ABSTRACT

MYTH AND TRUTH IN SOME ODES OF PINDAR

Rupert Mann D.Phil.

Lincoln College, Oxford Trinity, 1992

The main part of this thesis is a survey of Pindar's treatment, in his epinicians, of myths involving the mythological family of the Aiakids. I establish what may be known of Pindar's sources for these stories, and then compare his own accounts. I consider (together with some minor incidents) Aiakos' assist-ance in building the walls of Troy; Phokos' murder; Peleus' experience with Hippolyta and Akastos, and his marriage to Thetis; Telamon's participation in Herakles' expedition against Troy; Achilles' infancy, his combats against Telephos, Kyknos, Hektor and Memnon, and his own fate; Aias' birth and suicide; and finally the story of Neoptolemos' visit to Delphi (chapters 1-7). My major conclusion is that his versions of these myths are more firmly grounded in the mythological tradition than is widely believed: they are constantly allusive, and contain little innovation. What changes there are may be ascribed to a broad rationalizing tendency, rather than to sophisticated poetic purposes. Pindar seems to prefer lesser known, often locally preserved, strands of tradition, but is concerned to produce authoritative accounts of them. The defensive tone of N. 7 may be satisfactorily explained by his care to produce such an account from confused and undignified material; the poem does not contain an apology for a hostile treatment of Neo-ptolemos in Pae.6. In chapter 8, I confirm my conclusions by examining three difficult cases: the myths of P. 3, O.I, and the break-off from the first myth of 0. 9. These examples confirm that traditional material has intrinsic value in epinician, and suggest the conclusion that the explication of a paradeigmatic relation between myth and victory is not the only valid explan-ation of the function of myth in Pindar. Myth may also serve to provide a publicly acceptable warrant for the praise of the victor.

MYTH AND TRUTH IN SOME ODES OF PINDAR

Rupert Mann
Lincoln College, Oxford

D.Phil. Thesis

Trinity, 1992
U >•> '

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest thanks go to Margaret Howatson, who has been by turns wise, scholarly and pragmatic, but always encouraging. I could not have wished for a better supervisor. I thank also my parents and friends, who have become increasingly supportive; and especially Kate Bomford, for bringing a full constant light to many dark corners.

ii

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 o-f the victor; or ideas propounded elsewhere in the poem), the myth will exemplify it. This seems straight-forward: two difficulties are that Pindar does not label the

g
myth with the notion that it is illustrating; and the possi-bility that that notion is a very simple one (as, for example, that Aiakid blood is good), which goes no way towards explain-

9 ing 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

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). Young, Isthmian 7 37 n.125.
8 Carey, 5 Odes 8f - »
9
Which thus becomes simply pleasurable - but alogos - narra-tive (Verdenius, Cow». 1.5; H. V. Carter, "The Mythological Paradigm in Latin And Greek Poetry", AJP 54 (1933), 2O1-24, here 202.)
10 SP 1 and 2, published in 1962.

11 Of the two poems Bundy treats, only J.I has any mythical
material - the catalogue of the victories of Kastor and lolaos (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 "dis-missed" (8, 9): Young, PC 87.

of these that have, by convention, meanings not always per-12 ceived -from the surface denotations of the words themselves." This approach is anathema to the type of biographical specula-tion 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 . 13 victor.
Bundy's approach laid down a stern challenge to the stud-
ent of Pindar's myth. He ruled out the appeal to the unknow-able 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

14 simply digression. "There is no passage in Pindar and Bakkh-

ulides 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, 63fj KShnken, Funktior, 19-36; Slater, Hypothekai 80.

14 Young, 3 Odes 1 n.l; K6hnken, Funfction 9f, 228f.
15 SP 1.3, with Slater, Doubts 196 n.22.
Thummer 1.110-12O. These are categories we have already seen, but they are now explained teleological ly (cf Most, Measures 29f).

more than the broadest terms - leaving Thummer with the ines-capable conclusion that myth is "vorwiegend dekorativen Bestandteilen des Epinikion".
Thummer was attempting to link myth directly to

18 laudandus. 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 o-f

19 the whole poem, which is an encomium.

To interpret a Pindaric myth, then, requires an analysis
o-f the poem in which it occurs, demonstrating how the myth contributes to that poem. I-f the result seems complicated, the critic will argue that it must be so: "the complex nature o-f Pindar's poetry... demands a complex kind o-f criticism."^ In the years after Bundy, a number of interpretative tourz de force appeared: the work of Segal, Young, and Ktthnken. 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

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 1O6.

persttnlichen Zweck sprechen kann. Wichtig aber 1st auch, dafi keine Gedichtpartie bei Pindar aus ihrem Zusammenhang herausgenommen und fUr sich beurteilt werden dar-f: Viele Auffill 1 igkeiten, ftir
die man so oft historische und pers5nliche Motive
erfunden und verantwortl ich gemacht hat, finden
ihre Erklitrung, wenn man den Kontext beachtet und
sie im Rahmen des Liedes, in dem sie stehen, interpret!ert.
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 gl or i-f icat i on *?Q
of... the victor"."" But others argue that such interpretations

29 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 ex-clusion 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 KcShnken, Funktion, Gnomon 46 (1974),
113-21, especially 117-9 on P. 10; Lloyd-Jones, Modern Inter-pretation 117; Verdenius, Comn>. 1.3, 5, 8f.
30 Slater, Doubts 193, 199f; Heath, Unity 155 with n.3; id. Or jf g i n s 98.
Ktthnken, Function 115f; G&rtner, Sieges!ieder 40; or, more spectacularly, S. L. Schein, "Unity and Meaning in Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode", MHTIZ 2 (1987), 235-47, especially 237-9.

digressive a-fter 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

34 emphasised. We should not look for a one-to-one relation

between the paradeigmatic myth and a real event, for the exemp-

lum 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 state-

ments of the poem, yet with which the poem is concerned. 0

An effective starting place for an interpretation of a

myth which proceeds on lines like these is a detail which is

f ^y

Verdenius on O.ls "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" (Coma. 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" <Coimn. 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.

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

04 Slater, Doubts 195.

Carey, Pythian 4 149-50; Davies, Thetis and Helen 262 n.23 and passing cf Van Groningen, Composition Litteraire 345 n.l.

""' Carey, ibid.; Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 133-40; Race, Pindaric Encomium 138 n.22; cf C. Macleod, "A Use of Myth in Ancient Poetry", CQ 24 (1974), 82-93, here 88 = Collected Essays (Oxford, 1983), 159-170, here 165. Compare the approaches to ekphrasis and epic simile suggested by D. P. Fowler, "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis", JRS 131 (1991), 25-35, especially 34f, and R. 0. A. M. Lyne, Hords and the Poet (Oxford, 1989), 63-68.

8

interpretation of the whole: they "serve the poetic purpose and form of the poem". Now Kohnken and others exploit it.

This thesis is concerned with the validity o-f this strat-
egy 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 in-vestigation 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 pro-positions 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.

54, 34, 34-43.

44 Kohnken: Poseidon Hippios 204, 206; Cods arid DesceTidan ts 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. 7Off; March, Creative Poet 23; Hubbard, Aiakos 5f; Nisetich, 1-mmor tali ty 12; Carey, Prosopo-graphica 5f.

10

This suggestion is supported by the allusive manner in which

45 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 re-fers to (e.g. 7.8.24); and enriching the sense (e.g. the

46 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 dis-covered that there are indeed sources and that Pindar is faith-

47 ful to them. This will be my conclusion for the Aiakid

myths. Richard Stoneman surveyed Pindar's treatment of the

49 myths of the Theban Cycle and found it traditional. He also
considered the myth of the Dioskouroi fighting with the Apharids in H. 1O, and concluded that it was not an example of Pindar's My then idea 1isierung, but a version of the account

45 See e.g. below p.189, 199, 87; cf Kakridis, Pelopssage 182;
Fogelmark, KAI KEINOIZ 70.
46 Below, p.24f, 172-91.

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; Ktthnken, Heilichos Orga lOOf). The second statement in fact shows that it need not be Pindar who alters myths.

48 As it had been Games', in his examination of Pindar's treat-
ment of the careers of Aiakos, Peleus and Telamon (.Autochthony 94, 107f, 230, 261f).

49 Mythological Tr adit ion.

11

given in the Cypria. Robbins thought the myth of 0.3, pace

Ktthnken, traditional. Young himsel-f examined 0.7.53, and

concluded that his interpretation "subtracts yet another

passage from the arsenal o-f those who see Pindar (Huxley's

'Editorial Pindar') as a constant carper against other poets

52 and previous mythological traditions." Finally, we note that,

although he chose odes that shared mythological subjects in

order to show how Pindar's treatments o-f them varied,"'"' Ktthnken

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

" "Mythology and Interpretation: Two Notes on Pindar's Wemear/s", Maia 28 (1976), 227-32, here 229ff. Innovations had been argued by F. Staehlin, "Der Dioskurenmythos in Pindars 10 nemeischer Ode (Ein Beispiel einer Mythenideal i sierung) ", Philologus 62 (1903), 182-95; and by A. Puech , "La Mort du Castor dans la X e Nes>eer/e", REG 43 (193O), 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.1O.68; cf Apoll. 3.11.2: Staehlin, op. cit. 194; Stoneman, op. cit. 232 n.24). We shall see an answer to this.

J E. Robbins, "Heracles, the Hyperboreans, and the Hind: Pindar, Olympians 3", Phoenix 36 (1982), 295-305, here 299-3O2.

52 D. C. Young, "Pindar and Horace against the Telchines
7.53 and Carro. 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 Class-ical 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 Function 15.

1940, Robertson noted that features "care-fully designed to recall the rejected story" appeared in Pindar's renovated myths
- in other words, that details -from the old version stubbornly

54 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 clari-fies the Hesiodic story Csc. o-f Koronis3 and its moral rather than 'revising' and 'correcting' them."'"' Van Groningen before, and Woodbury afterwards, made similar observations on 0.7 and W.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 notor-iously defensive tone of A/.7 is explicable by consideration of the powerful but confused mythological tradition about Neoptolemos. Even the narrative in 0.1, which contains "the most salient and self-assertive example of literary revision-

58 ism in Sreek mythology" reveals traditional material.

Finally, W.5, in which Pindar refuses to tell of the fratricide

54 Food of Achilles 179.
55 3 Odes 37 n. 1.

"" On (StopOSoat. (0.7.21), Van Groningen wrote: "Applique a un XcVoc;, un recit, ici un mythe, il doit indiquer une combinaison nouvelle des donnees et une interpretation plus precise. Le narrateur qui entreprend de 6iopSSoaL un \oyoq ne reproduit pas machinalement ce que la tradition lui offre, mais il recon-struit et s' efforce de montrer par cette presentation modifiee et amelioree quel est le sens reel de ce qu' on racontait im parfaitement auparavant" (Composition Litteraire 355). Woodbury concluded his analysis of the mythological tradition behind W.7 by suggesting that Pindar was "the interpreter of myths that are given rather than invented" (Neoptolemos 133); cf Hubbard, Pegasus' Bridle 32.
0 Below, pp.4O2-8; ch.7.

58 Hubbard, Cooking 3, 13; below, pp.409-28.

o-f Phokos by Peleus and Telamon, still suggests that murder, a traditional detail; and W.7, in which Neoptolemos is eulogized,

59 still allusively suggests his brutal killing o-f Priam.

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 func-tion 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 trad-itional version? So the motif of petrification in Iliad 24. The new 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. But he also conceded that the popular view could not simply be gainsaid. Is it just a coincidence that the famous changes in 0.1, P.Z and P.9 all involve the amelioration of the gods' image? Certainly, we should be reluctant to explain them as reflections of Pindar's

62 piety; a better approach is: "Das mythologische Subjekt wird

von Pindar ver&ndert, wenn das traditionelle Schema seiner

59 Below, p.75ff; 373.
van der Kolf, Quaeritur, here 17; Illig, Erzahlung 63, 16f; Huxley, Pindar's Vision ch. 2.
"Although Pindar's changes do compliment Apollo in general..." (3 Odes 34); cf Rose, Paideia 151.

62 As e.g. Bowra, Pindar 61.

14

myth - which is then, typically, introduced by a relative pro-

g
noun, and also begun at the moment in time of its conclusion. <p
In -fact, we may go -further and see here a kephalaion ring.

The kephalaion is o XQL <5a i poweoo i <5ixac; eiteipaiue, which is

then explained by the narrative of 24-46. Finally, the kephal-

aion 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 W.8.8-12, line 24 is explic-

able 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

g

Aiakos 9f. Pronoun: Des Places 48-50; cf Ktthnken, Funktion 133-35. Temporal return: Illig, Erz'ahlung 57ff; Slater, Pin-dar's Myths 64f; but cf Ktthnken, Tine and Event 67f. See next note.

9
It is a "knappe Inhaltszusammenfassung zu Beginn der eigent-lichen Erz&hlung" (Illig, Erz'ahlung 2O) ; 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 RCing] CComposition32, which focuses on the temporality of the story.

Compare to Hamilton's paradigmatic description: "the kephal-aion (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 narr-ated or the kephalaion is explained (B). Then the result of these actions is given again, with perhaps some further narr-ation, but never in precisely the same terms as in (A) (Ai)" (Epinikion 57). This fits neatly. Hamilton does not identify I.8 as a kephalaion ring myth (59, 45f); see instead Greengard, Structure 33f-

Although it is slightly contaminated by his comments on the main mythical material of 1.8, 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 1.8 is not an invention; and so neither is 23f.

24

in death (39) seems neither decorous nor particularly to the

poi nt.

So the prophecy o-f 45f cannot simply be a reading of the

teras o-f 37-40. The three snakes are not Aiakids, but each

demonstrates the efficacy o-f the work o-f one the three builders.

Two show where the wall is impregnable, and the third, where it

may be broken. Apollo first reads this teras to Aiakos (42);

and then gives the extra information of the time and personnel
g

of the capture.

9 No certainty is possible in the counting of 45f. If WE?

retain the MS reading of TCTparoiQ, 45f must refer to Aiakos

and Neoptolemos. But there is no satisfactory verb, with

Flepyajjoc; as the subject, which can accommodate both of the very

different roles that they perform: Troy was built by Aiakos,

Beattie, Olympian S 2. Robbins, The Broken Hall 319f, attempts to prove it by comparison with P.4.47f, arguing that Medea includes the parents in TeTpcrroju itatiSuiw *' entyet VOH&VMJ / afua; but I cannot follow his calculations, which must in any case be bedevilled by the question of whether at^ia introduces another generation. Pace Borthwick, Zoologies 2O3 n.29, the problem is not simply a matter of inclusive counting, but whether the addressee father can be counted as one of nai&uaj oeQeu. For the idea of collaboration cf also Huxley, Pindar's Vision 27f.

Gildersleeve saw the difficulty of applying aTv£ouei;<d to Aias and Achilles, whilst still applying it; cf Robbins, The Broker/ Hall 318. For the propriety, Hubbard Aiakos 19.

S.0.8.49b, 52b above, 53b; Boeckh on 31-52; Robbins The Broken Hall 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' involve-ment <33ff) and au<pi (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.

g
Robbins The Broken Hall 320.

9
Farnell concluded that there is simply an arithmetical slip here tHorks 2.64).

•71

panhellenic canon."~ On this line, Carey writes: "No argument is offered -for this belief, which appears to rest on a disin-
22 clination 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
2~*.

seems to look only towards Pindar. " Elsewhere, the assistance of a mortal is not mentioned in the context of other descrip-

24 tions of the supernatural building of the wall. Commenting on

his work, Poseidon rules out a weak spot: he built a wall round the city e£>pi re xat uaXa xaXau, "v" appr^Toq 3to\iq eiY) (11. 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
25 an unbreakable wall.

21 So Boeckh on 31-52; Van der Kolf Quaeritur 30f ; von der
MUhll, Heitere Notizer, 54.

22 Pr osopogr aphica 5 n.19.

23 Fr. 54 Powell:

^ yap <5r| 4o~p6c; re nooei<5aa>u> T*
i xpr|<5euua

24 For a survey, see Von der MUhll, Heitere Notizert 53f .

25 Little Iliad: Chrest ,23Of f ; Iliupersis: Chr est . 241f f ; Odyssey 4.271-289; 8.493f; 11.523-532. Huxley, GEP 161.

31

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 (&.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
- ew a paXiaTa / aupaTcx; COTC jtoXtq *ai eirtiSpouou enXero ref
- and the possible reasons for the attack on this spot -
TLQ o$iu ewiojie 6eonponLu>u eii e'&oc;, / r^ w *cu
*ai auwycL (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 Andro-mache knows, fearing that the Achaeans have witnessed a similar

The misplacement of the fig tree is still a problem. Kirk ad loc. argues that the fig tree moves around anyway; but Il.lfc6ff and 22.145ff both at least have it out on the plain. It is not an important point. What is important is that the inter-polator's motivation has been explained.

34

that o-f the burial of the -founder of a city over the gate.

And so the Horse could be represented as going through the

40 gate and disturbing Laomedon ' s tomb. Hence the importance o-f

the enlargement o-f the gate; once his body has been disturbed,

the protection which it provided through the long siege

41 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 imposs-

ibility of climbing up. It had also been left without super-

natural 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.l.lBSf- 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 Babyl-onians' 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 TO ret^oc; itepietXe *ai raq JiuXac; naaac; ajicoitaoe (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.2.24i - the horse pausing on the threshold:
tanta fuerat vis con seer at i OTI is in porta Troiana ut etian post pro-fan at ion en ab ingressu hostes vetaret. nan novinus...

38

creatures in some way serpentine, and an apyrfc is a kind of
82 snake.
Further, Apollodorus' description o-f the sally out of the Horse is significant: *ai itpSroc; MCW 'E^itou FlopScwq aipaXXoMeucx; anedaueu <Cp.5.2O). Echion, Snake, son o-f Sacker, is elsewhere unknown, but he sits happily with the idea o-f the Horse as the
g|T fulfillment of the teras of the snakes.
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 ex-

84 plaining this feature. 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: eoaXXoueuoi;

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.

52

To sum up: one version of the story o-f Laokoon would appear to be set be-fore the siege o-f Troy. It involved snakes breaching the wall o-f Troy, and perhaps even changing into warriors. It -foretold the place o-f entry o-f the Greeks, the

95 Horse, and Neoptolemos. 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 o-f the antiquity o-f the 0.8 story that we have al-ready seen, this model explains neither the detail o-f 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 di-f-ferent generations. The Laokoon story occurs during the generation

95 We note how, in the Cycle, it is a-fter 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 <FGrH 26 F 1.XXXIV). But we cannot tell: in this matter, the poet o-f the Little Iliad was "un podte en quelque sorts prisonnier de 16gendes plus anciennes... il a accumu!6 un peu pdle-mdle les nombreuses traditions sur la prise de la Troie" (Severyns, CE 333).

according to Pausanias, who is reporting the local explanation of the grave and of the stone on top o-f 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

34 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
- 7,5
result of a hero's death." In particular, we note the story which ascribes the foundation of the Olympic games to Pelops, who instituted eopraw XQL ejraQXa QauowTt Oiuouaco (Phlegon FGrH 257 F l.Sf). Oinomaos 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.
Ow/ E. Pfister, Der Re 1 iquienkuIt im Altertum <Giessen, 1909, 1912), 2.496f; Brelich, Gl i eroi greci (Rome, 1958), 94f; Nagy, Pindar's Homer 119f.
36 Nagy, Pindar's Homer 119 n.15, 120f.

71

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 Hellenics 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

49 mythically ascribed to Aiakids.

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,"' and secondly, that Telamon's involvement, and thus kinship, was also familiar to them.""1 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. 1"1 "
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 rhetor-
ical poses in Pindar's work, critics seemed happy to see this

49 Farnell, Cults 1.63.
>JU GSrtner, Siegsslieder 34.
J 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, Myths* 48.
50
*" Which suggests that this was the version known to the Aeginetans. With the explanation of the Nereids' presence here, contrast Robbins, tiereids 31.

75

passage as a product o-f 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

54 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."55
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

lj "' Farnell, Works 1.188; Finley, Pindar and Aeschylus 47; Norwood, Pindar 80 f . (For another excess, see Wilamowitz, Pindaros 171.)
Bowra, Pindar 68 (for the moral view", see Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 51ff).
"J 'J Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 45. A similar difficulty is presented by the treatment of Bel 1erophon's death by prae-teritio at (7.13.91 - <51aowitaaopaL OL popou &yu> - especially when compared to its explicit treatment at J.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-

What is needed is a positive reason -for the mention of the murder, which complements the use o-f 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 o-f 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 ex-planation 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 en-dorsed innate virtue, if he has his brother's skeleton in his closet? The dynamics of the break- off, which must be com-prehensible, confirm that this is a real problem: the death is

65 unsuitable material for epinician.

63 cf Carey, 3 Myths 153 n.43, 155.
64 As Bowra hinted (Pindar 68); cf Farnel1, Horks 2.275f
6j contra Robbins, Hereids 32.

78

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 o-f the allusion and the declaration that such stories are best not told. Pindar re-flects the story, allusively, back at his audience, and then shies away from it (exploiting its negative aspects to high-light 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

. 68 importance.

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.

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. H. 11 fin.; 1.5.14). Narrated at length, it could only be a negative exemplum - as it is at 7.7.44ff. And so it appears fleetingly here (note that a tricolor 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).

AO See p.216 below.

79

arguments also. The testimony of the scholiast on Apollonius suggests that the story was not Pindar's invention.
What is interesting here is the question of whether there really is a hit at the rival version; or whether auev
is simply a Pindaric negative restatement of the positive

78 The closest parallels occur during Pindar's

descriptions o-f the death of Memnon , whose fame spread ou* anowoorrioauToc; (W.6.50), and who Achilles resolved OTCUX;. . . ur|. . . naXii; otwacSe. . . uoXot <W.3.62f). I shall argue that this circumlocution for death, which Pindar uses nowhere else, is a hit at the tradition that, when Achilles killed Memnon,

80 Memnon did go home - carried home to immortality.

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 lolkos, 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

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 memor-able detail, which he wants to mention.
78 cf P.12.28f, W.4.77: Race, Negative Expressions 111.
79

See below, p.241ff

cf also, perhaps, apocrrt (W.8.9); see above, p.21 n. 17.
80

101

a son stronger than - and so able to overthrow - his father. Further, the wrestling with Thetis, through which Peleus wins her, described in W.3.35f and W.4.62-4, is at odds with the formal wedding implied in J.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 Weroearv.-, and another in 7.8. Scholars have argued speculatively over the identification and reconstruction of these versions, and suggested the existence o-f earlier, otherwise unknown, epics as the sources, alongside the known candidates of the Cypria and Catslogne. Further, there is no explicit evidence of a source for the version of Z.9; 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 Pel ion - and so, it is argued, the two incidents must come from differ-ent 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 argu-ment needs to be used with care. For there must come a point when the critic who can imagine originally discrete episodes

Graef , Peleus arid Thetis 196-2OO; cf Wilamowitz, Pindar os 178, who argued that the wrestling was incompatible with the s-var iarite .
*~ 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 sub-jugated Thetis then participating in a formal wedding.

103

divine marriage, which does not preclude Zeus' award of her, in consolation, to the best o-f mortals.
The obvious candidate -for this alternative reason is a tpepTepou Jtarcpoc; prophecy along the lines o-f the version of 7.8:
e (5* eSpovXoc; eu UCOOLOL u, cpeprepou narepoc;

deou, oc;
ivoS re Kpeaoow aXXo |3eXoc; 6 1 collet #ept
roc. T'

^ Acdc; nap' a6eX<pecu'oiu. (J.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 Csts logue , must originally have gone hand in hand with this explanation of her marriage to a mortal.
Now, this story, in 7.8, has been perceived as an ad hoc reworking of the archetypical succession myth. This sophist-ication 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 o-f
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.Q86i f: K&hnken, Cods and Descendants 34 n.19.

108

she did not, but was turned to stone. And petrifaction does occur in Achilles' story, but in an unprecedented and unmotiv-ated place: Xaovq \i6oex; itotrpc Kpoutoiw (611). So, Homer has adapted the traditional myth to make his point; and included this detail, the moti-f of petrifaction, although it no longer

r>&

has a place in the new narrative.
The Iliad 1 passage is broadly similar. Here, the narra-tive 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 ->j
a favour, he or she must point to reciprocal services. 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

og

be balked if Zeus does what Thetis wants. "~ 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.

^7 Braswell, Mythological Innovation 18f and passim.
op Willcock, Mythological Paradeigna 143.

112

magic spear never missed, and returned to its thrower. Homer rationalises this, as we should expect: when thrown, it is
- TO

returned, but only by divine intervention."
Pindar goes even -further, ruling out the possibility of
the magic spear by denying that Chiron supplied it. This is a typical rejection o-f the association of the supernatural with

40 the human. 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 auth-

41 ority for that alternative source. I would suggest that an

informal Aeginetan story told of Peleus making his own spear, but that it has been utterly obscured - apart from A/.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 extra-ordinary (e.g. made of bronze: CPisander] fr. 13 B); and one which stressed Herakles' autarkeia, in which he cut it himself

39 7J.2O.322ff, 22.276ff; see Janko on 16.13O-54.
40 Grant, Folktale 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 Mir/d 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.

117

42 •from a tree (e.g. Apoll. 2.4.11). I am suggesting a similarly 43 bifid tradition about Peleus' spear.

The presence of otherwise unknown traditional material at W.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 inter-pretation of 77.1.404. 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 -

4"~*
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. £"7.442ff; Edwards, Neoanalysis 317-9; S. G. Miller, "Eros and the Arms of Achilles", AJA 90 (1986), 159-70, here 161-3. Is the implic-ation that, on this tradition, Peleus has no divine armour to pass on to his son?

118

which combination seems artificial. Hypothesizing the early existence of the prophecy version explains these anomalies.
That, then, is a possible model o-f the history of the prophecy version. But critics have almost unanimously argued

44 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) 45 46 are. I shall consider K&hnken'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;

47 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 1.8, the marriage is pre-sented as Themis' suggestion.
Against this, Themis appeared before the wedding of Peleus
and Thetis at the beginning of the Cypriai
&c; poiAeuerat. ^JCTQ Try; ©cptiSoq Jtept TO£ Tp6>l*MoS
eur) 6e "Epic ewt^oupeuc^ TO>U>

44 Z.Z.8.37b; Farnell, Horks 2.379f; Ktthnken, Gods and Descend-ants 33f n.19; Hubbard, Aiakos 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, My then 44-50.
Gods and Descendants 33f n.19, implicitly endorsed by Carey,
5 Odes 195. Stoneman ignores KcShnken.

47 Or, with van der Kolf, Quaeritur 62, the Aeginetans.

119

. f\ <5e tofopia napa Zraoiuw raS ra
K& jrp L a itc no L r|*oT L c c JIOUT L oCrax; ... (F 1) (Z./4.IJ. 1.5 = Cypria -fr. 1 (I) B = £<?F F 1)
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."0 But the scholium does show that discussion of the necessity of Thetis marrying Peleus was at some point introduced into the trad-itional 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 q>epTepou> jra-rcpoc; 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 W.5, which is begun at 26, but nowhere clearly

51 ended. It is a similar narrative device at work in 1.8,

where, although Themis' prophecy is formally closed (45), its closing section (41-5) exceeds any likely content. Themis'

52 speech is, to this extent, a narrative device.

The case for the novelty in 1.8 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. KShnken explains his prominence: "it is a -poetical device to

J " See Jouan, Euripide 46-5O; and Davies, Epic Cycle 35 for a crisp judgement.
51 Robbins, Nereids 29.
5^ Van der Kolf also sees the improbability of 41ff being prophetic, and solves the problem by claiming that they simply give Themis' opinion (TO uew euou>. . . (38)). I shall return to this question (below, p.134).

121

honour the god of the Isthmus who is responsible for Kle-andros '. . . Isthmian success. Iiwl ° Bowra writes o-f the exagger-ation o-f the danger -facing the gods: there are now two problems which must be solved - the prophecy and this rivalry between Zeus and Poseidon (7. 8. 42-f) . 54
Ktthnken'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 ar/y telling of this story. It will always be in the narrator's interest to exagg-erate 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. ^ Corroborative evidence for Poseidon's role in the story prior to 1.8 may be given by a line of N.5, in which he appears. K&hnken has satisfactorily explained the encomiastic motivation behind this appearance: he is mentioned because Isthmian victories are celebrated. But as they are not of

^° Gods arid Descendants 28.

54 Pindar 3O8f, 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).
Severyns, CE 249. He is one of the three who, according to Achilles, sought to overthrow Zeus (7J.1.4OO). And so he is mentioned in the paradeigmatic use of the traditional material of this story. Might he already have had a role in the story, which Homer redefined for his purpose?

122

Finally, KBhnken argues that the basic -features of the Zeus-Peleus-Thetis-Achi11es myth are constant elsewhere in Pindar, and that they accord with the accounts in Hesiod and

66 Homer.
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 W.5.34*f. At 7.8.3B-4O, Themis describes Thetis as a ycpac; QeoMOpou, for the euaepeoTarow 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 W.5.37) is simply a matter of

68 focus.
In sum, there is a deal which might be said once the innovation of the myth of 7.8 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.

I concentrate on the difference between the 7.8 story and the treatment in the other odes.
As Kcihnken says: "The essential fact is that the marriage of Thetis in Isthmian Q is presented as being conferred upon Peleus as a divine -favour" ("Two Notes on Pindar", BIOS 25 (1978), 92-6, here 94.

68 As Kohnken suggests, but seems to ignore (Cods and
Descendants 27).

126

Peleus is to -fulfil the destiny of -fathering a son stronger than himself. This gives 67f much greater force.
But we can deduce nothing about the subject of the Muses' hyneriaioTi , in his sources, from Pindar's treatment of it. Pindar's Muses sing, in W.5, of Peleus' exploits at lolkos <2&ff). But their song seems to me simply a narrative device: an elegant "gleitend Obergang" into the matter of the myth. Once the story is under way, that it is formally the Muses' 108
song is forgotten. And so 1 doubt that this subject matter 109
can be adduced for an earlier poem. !'
As in the case of Peleus' adventures at lolkos, we thave
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 1.8, 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 7.8. But this, I have suggested, is the product not of a radical reshaping of the matter of the myth; but of the need for poikiliai she is used to prophesy what was in the source straight narrative - just as the Muses in W.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, Er2'ahluT,g 7O with n.3.
Robbins, Nereids 29.

109 See Jouan, Euripide 83.

138

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.

139

Next, Alkyoneus becomes associated with cattle theft. Herakles' association with the theft o-f cattle is rich in mythological implications. On one level, the theme has been seen as the mythic -figuring o-f the concern o-f a nomadic culture •for its cattle: the hero o-f the culture overcomes the demon who steals them, and retrieves them. Or the cattle may be tokens o-f Indo-European culture; their capture by the culture hero and the death o-f their previous keeper - is definitive o-f his

52 culture's victory. Burkert concludes that Herakles' journey

is a re-flection 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. O. 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 re-trieval 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 dom-esticated 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 recover-

54 ing 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. J 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: genies 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.
"J *J Encounters with lalebion, Derkynos, Eryx, Cacus, and Alkyoneus; Burkert gives these and other adventures at S&H 84, with nn. 7-21, p.18O.
56 Robert concludes that Alkyoneus stole cattle from Acrocorinth before Herakles had any part in the story <Alkyorieus 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.

156

location. Stories of the giants appear to have originated -from

the Euboeans; and they colonised all over the Chalcidicean

88 peninsula as early as about 730. It is curious that, given

his activity in the same area, Alkyoneus resisted incorporation

QQ

into the posse; but he did. Perhaps the reason -for his isol-

ation is the story I have been reconstructing.

Pindar's accounts re-fleet the composite nature o-f his

source. It is perhaps their variegated nature which has pre-

90 served them -from over-attenti on by modern scholars. I shall

now consider them as re-flections o-f a lost narrative.

We can infer little - other than the victory was complete

- of the attack on Cos from either rce<ppeu 6e aw M&(.\JU>

(7.6.31f> or JtopSnpe xau Mepoitaq (tf.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

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.lOO). Colonisation: J. B6rard, L'Expansion et la colonisation Grecques jusqu'aux guerres n&diques (Aubier, Paris, 1960), 66-9. The exact date is uncertain (66).

89 Vian, GdG 217f; Nouvelles Reflexions 258$ LIMC 1.1 p.564. Even when he finally became associated with the true Giants, he remained distinguished. So he is FLyauTOJU npeopiraTcxj at PMG 985.13f-

Of)

Ktthnken discusses W.4.25-3O at Function 196-8, contrasting it with the parallel treatment of the same actions in 7.6. He emphasizes Telamon's priority in W.4. in contrast with his role as a parallel for Lampon, the victor's father, in 1.6. Herakles emerges as his helper (cf Hubbard, Pindaric Mind 78, 14O). W.4 also emphasizes the difficulty of the fight (27-3O), leading to the gnome of 32 (cf Z.SOb; Carey, 3 Myths 146-51). 7.6 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.ll; Hamilton, Epinikion 58f; Race, Sty7e and Rhetoric 49f).

167

of the opening salvo in Apol lodortis ' description of the fight on Cos: Herakles' men cannot get close because stones are being thrown at them: the Coans paXXourec; \t6otc; JtpooitXetV £xuX*x3u (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 genie, 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. u I suspect that this was the *?6>
case. Herakles uses his bow <I.6.33f), as he does frequently

97 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 in-
compatible 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 iLIMC 1.1 p.563); contrast Andreae, Herakles.

169

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 up-bringing in her absence. But Chiron's role is not dependent on 01
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 (11 -9. 478-f f) . This might mean that the version in which Chiron brought up the orphan Achilles, although redol-

22 ent 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

23 bringing up their child. Thetis laments the humiliating in-
24 equality of her marriage. These appearances would be
25 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.

•

21 K. Friis Johansen, Achill bei Chiron <Lund, 1939), 183, 2OO. •?•?

So Aristarchus, as above, and March, Creative Poet 23-6.
23 Thetis: 1.357f; 18.35f; 24.72-4. Chiron taught Achilles medicine (11.831-f). Jouan, Euripide 89f.
24 18.429-34, 84-7; 24.90-92.
25 Note Z.A. II. 1.396; cf Severyns, CE 256f.

176

There are two matters worthy of comment here: Pindar's treat-ment of the moti-f of the spear; and the extraordinary promin-ence 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.

28 The cure was the action of Euripides' Telephus. But Pindar

does not mention the cure: it is another example of the folk—

29 loric magic which he everywhere eschews. Nevertheless, this

piece of sympathetic magic is the most notable aspect of the known story - and so the most effective signal of that story. The consequence is that, whilst nowhere referring to the mira-culous cure, in each account of the incident, Pindar does refer to Achilles' spear (0.9.79; 7.5.42; 7.8.52). 31
The extraordinary prominence which Pindar gives to the incident is easily stated. In 7.5, it stands as the climax
- y*^

<note Spa) of a catalogue of Achilles' exploits; in fact, the

27 Frazer, Apollodorus ISSff n.l; W. R. Paton, "The Armour of
Achilles", CR 26 (1912), 1-4, here 2. On the spear, see above, p.l!6f-
28 Eur. fr.724 N2: Handley and Rea, Telephus 27-39. Also, perhaps, Aeschylus' Telephus: Z. Ar. Ach. 332, Webster, Euripides 43; but see TrGF p.343f.
29 Grant, Folktale 32f-
cf aoSuaiwovTa (N.3.48): see above, p.189.
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.

32 Hamilton, EpiTiifdon 58; Bundy SP 2.56f- Race notes that this
climax is then capped by the mention of Aegina itself, care-fully placed at the beginning of the triad (43; Style and Rhetoric 20f n.36). See also below, p.2O5.

201

- a bold metaphor - and pvovro 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 4 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."1 On the contrary, Achilles' fight with Hektor - the symbol of Achilles' decision to fight rather than return home
- would seem paradeigmatic 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.l.SOf:

On this line, see Farnel1, Works 2.383; Silk, Interaction 106.
4

Privitera, Eracle 264f <but add J.S.55 to his catalogue of Hektor's appearances).
5

Griffin, UTI iqueness.
6 77.9.410-16; 18.79-126..

Young, Isthmian 7 39-43, here 39; cf Bowra, Pindar 183-6; Braswel1, Fourth Pythian index s.v. games; Nagy, Pindar's Homer 150-2. See too M. Dickie, "Phaeacian Athletes", Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar vol.4 = Area 11 (Leeds, 1983), 237-76,

here 237-43.

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 aud-ience 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

12 Iliad and the Odyssey, he owes almost nothing."

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." " 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 77.2.653-70; and notes verbal similarities between J7.2.655f and 0.7,73ff, and between 11.2.667 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

K. C. King, Achilles. Paradigms of the War Hero from Hower to the Middle Ages (U.Cal.Pr. 1987), 61.
Bowra, Pindar 283. It should not need to be said that this
is not "an anti-Homeric bias", which suggests that Pindar dis-liked Homer, and provokes the citation of «.7.2Of as an explan-ation of his dislike. Cf Nisetich, Piridar arid Homer 2; Wilamowitz, Pindaros 463.
13 3 Odes 114 n.5.
14 3 Odes 82f, 83 n.l; 9O.

21!

another source: he describes Tlepolemos cX.fl6u>T' e* 6aXautou Mi<5eac; (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. u We know that other versions of this story existed (CHes.D fr. 232). Presumably, it is to the Homeric account that Pindar refers in 21.
Young also suggests that P.3.1Olff and 7.8.56ff draw on
Od. 24.58-73 in their description of Achilles' funeral. 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' trans-

18 lation to some better place.

To these two instances Nisetich adds, as an example of "Pindar's creative use of Homer", P-9, as interpreted by

19 Kohnken. There, Pindar uses the vocabulary and mood of the

seduction of Zeus in 77.14 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, Conm. 2.56f; cf Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 106f>. But there is nothing un-likely about the Rhodians making the modifications themselves - just as the Aeginetans cherished the Aiakids before Pindar.
0. 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, Horks 3.383f.
18 Edwards, Achilles ir, the Underworld 221 with n.14. See below, p.255ff.
9 Pindar and Homer 74 n.12; Ktthnken, Heilichos Orga.

216

that myth is not Homeric at all, but -from the Hesiodic Cata-

logue (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 ^0
o-f Od. 1.253-71; and its close, as I have described it (above,

p.lSlff), 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 W.2.14 might

recall II.7.199-F; N.6.52, Od.4.189; and 0.9.66, IJ.9.483. In ''I

each case, the Homeric source informs the Pindaric passage."~

22 Homeric vocabulary is used dynamically in new contexts.

So, the general principle that Pindar does not draw on

Homer for mythical material remains sound.

We have seen that traditional material, known to an ode's

first audience, has intrinsic value in an epinician. This

makes the absence of Homer doubly surprising: for no material

Peliccia, Pindar us Homericus 54-7.

21 On W.2.14, see below, pp.277-9; on W.6.52, below, p.239f. In
0.9, Pindar describes the succession of Opous to his father's throne. This, according to Eustathius (ad IJ.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 (IJ.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.

T>

" A pleasantly parallel result is thrown up by Schultn's close examination of Pindar's use of Homeric expressions in P. 4 (.Ds colors 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).

Reluctant to imagine Pindar impugning Homer, and taking advantage of the description o-f the OTC\O>U> Kpioic; which follows, some critics have referred the o" of 22 to Odysseus, as we know
O^"

o-f Odysseus' patha through his own account to Al kinous.'i"J But context, metaphor and vocabulary all suggest that Homer is

r>&

meant. Referring only 22f to Odysseus is a slightly desperate measure to evade the charge against Homer; the Greek becomes

27 28 highly involved." There must be some ambiguity here."11" Most

points out that as "the four books of Odysseus' fabulations are reported in or at 20 recta Cit3 means that the words are simul-79
taneously 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 SitX^w KpLoi.q} in which Odysseus was awarded the armour of Achilles, in prefer-ence to Aias (note yap) . "' 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

" Fraenkel, op. cit. 360f .
^ Carey, 5 Odes 145; Ktthnken, FunktioTi 51 on
Kcihnken, FuTiktiori 50.
•70
" C. Segal, "Pindar's Seventh Neroearv", JAP A 99 (1967), 431-75,
here 442, noted the close association of Homer and Odysseus; 6. Kromer, "Homer and Odysseus in Heniear, 7.20-27", CW 68 (1975), 437-8, argued for completely ambivalent ambiguity, but drew odd conclusions.

29 Measures 150.
C< ° Hubbard, Subject/Object 63f-
** On the onXwu xp(.a<.q see below, pp.280ff-

219

should have been judged best of the Greeks after Achilles; and so, o-f course, Homer's glorification o-f Odysseus throughout the Odyssey must have been exaggeration. Pindar's challenge to Homer's authority is enabled by the attitudes o-f 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 pan-hellenic 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
- ^•7
hand, is too well known.""'

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 -
~^4

except in special circumstances^ - 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

3°

IMagy, Best of the Achaeans 3 §6 n; see too Griffith, Contest 191, 199f.
33 cf Grant, Folktale 100.
As in N.7; or 0.7, in which, presumably, the Rhodians cherished their own aetiology over the brief Homeric version.

220

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 o-f the narrative interest o-f the story-telling, which a retelling o-f a too well established story would lack. "The victor in turn basks in a reflected glory by being the cause o-f this enter-tainment to his -fellow citizens."'"' He wants to be remembered; hence the necessity -for the myth to be the memorable version o-f

. . . 37 the story.

Gregory Nagy has recently described similar tensions using

38 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

39 because they are more local in orientation and diffusion."

J cf Pindar's description of Homer's treatment of Aias:
TO L T£T I JJCCKSU £ I * avQp&TTUHJ , Oq

jtaoau op&iioaLC; apeTay Kara pap<5ou etppaoey
QeoJieoLOiu ejrea>L> Xotitofc; aQup&Li>.
<J. 3/4/55-7)
'J Lee, Historical Bundy 67 n.13.
° cf 0d, 1.35 If; 0.9.47-9 (which is a counter-example to Miller's thesis that weapa in a more controversial passage (W.3.20f) refers to a "specific category of subject matter" (Phthonos 113f)>. That passage refers to the risk in the attempt to produce a new authoritative version of a myth.

38 _ . . , .. Pindar _• Homer.
TO

The quotation is from Best of the Achaeans 8 §14n4; but the treatment is at Pindar's Homer 70-81.

221

The Homeric epics have evolved their relatively more Pan-hellenic character, in comparison with the epics o-f the rest of the Cycle, which are at "a point of textual -fixation that still seems like a case o-f arrested development in contrast with the

4O ultimate Homeric -form." He suggests that Pindar's praise-

poetry is working within the same tradition o-f

41 panhel leni nation, trans-f orming local stories into Panhellenic

ones: "the ainos purports to be both Panhellenic and local, grounding its Panhellenized truth-values in the legitimacy and authority o-f native traditions, which shift -from city to city and which are the context -for the here and now o-f

42 performance." Ainos he has defined as "an affirmation, a
43 marked speech-act, made by and for a marked social group."
It is immediately clear that a good deal of Nagy's argu-ment 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 oppo-site 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 Harrative 126f.

222

44 de-fine the community. Nowhere is the importance o-f such

material so clear as in W.5, where Pindar manages to include the death o-f Phokos depite its intrinsic unsuitabi 1 ity 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

45 epinician. This, I think, is a more illuminating level o-f

explanation than that which appeals to the brilliance o-f 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 o-f his patrons to re-inforce the social order o-f that community (Rose, Paideia, especially 149-f; id. "Towards a Dialectical Hermeneutic o-f Pindar's Pythian 1O" , Helios N.S. 9.1 (1982), 47-73, here 55).

ur| TptDirrou' xar*
, aCXX* aXDXoTpiatc au* f rotate;, auC JtDrauoV apua
Moi-oaC DJJCU. (Pae,7b 10-14)
Whatever particular Pindar wasreferring to, the drift of this seems clear: it contrasts hackneyed imitation o-f Homer with more adventurous poetics. (On the particular, see I. Rutherford, "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo", CQ 38 (1988), 65-75, here 66f -)

46 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) - fJaia ev (jaxpofai noiMiXXeiu aMoa oocpofc; <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"

AS 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 49
poem, was to mark the victory.
This explanation for the preference for the local over the panhellenic also suggests an explanation of the general prefer-ence 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, Pindajr f Aristotle, with
Richardson, Pindar 389. Cf Race, Pindar and the Vulgus 254f, comparing the P.9 slogan with IJ.2.488ff; id., Pindaric Encomium 139f-

48 Contrast Kannicht on the absence of Iliadic subjects from the
earliest iconography (Poetry and Art 85).

49 On Pindar's poetry as monument, see J. Duchemin, Pindare:
poete et prophets (Paris, 1955), pt.4 ch.l, especially 281f, 296; 343f. Cf Greengard, Structure 3f- R. A. McNeal, "Structure and Metaphor in Pindar's Fourth Isthmian", QUCC 28 (1978), 135-56, here 154, argues that 7.3/4.55-7, quoted above, shows that Pindar considered that Homer's treatment of Aias was a monument to him.

224

o-f the death of Phokos in W.5» Traditional material will mark, a victory in a way which novel material will not. It bears the authority o-f tradition; and so will invest the victory with which it is associated with that authority. As the audience accept the version o-f the myth in the epinician, they should accept also the other things the poet tells: the worth o-f the victory. If the myth is true, so too is the praise of the . . 50 victor.
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 Hero-dotus' 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 dis-crepancy between the lengthy Iliadic journey via Egypt, and the quick three days of smooth sailing in the Cypria - and
S 7^

concludes that Homer did not write the Cypria. " 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.

u I amplify these points in my treatments of W.7 and 0.1; and in the Afterword.
51 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 43-5.
52 Hdt. 2.116-7; cf 4.32.
50 Pfeiffer, Classical Scholarship 73f; 117-

Nisetich has recently argued that Pindar's conception of

54 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 o-f

the Cycle. 0 But in the absence o-f persuasive proo-f to the

contrary, it is the sa-fest interpretation."'

It also tallies with the -fact that, although Pindar does

not treat Hector at length, he does include him in catalogues

o-f Achilles' victims. Further, he appears in those catalogues

54 Pindar arid Homer esp.1-23; 70-72.

JJ The two important passages are N. 7. 20-4 and 7.3/4/55-7, both describing the suicide o-f Ai as (on which, see below, p.290-f-f). The -former specifies the author o-f the Odyssey - but does not, o-f course, thereby necessarily exclude his being the author o-f other poems o-f the Cycle. In 7.3/4, Nisetich discovers an antithesis between the poet o-f the Aethiopis and "Homer" (53-f / 59f) and so concludes that the poet o-f the Aethiopis cannot be "Homer" (Pindar arid Homer ID-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 o-f the oitXwu xpiocc; 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-4.277f:
5*

(jeyiOTau

is sufficiently

TL-

. JtawTL

This, Fitch suggests,
closest Iliadic/Odyssean source - eoSXow xau ayyeXcx; afotMa &i6r\ (77,15.207) - to suggest
in the Cycle. But *" Braswell ad
"Homeric proverb" was constantly

different from
TO

the
TCTUXTCIL, OT*
source elsewhere

1 oc . points out that this
misquoted; and Burton, Pythian
Odes 17Of, 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,
Homer 414f-

Pindaros 339; Gildersleeve 302; Nagy , Pindar 1;

226

undistinguished from the heroes of the rest of the Cycle. 58

Only 0.2.81-3 even -faintly suggests his pre-eminence as one of

Achilles' victims; and 7.5 and 7.8 provide immediate counter-

59 examples. The ranking o-f 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 con-

sider the reason for this predilection; and then comment upon the details of the various accounts.

5B Nagy, Pindar's Homer 414f. Cf Carey 5 Odes 2O1 on 8.55. 59 Nisetich argues that Hektor's pre-eminence at £7.2.81-3
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.

Nagy, Pindar's Homer 415f and ch.14 passim.

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 fiff-century critics (Classical Scholarship 42).

is counter-intuitively schematic; runs counter to the tenets o-f oral poetry theory; and contrary to the traditional, evidenced, and altogether reasonable view o-f the priority o-f Homer. The neoanalyst must adopt the weaker position: Homer re-fleets "not the cyclic Aetbiopis, but an earlier state o-f the mythological material which later -found its way into it." There is no guarantee, then, that any particular aspect o-f this earlier state persevered to the known text o-f the Aethiopis. And so an unassimi lated detail o-f the Iliad might illuminate this early state, but not the known text.

Further, this dilution o-f 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

g

the sole property o-f 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

Willcock, Antilochos 483. Kullmann acknowledges this refine-ment 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 mu.st be pre-Homeric" (Oral Poetry Theory 310; cf 311). Cf Davies, Epic Cycle 4f-"Elles Csc. neoanalytic studies]... ont donne plus de corps a 1'hypothese de 1'existence d'un ensemble poetique anterieur a Homere que 1'on pourrait definir comme un tfr-Kyklos. Mais, a mon sens, elles n'ont pas reussi a demontrer 1'identite de cet ttr-Kyklos avec nos trois epopees cycliques, Chants Cypriens, Ethiopide et Iliou Per sis" (F. Jouan, "Le Cycle epique: etat des questions", Actes du Xe Congress Association Guillaume Gude (1980), 83-105, here 96).

g

Fenik, Typical Battle Scenes 236. Cf Kannicht, Poetry and Art 71f; Edwards, Neoanalysis 311-6.

229

I would explain Pindar's two descriptions o-f Memnon' s end

in this world by appeal to this con-fused and evolving

tradition. He definitively rules out the version in which

Memnon is carried off home: Aethiopia was no longer a suitable

81 destination -for an afterlife.

His periphrasis, on the other hand, accommodates both the

story recorded by Simonides o-f Memnon's burial in a strange Q*"*
land, *" and also the datum that Memnon was translated to an

a-fterli-fe in some place other than his home in the east. It

glosses over the eschatol ogi cal di -f -f i cul t i es involved; alludes

to the sensible narrative, and denies the implausible. From

con-fused and possibly intractable (qua supernatural) material,

he conjures a digni-fied and authoritative myth.

Now, what of the vocabulary used elsewhere by Pindar to

describe Memnon's death 0 It shows the same cautious awareness

of the difficulties involved.

Tithonos (Horn. h.Aphr. 225), typically for a mortal lover of an immortal (IJ.2O.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 197-2O1. On all this, see Vermeulje 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 destin-ation 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 W.3.34.

po
Farnell, Uorks 2.285.

Pindar mentions Achilles' a-fterli-fe twice, in different terms. He does allude to a white island as Achilles' realm in N.4:
arap

A fag ZaXajjfw' C^CL marpcoau' 1
eu <5* Ev^etua) ireXayei. ipaeuuau 'A^iAeuQ uaooiv.
(W.4.47-50) 10
But in (7.2 Achilles i s on the Island of the Blest, taken there by his mother, eitct Zrjuoq ryrop x X.ITCU'C, CJCCLOG (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 Ddyssean picture; or he makes Achilles, literally immortal, an analogue for Theron, literarily so.

jr> But neither of these arguments compels. 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

Bee Z.tf.4.79a for

11 Solmsen, Achilles 20; Nisetich, Immortality.
Solmsen does not consider the Aethiopis.

258

have been made be-fore Leuke was thoroughly within bounds to the

. . . 19 settlers.

By the end of the sixth century, then, Achilles is in some sense established on Leuke. 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. ""

But Achilles i.- taken off to immortality, as the Aethiopi;
f-*-r

probably had it, and as his worship in cult suggests.° He

must, then, go to an Island of the Blest which remains out of

— A

this world. Simonides and Ibycus sent him to Elysium.*" Pindar
^e-

puts him on a jja:*apu>u uaocx; (0.2.71f).'' All this requires no

special pleading: it is the inevitable upshot of a process of ^6
eschatological rationalization. The reference at W.4.49f is

19 cf Rohde, Psyche 565f n.lO2.

20 His journey there may be shown by an amphora of c . 540 (LIMC
1.1 p. 195 (no. 901)).
"?1
cf 0d.6.S; Hes. Op. 167; Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 74f n.20.

22 Note Nisetich 's insistence on the separation (Immor tal i ty) ;
cf Burkert, GR 205.

23 Farnell, CHC 323, 363, 371f-

24 PMG 558 = 291; also an Attic skolion tPMG 894).

25 cf this fragment of epic, which goes on to describe Ai as and
Odysseus taking Achilles' body out of the fighting:
T. C. D. (.uiiojjC. D
tDu, odt ^au>6oc; '
ill.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.

OA Nisetich 's argument for Pindaric innovation, motivated by
poetic tensions, depends on his claim that "whether Leuke,

260

plainly to Achilles' cult on Leuke, and does not discord with

27 his presence on a less terrestrial island.
OO

Which Leuke was meant in the Aethiopis?^ In early stages

of the tradition out o-f which the Aethiopis evolved, oi course,

Achilles' destination must have been out o-f this world. It is

a neat coincidence that those settlers in the Black Sea were

Milesian, and that the tradition of the Aethiopis seems to have

29 been localized in Miletus. 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 ~^0
the Aethiopis must have used that identification." But I doubt

that mundane Leuke was still so unknown and mysterious by the

time of the stabilization o-f the text of the Aethiopis. ° So

Elysium, and the Island of the Blest were originally the same is an entirely different question <Jroroor ta1ity 13 n.48; cf Pindar arid Homer 4f , 74-f n.20). It is not.

27 cf O.S. 3.775ff (Achilles on Leuke); 14.224-6 <Achilles in Elysium), with Vian, Recherches 35 n.3. Of course, traces of an afterlife on Leuke remain (Eur. Andro. 1259-62; J.T.427f).
'•'S

^ See Monro, Epic Cycle 16f.

r>o

Monro, loc. cit.; Hommel, Achilleus 22-4; Pinney, op. cit. 133, 139.

Nagy attempts to rule out the previous stage, in which the White Island is extra-terrestrial (Pindar's Homer 71). This is to ignore Rohde's observations. It also appeals to the ident-ification of mythical places of immortalization and ritual places of cult (Best of the Achaeans 189-92). But White Island is not the place at which Achilles disappears from the -face of this world (as i-f 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 Best of the Achaeans (34Off).

We have seen much the same difficulty with Memnon's afterlife: once the Aethiopes are located in this world, Memnon

261

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

Q

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
9
makes him greater.

cf his loose quotation of 7J.15.207 at P.4.277f. The archaic <p£yra (13) may bestow a Homeric patina.
8
Monro, ibid.

o

The victor was in fact an Athenian (16); but must have had some connexion with Salamis - perhaps a member of the family Salaminioi (Instone, op. cit. 115).

279

In the context o-f a competition for the armour, this mark
•for the adjudication is surprising; but it is simply the •formal expression o-f the recovery o-f the armour guaranteeing its possession: whoever does most to recover the armour, should keep it. At some stage in the evolution o-f the tradition, the obvious roles -for Odysseus and Aias must have been switched, and this straight-forward procedure hijacked to provide Aias with a motive -for suicide in the context o-f an award o-f the 16
arms.

Now, i f the Epitome re-fleets the Aethiop is, 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

17 the armour, Thetis arrives and makes it a prize. aTeprySeic;

(IM.8.27) may carry a good deal of weight beyond the claim that

18 Aias should have won the armour. 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

Now we see why P.Oxy.251O, 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.
0d.ll.546; fp.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.

286

claim that Odysseus carried the body, or deny that Aias did. 27

He speaks explicitly only o-f the -fight before they took the

body out - the -fight in which Aias distinguished himsel-f by

killing Glaukos (Apoll. fp.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 <31-f). Now we must

return to reinterpret awoijoca: it no longer re-fers to the more

wounds that Odysseus in-flicted during the recovery o-f the body,

but the more wounds that Aias in-flicted during the -fight over

28 <• > the body, and the whole war. Hence the opacity o-f r^ pau. . ye:
r>9
it accommodates both interpretations."

I suggest, then, that this passage in W.8 must be inter-

preted in the light o-f the tradition, as represented by the

Aethiopis. It challenges the award o-f the arms to Odysseus

27 As Nisetich would like to argue, and implies: "The most
explicit point of difference Cbetween the accounts of the cyclics and of Pindar 3... 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 arid 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"<2O, my italics). Farnell equivocates by speaking of the "chief part" in the recovery: "Pindar delib-erately falsifies the story for his own purposes" (Uorks 2.307) .

28"*" The locus classicus for a phrase in Pindar demanding reinter-
pretation in the light of what follows is P. 3.27, where Apollo's oxoitoc; finally turns out not to be the raven that we are at first led to believe. Also <7.1.26ff. See below, ch. 8.

«^j

cf the difficulty over eject... mSc; av (0.9.29-f): one cannot be sure whether it means "how else..." or "how could have..." <Molyneux, Herakles 302f>; see below, p.430.

(W.8.27), jt£pq>aoi.<; (W.8.32). 42 It was the blindness of the Sjji-Xcx; aw<5p£u>, 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 o-f these two treatments suggest that they look towards the traditional account; and they harmonise per-fectly 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 paradeigmatic of how Pindar achieves various purposes with mythical material by changing his

43 selection of detail and emphasis, and not by innovating.

At the core of the story of Aias' death lies the Achaeans' failure to recognize and honour Aias' true worth. In W.8 Pindar presents this as the result of phthonos, and turns it to be a contrast with encomium, at the heart of which is the

44 correct appreciation of the laudandus' worth; in J.3/4 it begins as a demonstration of the unpredictability of fortune,

Homer's and Odysseus', and the ouiXoc; both mankind and the Achaeans at Troy.
42 cf G. W. Most, "Sappho fr. 16.6-7 L-P", CQ 31 <1981), 11-17, here 16 n.32.

43 In no detail clearer than his differing uses of Homer in W.7 and 7.3/4. Whilst pointing this out, and noting the scholiasts' perplexity which it caused (SI. 1.4.63a) , Hubbard concludes: "Pindar felt quite free to revise and manipulate details of any myth to suit the context. Different sections of the Iliad might be cited as honouring either Aias or Odysseus" (Pindaric Mind 113 n.21). The second sentence is right, and disproves this example of the phenomenon asserted by the first.

44 Carey, Neineari 8 37 and passim', Ktthnken, Function 30, 34-6;
Most, Measures 152 n.78.

29'

general, a penchant for the bizarre, critics have seen Aias' madness and his attack on the Achaeans' booty as part of its

49 account. In the simpler version of the Aethiopis^ the

implication is, Aias suicides "fou de douleur et d 'humi 1 i at ion" . ~*
There are three difficulties with this reconstruction.
First is the mention in Aethiopis T 8 (II) B = EOF T 3 (i) of Aias Cjjaua3ux5r)<;, which suggests that Aias was mad in that poem also. 0 This is tantalizing evidence. It is the caption for a picture of Aias before his suicide, hiding his head in his
c* o

hands, near a dead ram. " The value of the table as evidence is ambivalent; certainly some of its scenes of the Iliad seem tc have been inspired by epitomes or other pictorial representations, rather than the poem."1 "' It may simply be a careless caption, reflecting not, as it claims, the action of the Aethiopis, but the dominant tradition. Like the Chrestonathy, 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).
° Severyns, CE 331.
J This seems to be either ignored or glossed over. Kamerbeek, Ajax 2 mentions it without investigating the implications; Vian, Recherches 4O 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 ILIMC 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.

29!

reaction would also seem to accord with the behaviour of

characters in the Iliad. J No need for a doctor to interpret Achilles' mood on the death o-f PatroMos:
TOU 6* ax&cx; ue<peXr| c^aXu^c ueXaiua-
<5e *epoiu eX<i>u xouiw ai6aXoeooau
6* ?#uue npooawiou-

(12. 18.22-25)

Equally, when Andromache, -fearing the worst -for Hektor, rushes

to the walls of Troy Mcuwa6i for) (77.22.460), she does so

instantly; and if anything, thereafter becomes calmer."*

It seems to me that we must either posit for Aias a

psychology sophisticated enough to accommodate a slow crescendo

CjO

towards -furor - but this seems inappropriate to early epic; or

accept that the first signs which Podaleirios sees in the

Aethiopis (Iliupersis fr.4 S = EOF 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 arid Madness ir> Aricierit Greece (Ithaca and London, 1979), 67f; Davies, Epic Cycle 65.
M. I. Davies, "The Suicide of Ajax: a bronze Etruscan Statu-ette from the KSppeli 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.

Z97

source does not, of course, invalidate comment upon its use in the poem.
Finally, I note that Aias' invulnerability, which Pindar avoided in his treatment of the hero's birth, and which may have made his suicide di-f-ficult in the Cycle, is ignored entirely. Once again, Pindar excludes the traditionally

•fantastic.

in

KShnken, Funktion 105; it has a role in the web of darkness and obscurity contrasted with light and fame (llOff; cf p.294 n.45 above).
cf Aesch. fr. 83 R. On Aias' invulnerability, see above, p.266ff-

301

statement by Pindar to the Aeginetans about a matter entirely discrete -from that victory. How, then, could it have a unity? W.7 became the test case -for this central question of Pindaric

2 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. 0
The case -for the connexion o-f the two poems rested on three kinds o-f argument. First is the evidence o-f the scholia themselves. Aristarchus seems to state it as a fact that the 4
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."1 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 'A#aioc; avr\p 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 Hemean 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.

The first approach is exemplified by Wilamowitz
rteneisches} the second, by Schadewaldt, Aufbau.
4 S.W.7-7O; cf 94a, 123a, 150a.
u Van der Kolf, Quaeritur 49f -

3O3

audience. Only 102ff refers directly to the scandalous Paean , but other passages dwell on the integrity of the poet, an epi-nician theme which is in this case especially significant. 7 (The question of unity is thus re-framed as the question of the

g
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

9 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 apo-logies for (or defences of) the Paean were "the encomiast's rhetorical poses" misunderstood. And he believed that the

12 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.
Recht~f er tigung 4O4f ; 391ff .
8 cf Z.W.7.123a; Carey, 5 Odes 16 n.37.
9 Scholier, 385-91.
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.

3O4

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. "'
And now the controversy remains in uneasy stasis. Bundy's general thesis that the odes are the product o-f the disciplined professional encomiast, and are dedicated to the praise of the victor, is unquestionable. But W.7, and in particular 102ff, 14
seems extraordinarily defensive. Perhaps that extraordinary quality cannot be accounted for on Bundy's terms. "J In that case the scholiast's theory of a connexion with Pae.b seems to offer a valid explanation of the apparent intrusion of the poet's own voice, be it integrated within the poem as encomium . 16
or not.

On the other hand, the theory of a connexion, although easily loosely stated, is still hard to formulate exactly. 102ff remains a problem for this interpretation, also: if Pindar has worked so hard to mitigate the account of the Paean,

18 why does he finally appear to deny it?

° Slater, Futures 91ff; see Fogelmark, Studies 104-116.

14 Kirkwood, Vicissitude 56. t

Young, 3 Odes 25 n.l.
Lloyd Jones, Modern ITI ter pr station , 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 2O9f; 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."
Slater, Doubts 2O4; cf e.g. Norwood, Pindar 84: "a masterly blend of serene audacity, perfect diction, and impeccable manner".

18 Slater, loc. cit.

305

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 W.7 and Pae.6.^"~)
In sum: Aristarchus' explanation of the apologetic lines which seem to occur in W.7, which turns on differences between the narratives of Pae.6 and W.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." 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 Iliupersisi 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
11 iupersist

22 Most, Measures 133.

Most, Measures 16O.

313

temple, want to stone Aias, but -fail to. ° Wherever the cause is specified, it is always Aias' behaviour which torpedoes 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 suppli-cate 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. 16

What is important, however, is that at this stage, Neoptolemos is not a war criminal, but simply the sacker of

01 See J. Bremmer, A. M. van Erp, T. Kip and S. R. Strange, Some Recently Found Greek Poems * lines. Suppl. 99 (1987), 111; cf Bremmer, Scapegoat Rituals 315. Cf e.g..Paus.8.5.12.

14 H. Lloyd-Jones, "The Cologne Fragment of Alcaeus", GRBS 9 (1968), 125-39, here 136-9; cf Bremmer, van Erp, Kisp and Strange, op. cit. 96-98.
15 Gould, Hiketeia 96-95; cf Vickers, TGT 483-9, with 490f n.20. 17.24.305ff- For the juxtaposition of the successful suppl-ication of Achilles by Priam and the unsuccessful supplications everywhere else in the Iliad, see MacLeod, Iliad 24 15f, 33f - Cf Aer,. 2. 469-662.

317

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

26 inadequate; he could only be persuaded away - by argument, 27 starvation or fire. Even these techniques were problematic;

whether the forcible removal of a suppliant was ever a *^8

religiously satisfactory technique is a moot point.*1" What is

important, is that the Little Iliad at least provided a plaus-

ible and comprehensible account of the slaughter of Priam which r>9
did not entail the pollution of Neoptol emos. *"

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 Aegin-etans 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 partic-ularly 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, Hitteteia 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 lliupersis. This cotumuTiis opinio has lately been challenged by Nagy, Pindar's Homer 76.

episodes into the same scene5 and so Priam is shown with Astyanax, though in every literary source, they die in differ-35
ent 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. 0 Most extremely,

38 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

39 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

4O out at Delphi, It is an attractive idea.

In sum, the argument for an early version in which Neo-ptolemos' murder of Priam was depicted as a sacrilegious act remains a priori. But the principle on which it is founded is

<Unless PMG B 115/6.7 is relevant - see p.321 n.32 above.)
M. I. Wiencke, "An Epic Theme in Greek Art", AJA 58 (1954), 285-3O6, plates 55-64, here 29O. 297 and passim. Cf Cook, Art arid Epic\ Horsfall, Stesichorus 39f.
But there is a change in the early fifth century, from which time Priam is treated less pathetically <Wiencke, op. cit. 300-6).
Wiencke, op. cit. 292, pi.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, pi.59 fig.20.
40 Scritti lOf.

323

sound: that the archaic Greeks - and the Delphians in particular - could find troubling the religious implications o-f 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 an-other 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 diffi-culties of N.7. First, if Pae.6 is simply presenting a trad-itional version of the myth, Pae.6 itself might turn out to be relevant to H.7 only inasmuch as it exemplifies a tradition

41 which, in H.7, Pindar is countermanding. One of the simplest

objections to Aristarchus* theory - the sheer implausibi1ity of Pindar writing first one version and then, apologetically, another - is thus acknowledged. Secondly, if, in W.7, Pindar is avoiding the traditional version which he narrated in Pae.6, is the narrative which he does present his own invention? I consider this question below, but, for the

41 Slater, Doubts 2O5; Lefkowits, Autobiographical Fiction 44f

42 Slater, Futures 91.

324

moment, note that we have seen that the depiction o-f Neopt-olemos 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 emphasises his sacrilege; and it is entirely plausible that Pindar has drawn upon this in W.7.

The Return from Troy

Neoptolemos' journey from Troy received its fullest cyclic treatment in its proper place in the Nosti. 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 <W.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 W.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

This approach is exampled by Most, Measures 167f; Ktthnken,
69.

325

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 32 speculation." I have noted that Aw6wwa6»w is right, if only as

an inland marker. The area was -famous -for its cattle. But particularly accurate is Pindar's description o-f the mountains. They do lie in ridges < Morraxe i ura L) ; and they do stretch right to the sea (jrpSSvec; e^o^ot). 0 Most correctly insists that these are not just -forelands; they are jutting, mountainous

. . 35 promontori es.

These are telling details. Even i-f 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. 0 CScylax], the -fourth century geographer, mentions a short

where the voyage -from Thebes to Sicily cuts through it. Woodbury's "land-mark" and Host'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, Neoptoleme 14 n.l.

Hammond, Epirus 41; cf Pambotis.

^4 Hammond, Epirus 8-13.

35 e.g. 77.17.747, 8.557; Nenean 7.64-67 320 n.22.
6 Certainty is impossible. This assumption seems more plausible, and is worse for my argument.

344

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 Andro-mache and Hermione, later exploited by the tragedians, and a

45 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.

349

I shall argue that the shifts between Pae.6 and N.7 do re-fleet 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 para-doxes 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.** Whether the war actually took place is now a moot

1 2 point. But by 548 the Amphictiony, a league of surrounding

11 r.hypoth.P.b, d; inscr.W.9: Forrest, First Sacred War.

12 Its historicity was thoroughly doubted by Robertson, Sacred War; for a reply, see G. A. Lehmann, "Der "erste heilige Krieg"
- eine Fiktion? 1 ', Historic 29 (198O), 242-6.

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 o-f the pithosi nor the juxtaposition of Paean 6, W.7 and Polygnotus' picture.

The Mythological Tradition

At this point, a resum6 may be helpful. I suggested that
the difficulties of W.7 which have provoked critics to link it to Paean 6 were explicable by appeal to the complex mytho-logical tradition which lay behind the mythical narrative of W.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 Molossoi, 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
altar at the heart of his palace. The implications of such act were sufficiently disturbing for the Little Iliad to remove

an
an

366

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 Neo-ptolemos' 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 Molossoi, 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 Molossoi 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 Molossoi 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 king-dom 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.

367

up the -fate o-f the wise man who invests in his own kleos. Formally, it would stand as kephalaion, to be recapitulated at 49, to the myth o-f Neoptolemos, whose honour grows as his repute is maintained.
But 6e6<; appears to add a different dimension: Pindar now seems to be discussing honour which is not bestowed by a mortal

g
poet, but by a divine power. Most contrasts these two; and

cp his analysis becomes qualified and unconvincing. It is pr ima facie unlikely that Pindar is contrasting his own poetry un-favourably with anything, or implying that his poetry (logos) is useless, unless a god nurtures it. " 6eoq 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

7 cf A/.6.29f. For a|3p6u, see W. J. Verdenius, "ABPOZ", ttnes 15 (1962), 392f; L. Kurke, "The Politics of appoawn", CAnt 11 (1992), 91-120, here 94; and below, p.387 n.91.

g

Carey cites this gnome to prove that "the myth was introduced to illustrate the role of divinity in preserving fame" <Pindar ica 38) .
9 Measures 151; cf 158, 181.
Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 131.
11 cf P. 3. 108-11; 1.3/4.19-21; 0d.17.518f. We might identify the god as the Muse, following the scholiast <Z.N.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.

770

through poetry, so the myth is paradeigmatic of the veracity and power o-f Pindar's epinician poetry. These themes have been gradually introduced: the power o-f poetry to preserve honour at 8-f-f; the necessity -for truth at 20ff. Pindar has been as yet only implicitly involved; after his narration o-f the story of Neoptolemos, he will bring himself explicitly to

^ * 13 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

14 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.
The exempluiR 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. Kfchnken'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 (Fun ktion 59).

71

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. 15 There is no completely satisfactory solution. Least problematic, I think, is to follow Farnell and read (SoaSoSi; with uoX£u>, as Bowra does. The Thessalians described their annexation of the shrine as action helping the god: the Athenians who helped swore (3ori6iToe<.^ TO> 6eo> *ai TrJ yr) cepa. 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: hs tried to correct the malpractices of the priesthood. The emphatic position, and TOL, immediately controvert the alternative stories about his visit. The long delay of the subject of yoXcu 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 donnee of burial at Delphi confirms |3oa6o£>L'.

15 Farnell Uorks 2.291-5; Most, Nemear, 7.31-36 262-5.
Aeschines 3.1O9; Woodbury, Neoptolenos 107. For the phrase "helping a god", see Parker, Miasina 165; cf Woodbury, Neoptolenos 1O7. Plato Apol.2Zb7, which D. E. Gerber ("Pindar, Nemean 7.31", AJP 84 (1963), 182-8, here 187 n. 18) quotes to show that por)6etV 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 TOC: cf 1. 3/4.55; Denniston, GP 537.
18 Long delay: cf (7.10.24-30, and Gildersleeve ad loc.; surprise: Most, Hemeari 7.31-36 269 n.33.
19 cf Most, Measures 166. The technique is familiar: cf Gerber on £7.1.44, where mention of Ganymede confirms Pelops'

372

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 ercei, which makes their relation somewhat more than temporal, and somewhat less than

20 strictly causal. If such a relation can be discovered between

Neoptolemos' sack o-f the city o-f Priam and his burial at Delphi, we may reject the clumsy parenthesis o-f cw nudcoio 6a7t£<Soic; / xe^Tai., which will become the apodosis o-f the

21 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 o-f the NeonroXeue i oq TLOLQ whose stylish symmetry lay behind the dominant iconography o-f the scene and resisted immediate Thessalian re-formation. IlptaMOt> woXtu is not simply elegant 2*?
variation for Troy, but the lightest possible acknowledgement

23 o-f another level o-f explanation -for Neoptolemos' death.

As with the mention o-f the death o-f 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."

"Pindar Neneari 7.31-36 and the Syntax of Aetiology", HSCP 92 (1989) , 74-101.
21 cf C. Segal , "Pindar's Seventh Weroean", TAPA 98 (1967), 431- 75, here 446.
^2 Ktthnken, Funtftivr, 63 n. 132.
23 Most, Measures 166; cf Kirkwood, Vicissitude 82.

373

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 enei draw a veil over the death o-f 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 o-f Priam's. If Pindar is to produce a true account o-f Neoptolemos' career, he cannot entirely ignore Priam.

36 anorcXe<»>i<> Emphatically placed at the start of the sentence. Pindar controverts the version o-f the epic cycle in which Neo-ptolemos walks, and -follows instead the Molossian version in which he sails, which naturally accords better with what is known elsewhere o-f the Molossoi: their territory, and the datum that Neoptolemos ruled them.
K6hnken points out that these lines echo the opening o-f
25 the Odyssey. This -familiarity reassures: although in other versions Neoptolemos may have walked -from Troy, sailing is not unprecedented.
37 £x£pot> At Paus. 3.25.1 Neoptolemos has returned to Skyros, where he was brought up in Achilles' absence. This weak trad-ition is denied outright. We have seen that, in the -few cases where Pindar does flatly deny an alternative version, that
26

version is never part of a strong tradition. So here.

24 Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 45. Most, Measures 166; contrast Carey, 5 Odes 134.
25 FuTtktioTi 69.
26 e.g. H. 3.34 (above, p.101); W.6.50, W.3.62f (above, p.252).

374

48 The three words are at n>eC<Sc<; o jjaprtx; epypaotw
Even if it is not literal, rpta ercea must re-fer to a very few words - not to the myth of Neoptolemos that we have just

38 heard.

49f The witness must be either Pindar or Apollo - they are

^o both better candidates than Neoptolemos. The best arguments
4O 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

41 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 dec*; 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.

cf Carey, Pindar ica 37.

38 Farnell, Uorks 2.296; cf Woodbury, Neopiolemos 113 n.74; Ar.
Nub.l4O2 with Dover's note.

- TO

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, Piridar 73, argue for him.
40

5 Odes 154f; Pindarica 38.

See also Woodbury, Neoptolemos HO n.64; Most, Measures 176f 41

377

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'

42 deeds (49). The contrast is with Homer, who exaggerated
Odysseus'. 43

50-2 It is now broadly agreed that dpao& uca To6* etnefu must 44
mean "I make bold to say this". The interpretation o-f the next line should, then, reflect that it has been marked by this

45 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 odou in apposition with To6c, and supply etuat. The o«5ou. . . Xo^o>u is the course of Pindar's

47 / poetry, as laid out by the deeds he describes there. *t>piau>

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, Pindaric a 36; Bundy, SP 1.30-32.
Pindaric a 36f.
47 cf 7.3/4.19-21; W.6.45-9, with Lefkowitz, TO KAI EFO 197; Woodbury, Neoptolenos 114 (although he over-emphasizes the importance of the divine, which is incidental rather than central); Fogelmark, Nemean 7.50-52 126*.

378

48 "valid"). Whichever; xwpiau connotes authority: this is the

proper road to be on. The operate; are those of the Aiakids:

the deeds of excellence by which the road o-f words is led. 49

They are shining: both egregious and famous. 50

The difficulty with otxodew 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
cr*">

may refer to Pindar: "I know the right version of the song"."1

The problem is that the sense of o~*oaeu> boils down to "here".

It might be marked by A~ytva or MO*-- But perhaps the problem

is illusory: for Pindar's song gives the version of local saga

54 in a performance at Aegina: his song is the home version.

48 Within: Carey, Pindarics 37, after Fennell ad loc. , comparing 04$ou aua^tTOU' <W.6.53). Outside: id., 5 Odes 156. Neither can be ruled out: Silk, Interaction § 37, with 238.
40

S. Fogelmark, "Pindar, Nemean 7.5O-52", C.Ant. 45 <1976), 121-32, here 129.

~* On light /fame see Verdenius, Co»».2.37.

5 1 »f / Ktthnken, Funktion 75-7, using N.3.31: ot^o-Scw ucnreue. Carey
claims that in that poem a host of polarities suggest the mean-ing "from local saga" (see 26-30); in this, nothing does (Pindar ica 37). But we do have A"? lisa at 50.
50
cf Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 134; cf Woodbury, who refers o?^o6eu to the inborn qualities of the Aiakids.

Carey notes that otxodeu', coupled with a destination in 0.3.45f and 1.4.11-f, "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 Neo-ptolemos is a novelty: I have suggested that W.7 is bravura handling of difficult mythical material; whatever attempts at the story were current in Aegina before it, W.7 supersedes
them.

379

70-73 There is too little evidence on the pentathlon to be certain what is going on here; but enough -for us to understand

74 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.
74 See, in particular, C. Segal, "Two Agonistic Problems in Pindar, Nenean 7.70-74 and Pythian 1.42-45", GRBS 9 (1968), 31-45, here 34; H.M. Lee, "The TEPMA and the javelin in Pindar Hemear, 7.70-3,'and Greek Athletics", JHS 96 (1976), 70-79, here 73-78.
75 Carey, 5 Odes 166-9.
76 Carey, 5 Odes 169f; Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 43; and in general, her "The Poet as Athlete", S1FC Ser.3 2 (1984), 5-12.
77 So, broadly, Most, Measures 194f.

383

The problem with this interpretation is that it torpedoes
any hope there is of reducing W.7 to a neat and manageable polar schema. For Pindar, having stressed the importance of the accuracy o-f praise, now, it seems, absent-mindedly intro-duces the possibility that his own praise may have overshot the mark, and adds that, i-f it did, it simply reflected his good 8*?
intentions. *~ One solution is to construct a schema of com-plexity sufficient to accommodate the differences; so, partly, Most . 83
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.

85 H.7 is about the preservation of honour. The subject is

treated in various ways throughout the ode. The variations

1.3n.ll (and index s.v. <p6ouo<;))- Fennel 1 glosses Tpa*£<; with "niggardly" .
82 cf Lefkowitz, Autobiographical Fiction 43f .
83 e.g. Measures 196: "By contrast, Odysseus had the (specious) *Xcow but lacked the itouoq^.. 11 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 GrundgedaTtke; 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). (W.7 is about other things, too
- e.g. Sogenes' victory in a pentathlon competition.)
86 cf broadly, Greengard, Structure 107 n.66

385

hang together to -form some sort of unity, which is thus complex

•' * 87 and elaborate - notxtXou. But need this unity imply complete 38 logical consistency? It need not, if we cleave to the notion

o-f the linear, rather than static, poem, which is to be heard po (or read) through time, and not perceived synchronical ly. So here: as various facets o-f 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 inescapabi1ity - 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 inter-connection and interdependence of recurrent and developed ideas, thoughts, words, and images." On noittiXoc; and its cognates, see Young, Pindar, Aristotle 168f; "they concern inherent complexity, elaborateness, or intricacy of essential argument, not decoration"; Richardson, Pindar 389.

89 As Young's "cohere" suggests (see last note). Heath
criticizes this view (Modern Criticism 97f) and Young's explan-ation of noc*iXca (Unity 28 n.l, index s.v.); but his own con-clusion is not so far removed: "Diversity is one constituent of coherence" (154) (he defines coherence as "the quality of their Csc. the different parts of the text} conjoint effect" (loc. cit.); cf Young, Pindar, Aristotle 163, on "episodes... sub-ordinate to his CHomer'sD major, simplex theme."
po Slater, Doubts 196, answering Young, PC 87; Race, Style and
Rhetoric 6f.

386

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 o-f 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 TO TepnwoV nXeou 7te£epxeTai; and that, if he has been carried away, it simply re-fleets his readiness (prompted by the deed) to redeem the #apcc; laid up by the victory.
In -fact, the -first inkling o-f this positive slant was as early as ap*pou au^ec Xoyov (32) , which goes rather beyond the
91

simple notion o-f recording achievement. Now, Pindar is beginning to emphasize the transmutation his poetry offers; and the role of the divine, symbolizing the egregious quality of
92
Pindar's work, is to be emphasized.

77-9 Norwood's "Triple Diadem". " Pindar's image for his own poem emphasizes its diversity, and exemplifies the shift of
94

subject which is taking place.

90 Schadewaldt, Aufbau 320; Verdenius, Co»».1.105f.
91 Nagy, Pindar's Homer 282f; L. Kurke, "The Politics of ", CArtt 11 (1992), 91-120, here 109-111.
92 0.10.91ff exemplifies the notion that deeds without record are valueless; P.8.92ff shows the new thrust.
93 Pindar 1O7-11O; cf C.Segal, "Pindar's Seventh N*»ean", TAPA 98 (1967), 431-75, here 460-5.
94 Most, Measures 199: "it asserts the noc*c\ia of this poem in the disparateness of its constituents... yet asserts with the 'verb their... unification." Cf R. D. Griffith and G. D'Ambrosio-Grif f ith, "La Couronne Chryselephantine de la Muse (Pindare, Hen. 7. 77-9) " , AC 57 (1988), 258-66, here 264-6.

387

preserve the quantum of happiness <*aip6v oXpow 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: e" JTOWOC; rju, TO repicwou JtXeou jiei5ep#eTai. Poetry does not simply reflect, but transmutes. Sogenes' children will not only uphold his geras, but may improve it <*ai apeiou orct6ev>. 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 Tugend-hat's examination, still seemed to refer to Paean 6 - but one is enough. Under its influence, other passages, which may be interpreted as referring to, for example, general questions of 102 poetic propriety, acquire a special point.
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 1O2 couched in such earnest language? ° Pindar finally,

Rechtfertigung 404
Lloyd-Jones, Modern Interpretation 136.
For a defensive formulation of each problem: Most, Measure* 204; Crotty, Song and Action 136.

389

emphatically, declares himself innocent. Appealing interpret-ations of two difficult words, arp<$Jioioi and eX*6oai, 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 apo-logy 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 rewrought 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). 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 lingu-istic support for it turns out to be illusory: eXxuoai will not, on its own, mean "worried by dogs". We cannot be sure

104 Slater, Futures 91-4, published in 1969, and attacked by

Fogelmark (Studies ch.4> in 1972; Lloyd-Jones, Hodem Inter- pretation 136) in 1973; Carey (5 Odes 179) in 1981.
105 See Fogelmark, Studies 41f n.13.
106 Slater, Doubts 2O3-5.
107 cf K6hnken, Function 81 n. 197. In the word itself, there is nothing to suggest dogs <Z. W. 7. 150a) , "dragging Neoptolemos' name in the mud" (D. E. Gerber, "Pindar, Nemear, 7.31% AJP 84

390

102ff is between Pindar and the other versions. 116 These, less favourable stories, Pindar presents as hackneyed: on orponococ, 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 104-f to the story o-f Neoptolemos: "both sentences will in effect be rejecting the notion of telling the same old story over and over again".
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.
"The purpose of an epilogue is to surrender one's theme

119 without giving offence to one's audience." 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 apo-logizes for cutting short his praise by appeal to the principle

116 Slater, Doubts 2O5, 2O7; Lefkowitz Autobiographical Fiction 44f; Woodbury, Neoptolemos 133 and, tentatively, Most, Measures 208.
117 Measures 2O6; cf Silk, Interaction 2O3 n.17.
118 c f Race, Negative Expressions 115, who also compares the end of N.7 to the hymnal envoi.
119 Bundy, Quarrel 83.

393

that selection -from a theme is better than an exhausting,

12O complete treatment: a lot is too much.
1 *"* 1

The epilogue o-f N.7 seems broadly similar. A prayer

122 1 OT

precedes. Going over the same things is awopia; and so
1 *"*4

Pindar stops short. *" ua\|OJ\a*ac; and Texuoioiu accord neatly:

the -Former is typical o-f the unmeasured speech o-f the crass

125 eulogist; the latter typi-fy a lack o-f judgement. *~ Central to

the break-o-ff is the notion o-f excessive length, which is

avoided. "" At N.7.103, eXx&oat naturally suggests "drag out"

(LSJ s.v. A II 6); and there is a good parallel:

*~ Quarrel.

121 Slater, Futures 93-f compared N.7.104f to 0.2. 92-5; see Bundy,
Quarrel 89n.lll. 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 jjavytAaxac; . Lloyd-Jones adds nothing (Modern Interpretation 136) .

122 cf I.1.64ff, following the break-off of 6O-63 (on the
tethmos, see Miller, Digressive Leisure 2O6) ; 0. 13. 115, a single line of prayer following the break-off of 114, explained at 93ff.

cf the avoidance of repetition at 0.13.1Olf.

cf Most, Measures 2O6f .

/ cf XaXayrfeat in the epilogue of 0.2 (97); the Xa|3pot
Xoooaia *6pa*€x; of the same poem (86f>; TO xat>xao6ai napa
at ^0. 9. 38 (cf 40); awe^paj^ow (W.7.76); contrast H. 10.21.

cf /°.2.72f - where the monkey is the eulogist here, apprec-iated by his dull (cf P. 1.82) audience. Contrast the wise at P. 9. 78.

127 In an epilogue: 0.2.95-10O; 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, Digress-ive Leisure 212); P. 9. 75-9 (Young, Pindar, Aristotle); W.4.71f; W-10.19f; see Schadewaldt, Aufbau 288 n.2; Bundy, Quarrel 81f, 87f .

394

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,

132 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
133

envoi, critics saw evidence of a personal literary debate.
But, as with any purely formal explanation, the question
134

is now: why this example of the typical form here7 Why is Neoptolemos specified, when the formal function of closure would have been as well served by any other encomiastic

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.lll); and his cryptic note at SP 1.28f: the con-cluding foil of tf.7 "by its declaration of impatience with further elaboration, adds force to the laudator's confident assertion that W.7, his "hymn to Neoptolemas," has done justice to this hero and the other laudandi of the ode."

cf Young, PC 88.

397

perhaps also in Stesichorus' Sac* of Troy, and in the popular iconography.
We have seen how Pindar tackles this welter of confusion
and opprobrium with a strategic blend o-f selection, focus and renovation. His treatment is a tour de force; 139 a seriously •formulated attempt to controvert the pejorative depictions o-f Neoptolemos. It provides the Aeginetans with an authoritative account of their hero - which account can now, on Nagy's model, make its 14O 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 narra-tion of the story of Neoptolemos proves his ability to circum-vent 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 clari-fication and selection. He uses his authoritative, myth of

139 Tugendhat, Rechtfertigung 399.
140 Nagy, Pindar's Homer ch.14.

399

8
THREE MYTHS

In my discussion of Aiakid myths in the epinicians, I have concentrated on one principal determining factors the necessity that the narrated myth be traditional, known to the first audience. But we have also seen the pressure of rational-ization, manifested in the exclusion of the magically super-natural. 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 J.6, Pindar teasingly includes it (note especially apprywrov 47) but also carefully rationalizes it. On a larger scale, I explained the break-off in W-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.

401

omniscient mind, after all. And now we retrace our steps over the last couple o-f lines, and realize that the o*ojcog was Apollo himself; that al'cu had a weaker meaning, of "perceived"; and that KOLwauL 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 GSrtner's explanation of the break-off in N.5, Cairns argues that the rejected version counterpoints and so highlights the new story. ° 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 determ-inants at work. In N.5, Phokos' murder demands a mention qua traditional material 5 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 7.6, 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 A/. 5: G&rtner, Sieges-lieder 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).

406

provokes the question: what is this ivory shoulder? If, on the other hand, the lines re-fer to the traditional story o-f the cooking, then they are narrating the story denied in 37ff. But there is no warning that these lines are not true; 7 and if they are "true", then Pindar is being extraordinarily inconsistent. 8 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 insur-mountable 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 eatei is temporal, but later shows that it must have been causal ; K6hnken admits that the audience will have been baffled by the eiiei clause; and Howi e suggests that Ka6apo£> \e|3r|TOC; is a deliberately ambiguous phrase, resolved by the identification of Klotho. 9
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, cjcet (26) is temporal; we note that Pindar concentrates on the timing of Poseidon's love in his corrected

Ktthnken, Time arid Event 68ff.

g

Howie, Pelops 283.
9 Cairns, T i ball us 188; Ktthnken, Time and Event 71; Howie Pelops 286.
10 This is, then, as yet, an innocent kephslaion (Kbhnken, Tine and Event 68f; Hamilton, Epinikion 63f) .

410

separate from the rest of his remains (Pans.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

25 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 scholar-
ship 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 Oinomaos' charioteer, and seems to be an early feature of the story - possibly appearing in the AlciRaeoriis." 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 ya(.6mc>u cSfjou <Od. 1 1 . 128) ; but this does not help with

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. E. LV. 1.7.6.92 claims that the Palladion was made of Pelops' bones). Also Burkert, HN 99; Slater, Pelops at Olynpia 492.
25 e.g. Orestes': Hdt. 1.116.1; Parke, Bones 16O. But see the caution of Berber, Comm. 56.

26 Parke, Bones 16O.

27 Ktthnken, Time and Event 75 n.42.
28 Howie Pelops 279; L. Lacroix, "La legende de Pelops et son iconographie", BCH 100 (1976), 327-41, here 332 n.50. For a

41

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 con-

vincing to account for the massive scale of invention perceived

in the poem. 0

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

59 youth passes through on his way to maturity.

57 As was Ganymede at 0-lO.lO4f.

58 K6hnken, Poseidon Hippios is held up as a satisfactory inter-
pretation <e.g. Dover, Initiation 129; Nisetich, Pindar and Homer 73 n.7). But his identification of "the theme of divine horses ...CasH one of the most important unifying elements in the structure of the ode" (2O2) is, on reflection, not parti-cularly helpful - compare the importance of horses in his ana-lysis of 0.3 ("Mythological Chronology and Thematic Coherence in Pindar's Third Olympian", HSCP 37 (1983), 49-63, here 61f. "The motive of divine favour is a leitmotif in all three parts o-f the myth" (204) 5 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 implic-ation is that Hieron too enjoys divine love, although this love is of course not on the same physical level" tComm. 54) (but cf F. Cairns, "^EPOZ in Pindar's First Olympian Ode", Hermes 1O5 (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.

The threefold rhythm of expulsion, isolation and reinteg-ration 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:

420

arities are revealed only by an analysis of their structure. Pel ops' 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 o-f Pel ops' transition to maturity. Has, then, Pindar cobbled these two discrete (because equivalent) stories together?
Now, Pel ops' chariot race against Oinomaos has also been seen as symbolic o-f his transition to manhood: not only is he winning a bride, but he is killing the old king. J 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; then &paiOTepoc; eu> *tr\ avat^axoaei yeyove (Apoll. Ep.2.3); 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

68 form a single narrative. Such trebling is typical of

65 Hubbard, Cooking 5; cf Burkert, HN 95-1O3, GR 1O5-7; Nagy, Pindar's Homer 122$ Krummen, Pyrsos Hymnon 201.
Young children are the standard ingredients for cannibalistic meals (Henrichs, Human Sacrifice 225 nn. 1, 4).
67 Howie, Pelops 29O.
Sergent, Homosexuality 67 (but not 65).

422

show Pindar's version to be the true one - bi«+ in this poem,

74 Pindar does not make the cl^m explicit.
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 o-f 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. u
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 (TQMOU) 5 and they all eat him, too (<payou) - which makes the business of the revival, and the shoulder, difficult. It is not enough to say simply that the changes exaggerate the horror

74 Implications Slater, Hypothekai 80; not explicit: Hubbard,
Pindaric Mind 103, contra Berber, Comn. 67.
cf, broadly, Howie, Pelops 296-8 who also suggests that "the neighbour's lie developed into the myth".
76 /
See below on ycraTptjjapj'ou, 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 6ewraTa, "the last morsels"; Gerber points out that it is always temporal (Cororo. 87); but Pelops must be eaten all up anyway.)

425

So why does Pindar open the mythical section of 0.1 with
an account of a myth which he then expends a good deal o-f 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, 84
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 11. 85 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 trad-itional material has intrinsic value in epinician: untrad-itional 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 MQTCI (Sacuoua (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

428

In this passage, then, only the location cf 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 o-f three separate traditional stories o-f Herakles fighting individual gods.
Molyneux cannot accept this, because he believes that it
is impossible that Pindar could have invented this story and

18 then denied it; but on the other hand also doubts "that it is much more reasonable to invent a legend and then quote it in

19 illustration o-f a general statement."

But on the model o-f 0.1, it makes sense. It is the ana-logue of the exaggerated traditional version, in which the gods all have Pel ops 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
*?O

fighting three gods at once.*"

Z. 0.9. 43 maintained that Pindar meant three fights (followed by Fehr, My then 33); but aut*a naturally refers to one incident (Molyneux, Herakles 31 If, Carey, 3 Myths 151 n.36.

19 "[Pindar] might incur the charge of inventing a phantom"
(Farnell Horks 1.52); Molyneux, Herakles 304f.
19 Herakles 3O5f; cf Young, Isthmian 7 45. Z.0.9.44a, followed by Carey, J Myths 151 n.36, argues that the change is to aggrandise Herakles.
Z. 0.9.56, on XoL<5opnoat: SCOTL ai>6pa oura TOU e HpaxXca rp
6e25u ane6ec^eu owra peXrtoua; cf Craik, Olympian 1 and 9 40.

435

24 them. These qualities might be illustrated by many myths; the

selection o-f 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 auew SeoS, and thus not the stuff of

epinician - in marked contrast to Pindar's talent,

Epharmostos' , and the myth of Lokris which Pindar does
- 75
narrate. *~

The comparatively long break-off (35-41) is necessary to

accommodate the change in attitude towards the mythical *•>/.
material. 1 ** That change is not objectionable in a poem of 07
Pindar."1" Further, irapa xacpou, if it is not to be a vacuous

expansion of «avxSoQat, may be informed by the length of the ^8
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 .

Pindar's: 25f (contrast Archilochus (1-5; cf P.2.49ff»; Epharmostos': lOOff, 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 accommod-
ates 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 arid 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).

cf the shift between the opening of P. 3 and 77f: Peliccia, Pindar us Homer icus 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).

op cf G. A. Privitera, "II 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 map£
("off target", ibid. 183), cf P. 10. 4. See above, p. 394.

437

There are two immediate implications -for my argument. Not only does the hypothesis of the importance o-f traditional material for Pindar hold good, but also each o-f these three myths serves, in di-f-ferent ways, to confirm it, by providing problems which it resolves. In P. 3, the audience's expect-ations of traditional material demand the inclusion of the raven in the story of Koronis, although it is an uncongenial feature for an epinician. In O.I, the traditional story of Pelops' cooking is riddled with absurdities; but again, it is included. The untraditional nature of the treatment of Hera-kles in tf.9 marks out these lines as unusual; 0 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 3*7

for the selection of the myth, *"" we note that, once the myth is chosen, its traditional features must be used. Pindar's free-dom 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

Cyprja, which Pindar is following here, an immortal (fr. 8.2 B = EOF F 6.2).
31 cf Hubbard, Aiafcos 7 n.5.
•50

P.3: because of the reverberations it offered (Young, 3 Odes 34-44). 0.1- because of its importance for the ritual connected with Pelops at Olympia <Slater, Pelops at Olympia).

439

strategies is to eliminate the whimsical and spurious -from the myth o-f epinician. It is impossible to delimit what type o-f 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 o-f what is appropriate -for gods, and what is possible -for heroic man."""" What is inappropriate is sloughed o-f-f, leaving a version which is at once traditional (we have seen that the rejected version leaves its shadow) and rationalised. The model of the -false myth that Pindar makes explicit at 0.1.2.BH is in -fact the antithesis o-f Pindar's own mythologizing, not only in that poem, but throughout the odes I have considered.

33 This latter, Veyne calls the doctrine o-f present things (Did the Greeks? 14, 73f and ch. 6 passiw; c-f Gri-f-fin's review, TLS 82 (1983), 398- See too Artemidorus 0neir.4.47; Z. bT.IJ.14.342-51.

440

AFTERWORD

C Mcaoa <5t* a .

(P-4.279)

A good deal has been written on the role of truth in Pindar's

poetics. I simply point out that, whether one argues that

aXaQeia is that which is not -forgotten, or that which is trans-
>->

mitted without addition or omission," Pindar's myths,

T

traditional and refined, are a\rj6ece;. "'

What does the true myth offer epinician, which an invented

myth would not?

If the myth is paradeigmatic, then, as I noted in the

Introduction, it must be publicly accepted in order to make its

point. On this model, true myth offers epinican agreed prem-

ises from which its argument proceeds. But I have also sugges-

ted that the assumption that the myths are all paradeigmatic is

See Bowra, Pindar 31-3; Komornicka, AAA0EIA, Verdenius, GLC 28f; Komornicka, L'Attitude de Pindar & 20Of.

o

*~ Detienne, Ma'itresi 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 W.5, the truth that should hide its face is conveyed to the audience); Nagy, Pindar 's Homer 58-67.

3 Nagy, Pindar's Homer 66, 423f, 437; cf C. Starr, "Ideas of Truth in Early Greece", la Parola del Passato 23 (1968), 348- 59, here 353f. On the truth of myth see Vernant, Myth and Society ch. 9; Veyne, Did the Greeks?, with J. Griffin's review ITLS 82 (1983), 398; C. Brillante, "History and the Historical Interpretation of Myth", in L. Edmunds (ed.), Approaches to Creek Myth (Baltimore, U.P. , 1990), 93-138. On the simil-arities between Pindar's treatment of myth and that of the early historians, see Young, Isthmian 7 17 n.55; V. Hunter, Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides (Princeton, 1982), ch. 2. e.g. 86; 1O4; S. Hornblower, Thucydides (Duckworth, 1987) 86-8.

441

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 paradeigmatic 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 recus at 20 in Olympian 1; it
is designed to make us feel that Pindar is honest
and religious unlike previous bards.... His audi-
4
ence contained potential sceptics.
I have suggested that the recusatio in 0.1 in fact simply documents the strategy which runs throughout Pindar's mythologiring. The primary function of the true myth in epinician, then, is to convince the potentially sceptic audience of the poet's veracity.""* 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.
u cf Harriott, Poetry and Criticise 58; Bundy, SP 2.6O n.66,
65. The sceptics' examination: W.8.19-21; cf 0.10.53-5 (p.424 above).

442

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 W.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
^5

mostly, a living animal.*" It emerged from Meuli's study of Greek sacrifice that many of its features were expressive of

OA

guilt at the killing of the sacrificed animal.*"" Such features
~>~7

demonstrate the value of what has been destroyed." So, for example, the responsibility was transferred onto the animal itself. One strategy was to make it volunteer for its own death."" It might be provoked into nodding by the sprinkling of

29 water on its head. In a sacrifice of a goat to Hera at

Corinth, the goat itself dug up the knife with which it was to "%<"}
be slaughtered.'"" In a sacrifice of an ox to Zeus Polieus on Cos, it seems that twenty-seven bulls were driven through the market place, SueTat. 6e, at M©y «a £jro*£iyec TQ *IoTta. "

25 Versnel , Polykrates 37.

The Urischuldsffomodie (OpferbraUche 261-81).
27 Ritual as action redirected for communication: Burkert, S&H 35-9.
Meuli, OpferbraUche 264ff.

no

Ar. Pax 96O, with 2!., which comments on the sprinkling of water: tua oeiar) rr^w *e(pa\nuf *a ^ cmwe£eiu> rote; tepou; <5o*?i.

30 Burkert, Greek Tragedy 118 n.71.

^ 1 Nilsson, Feste 16-19; Burkert, HH 138 n. 1O.

452

But how does this tally with the story of the removal of

the body, and its replacement elsewhere in the teroer/os? The

removal, by Menelaos, is unlikely to represent a shift in

attitude through time. I suspect that the two burials reflect

65 two victims; and that they were united at an early age. 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 war* e^o^u". One can go no further with

any confidence.

u Trammel 1 suggests that the removal reflected unease at the oddity of the threshold of the temple as a burial place (.Grave of Heoptolemos 273.

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" (tfuroar/ Sacrifice 232). Also Hughes: "Possibly myths of human sacrifice... originated in the ambi-guous emotions aroused by sacrificial killing: by viewing their Canimalll 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" (Hunan Sacrifice 187).

The buck stops there for Burkert, HN 141, xxi n.3; and Versnel, Self-sacrifice 163-84. But I wonder if the ritual of Septeriort, 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.

460

What is important here is that various details o-f
and W.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 differ-ent details for each poem remains interesting. But it is only the selection, and not the invention, of details;; and is there-fore 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

68 of saga. Hence a fresh stratum of explanatory details:
Neoptolemos went to Delphi to consult the oracle about Hermi one's barrenness; and he was killed there by Orestes, to 69 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

68 See p. 355.
Pherecydes FGrH 64a, S.W.7.58, E.Eur . Or . 1649; II .Par v.i r . 21 (IV) S.

70 Sophocles Hermione (Pearson, Fragments 1.141ff); Euripides, Andromache , especially 967-81.

461

S. Sherwin White, Ancient Cos: An Historical Study -front the Dorian Sett 1 ement to the Imperial Period =
Hypomnemata 51 (Gottingen, 1978)=

C. M. J. Sicking, "Pindar's First Olympian. An Interpretation", ttnes 36 (1963), 60-70.

M. S. Silk, Interaction in Poetic Imagery (Cambridge 1974).

B. Simon, Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece (Ithaca and London, 1978).

M. Simpson, "Pindar's Ninth Olympian", GRBS 10 (1969), 113-124.

R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, The Catalogue of Ships in Homer ' s 11 i ad (Ox -f or d , 1970) . "

D. S. Sinos, Achilles f Patroklos and the meaning of Philos (Innsbruck, 1980).

W. J. Slater, Lexicon to Pindar (Berlin, 1969).

W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar", CQ 19 (1969), 86-94.

W. J. Slater, "Doubts about Pindaric Interpretation", CJ 72 (1976/7), 193-2O8.

W. J. Slater, "Pindar's Myths: Two Pragmatic Explanations", in ArktouroSf Hellenic Studies presented to W. tf,
Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday (Berlin
and New York, 1979), 63-71.

W. J. Slater, "Pindar and Hypothekai", Tiresias Suppl. 2 (Montreal, 1979), 79-82.

W. J. Slater, "Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle", CAnt 2 (1983), 117-32.

W. J. Slater, "Nemean One: The Victor's Return in Poetry and Politics", in D. E. Gerber (ed.), Greek Poetry
and Philosophy, Studies in Honour of Leonard
Uoodbury (Chico, 1984), 241-64.

W. J. Slater, "Pindar's Pythian 3: Structure and Purpose", QUCC 29 (1988), 51-61.

W. J. Slater, "Pelops at Olympia", GRBS 30 (1989), 485-501.

L. M. Slatkin, The Power of Thetis, Allusion and Inter-pretation in the Iliad (Berkeley, 1991).

O. Smith, "An Interpretation o-f Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode", C&M 28 (1967), 172-85.

O. Smith, "Pindar's Seventh Nemean Ode", C&W 35 (1984).

F. Solmsen, "Achilles on the Islands of the Blest. Pindar vs Homer and Hesiod", AJP 103 (1982), 19-24.

49O