτῶν ἀντιών ὁμίλλον, οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τῶν ἐπιδίδοντα τῶν πέλεκυν, οὗτος δὲ τῶν ἐπισφαξάντα, καὶ δὲ τοῦτο δρᾶσας τὴν μάχαιραν, καθαύ ἢς οὐδῆς ἀφόνω τῶν φόνου κατέγυρσαν.

(Porph. Ablst. 2. 30. 3) 34


Also Burkert, HN 138.

34 cf Pausanias' version: καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἱερῶν βουρφάνων, ἢς κτείνας τοῦ βοῶν καὶ ταύτη τῶν πέλεκυν βίψας - αὐτῶ γάρ
Finally, the ox's skin was stuffed and set up in front of a plough, as if resurrected: restitution is thus made for its death. 35

Many of the stories of human sacrifice reflect the concerns of the comedy of innocence. Certainly this is the case in stories literally about such sacrifice: the victim should go willingly and thus assume responsibility. 36 An etiology for a pharmakos ritual makes the victim guilty:

\[\text{\\\"\text{δι} τη δυναμι κύριον ἔστιν ὁ φαρμακός, ἵππας ἤφε \\
φιόλας τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος κλέμας καὶ ἀλοιχ ὑπὸ τῶν \\
περὶ τῶν Ἀχιλλέα κατελεύσθη, καὶ τὰ τοῖς \\
θαρηκλίους ἀγόμενα τοῦτω ἀπομιμήσατα ἔστιν.} \]

Istros ἐν τῶν Ἀπόλλωνος Ἐπιφανείων εἰρηκεν.

(Istros FGrH 334 F 50) 37

Typically, the pharmakos is stoned - the responsibility for his death is shared across the community, and each individual member less guilty. 38 Or the human sacrifice will descend into the underworld automatically - by riding, or being thrown, into

\[\text{ἔστιν οἱ νόμος - οἴκεται φέυγων. οἰ δὲ ἢτε τῶν} \]

\[\text{ἄνδρα δὲ ἔδρασε τὸ ἔργον ὡς εἰδότες, ἐξ δίκην} \]

\[\text{ἔπάγονται τῶν πέλεκυς.} \]

(1.24.4)

Also 1.28.10.

35 Such acts of restitution are central to Meuli's argument: Opferbräuche 224-52.

36 Versnel, Self-Sacrifice 145-8; 156-60.

37 Bremmer, Scapegoat Rituals 307f; and we shall see that Aesop is similarly accused.

38 Hirzel, Steinigung 225f.
the sea, or off a cliff; again, a displacement of responsibility.  

The story of Pyrrhos’ death is not so obviously the story of a human sacrifice; but still betrays traces of the comedy of innocence.

The guilt is his, and not the sacrificers’. Either, like Pharmakos, he is a temple robber; or, like the ox at the bouphonia, he interferes with a sacrifice.

Like the ox at the bouphonia, also, he is killed, it is emphasized, by the knife, the machaira; which is personified as Machaireus. In Pherecydes’ version, he even commits suicide; the complete exoneration of the sacrificers, and the ultimate expression of the victim’s volition.

The Delphians grieve his death:  

βάρμμεθην δὲ περιακὶ Δελφὸι ξεναγέται.  

(N.7.43)

39 Versnel, Self-Sacrifice 152-6.

40 Σ.Η.7.58; Strabo 9.3.9; Apoll.Επ.6.14: ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὸν φασὶ παραγενόμενον εἰς Δελφοὺς ἀπαίτειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα δίκας καὶ συλλαν τὰ ἀναθήμαta καὶ τὸν νεὼν εμπιμπράναι, καὶ διὰ τούτο ὑπὸ Μαχαιρέως τὸν ἱωνέως αναιρεθήμαι.

41 Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a; Σ.Η.7.62a.

42 In a Babylonian sacrificial ritual, the priest, after beheading the bull, says three times “This deed was done by all the gods; I did not do it” (ANET 336; Burkert, HN 11). Thus, perhaps, is Apollo responsible for Pyrrhos’ death (Eur. Andro.1147-65; Most, Measures 164).

43 The unemended text thus fits the dynamics of the story, even though it seems absurd, and the suicide is nowhere else mentioned. Cf Radt 192.
Arguing for a connexion between the *kommos* of tragedy and such grief at a sacrifice, Burkert concedes there is no good Greek parallel for lamentation over a victim, although there is e.g. an Egyptian one. But grieving for the victim would seem an obvious part of the comedy of innocence; it transparently demonstrates the value of the victim. Again, it is part of those stories less obviously concerned with sacrifice. Polykrates laments the loss of his ring. Aktaion's hounds, having torn him apart, mourn him; and Ino-Leukothea, who has leapt from a cliff into the sea, is both worshipped in cult at Elea (as an immortal) and mourned (as a mortal), a paradox to which Xenophanes apparently objected.

Finally, Neoptolemos is in some way compensated after his death; but not necessarily in cult, the usual requital for a sacrificial death (thus e.g. Pelops at Olympia or Ino-Leukothea above). He was certainly buried in the *temenos*; and there is a trace of an earlier burial under the temple *oudos*:

| perc mou toi thvaton axedon apanton oj poiyta | symfωνοι | televnthai mou ston thw Mathairwos | tafimai de to mou proton upo to othdou tou neou | mete de tauta mevelaun elhdanta avleiv | kai tov |

---

44 Greek Tragedy 114 with n.63; Hdt.2.39f.
45 Hdt. 3.41; Versnel, Polykrates 37.
46 Apoll.3.4.4; Hes.fr.217A; Janko, Aktaion 305-7; Burkert, *HN* 112f.
48 Although thus Defradas, Propagande Delphique 155.
49 Certainly, Neoptolemos did receive cultic appreciation at Delphi, but not, according to Pausanias, until 278 (Paus. 1.4.4). See above, p.357ff.
The significance of this temporary burial is unknown. But it is plainly in an important place.

The argument is cumulative; but these points of contact are enough to confirm that the myth of Pyrrhos' death at an altar at the hands of a priest with a sacrificial knife is a myth of sacrifice.

Can one go further? One avenue is to compare the legends of Aesop's death, which turns out to mirror Pyrrhos'. I have quoted Pap.Oxy.1800 fr.2, describing the Delphic ritual. It continues:


50 Cf Pherecydes FGrH 3 F 64a (above) and 64b (Σ.Ευρ.Ανδρ.140): τῶν μὲν θανόντα τούθ' Ἀ𝜚ἰλλέως γόνον ἄμων πορεύσας Πυθικὴν πρὸς ἐσχάραν ἤτι μὲν ἐν Δελφοῖς ή Νεοπτόλεμος τέθαπται, καὶ θερεκύθης ἱστορεῖ. ἢτι δὲ νεκρῶς ἐξέκοιτο ἐφ' ἔθαι πάλιν εἰς Δελφοὺς ἐπέμφηθ' διέσυνται.

51 Frazer, Apollodorus 254ff n.1 (here 256); Delcourt, Pyrrhos 44. I return to this.

52 Two dead ends are: Fontenrose's model, on which Pyrrhos precedes Apollo at Delphi, which is conjured out of air at Python 398f (on Delphic mythical chronology, see Sourvinou-Inwood, Myth as History especially 227); and Nagy's notion of Pyrrhos as Apollo's ritual antagonist (Best of the Achaeans ch.7 § 4) — which is not helpful.
The Vitae fill in an important detail: the Delphians plant sacred paraphernalia on Aesop as he leaves; and execute him as if he had stolen it. The similarities with the story of Pyrrhos are obvious. We note also that Aesop is stoned and thrown from a cliff; and finally rewarded in cult.

Aesop has been seen as a typical pharmakos; and this story, as an aetiology for a pharmakos ritual. Does, then, Pyrrhos become a pharmakos also? There is no good reason for it. We note that his marginal status, qua redhead and stranger at Delphi, which makes him an appealing scapegoat, is in fact a characteristic of any human sacrifice victim.

53 But, sadly, in a different version of his death, in which the Delphians fear his criticism of them becoming public knowledge (Vitae G, W, 127f). Cf Perry Aesopica II for Apollo helping the Delphians to kill Aesop; Nagy, Best of the Achaeans 289.

54 A. Wiechers, Aesop im Delphi (Meisenheim, 1961), 43-49.


56 As, in fact, Frazer wondered, after J. Toepffer, as a solution to the paradox of his reputation at Delphi (Apollodorus 257).

57 Trammell, Grave of Neoptolemos 273; Burkert, Pyrrhos 440 n.2.

Equally, to see the Pyrrhos myth as a reflection of an initiation rite\textsuperscript{59} or as a trace of the practice of human sacrifice would be a declaration of faith rather than of argument.\textsuperscript{60}

Some hope of an explanation is offered by the place of Neoptolemos' burial, under the oudos of the temple.\textsuperscript{61} This has been seen as an example of burial under the threshold.\textsuperscript{62} But now we can see that it might be more accurate to see it as the deposit of a sacrificial victim, rather than a burial. Further, οὐδός does not necessarily mean threshold, but may mean socle — especially in connexion with the Delphic temple:

\begin{quote}
"να εἰπὼν διέθηκε θεμίλεια ὧτερος Ἀπόλλων εὐφέσι καὶ μάλα μακρὰ διηνεκές· αὐτὰ ἔν οἴτοις λάινον οὐδόν ἔθηκε Τροφώνιος ἢδ' Ἀγαμήθης... (Hom. Hym. Ap. 294-6)\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

The burial under the threshold now resembles a building sacrifice in the foundations.\textsuperscript{64} The sacrifice is the price for the security of the building.

\textsuperscript{59} Bremmer, Heroes, Rituals 9. There is no rebirth in this case (cf Dover, Initiation 130, on Ganymede.)

\textsuperscript{60} There seems no good evidence for real human sacrifice in any myth of human sacrifice (Henrichs, Human Sacrifice; Hughes, Human Sacrifice 185-7 and passim).

\textsuperscript{61} Woodbury, Neoptolemos 101f n.28.

\textsuperscript{62} Trammell, Grave of Neoptolemos: the motive is "to make him a protecting spirit" (273). For the sanctity of thresholds in general, and burial under them in particular, see Frazer, Folklore of the Old Testament (London, 1919), 3.1-18, and especially 13f.


\textsuperscript{64} Frazer on Paus.5.4.4; Burkert, HN 39; E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture (London, 1891) 1.94-97.
But how does this tally with the story of the removal of the body, and its replacement elsewhere in the *temenos*? The removal, by Menelaos, is unlikely to represent a shift in attitude through time. I suspect that the two burials reflect two victims; and that they were united at an early age.\(^{65}\) In this case, the building sacrifice does not necessarily relate directly to Pyrrhos. The reason for Menelaos' involvement is unclear, but may indicate that the story of the removal is important not for Pyrrhos, but for Neoptolemos. In that case, perhaps the story of the removal is simply another reflection of the ambivalence which runs through his entire role at Delphi.

Over all, best to return to Burkert's formulation: "Der Heros ist das Opfer ἔξω ἔχων".\(^{66}\) One can go no further with any confidence.\(^{67}\)

\(^{65}\) Trammell suggests that the removal reflected unease at the oddity of the threshold of the temple as a burial place (*Grave of Neoptolemos* 273).

\(^{66}\) *Pyrrhos* 440. Cf Henrichs: "human victims in Greek religion are primarily an ideal construct of the imagination. They represent the most extreme form of sacrifice, which was rarely if ever realized" (*Human Sacrifice* 232). Also Hughes: "Possibly myths of human sacrifice... originated in the ambiguous emotions aroused by sacrificial killing: by viewing their [animal] victims as a mitigated form of a far more terrible act, the worshippers both acknowledged the seriousness of the killing and reduced their responsibility for the animal's death" (*Human Sacrifice* 187).

\(^{67}\) The buck stops there for Burkert, *HN* 141, xxi n.3; and Versnel, *Self-sacrifice* 163-84. But I wonder if the ritual of *Septerion*, in which a boy steals into a wooden hut, erected on the *halos* at Delphi, overturns a table (bearing a sacrificial meal?), burns the place and runs away ("dies"), has any connexion with Pyrrhos' disturbance of the sacrifice, firing of the temple, and death.
What is important here is that various details of Pae.6 and N.7 - the temple-robbery, the fight over the sacrifice, the grief of the Delphians, and the honour done Neoptolemos after his death - which have been used as important tokens in the controversy about the relation of the two poems, turn out to be parts of the comedy of innocence which naturally attends the story of a sacrifice. Of course, Pindar's selection of different details for each poem remains interesting. But it is only the selection, and not the invention, of details; and is therefore at one with his normal practice. It requires no special pleading.

By Pindar's time, the Pyrrhos who figured in a Delphic myth of sacrifice had become amalgamated with the Neoptolemos of saga. Hence a fresh stratum of explanatory details: Neoptolemos went to Delphi to consult the oracle about Hermione's barrenness; and he was killed there by Orestes, to whom Hermione had earlier been betrothed. This is the preferred version of tragedy; but it is predicated on the epic betrothal of Hermione to Neoptolemos, mentioned at Odyssey 4.1ff.

---

68 See p.355.
69 Pherecydes FGrH 64a, Σ.Ν.7.58, Σ.Eur.Or.1649; Il.Parv.fr.21 (IV) B.
70 Sophocles Hermione (Pearson, Fragments 1.141ff); Euripides, Andromache, especially 967-81.
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