THE ENDS OF THE EARTH: FATHERS, EPHEBES, AND WILD WOMEN IN *NEMEAN* 4 AND 5

JEFFREY S. CARNES

Nemean 4 and *Nemean* 5 form a curious sort of diptych—in addition to being linked as Nemean odes for Aiginetan victors, they are alike in their prominent treatment of the myth of the exile of Peleus and his attempted seduction by his host's wife Hippolyte. Yet the two odes tell significantly different versions of the myth: in *Nem.* 4, Pindar depicts Peleus' rejection of the tainted offer in terms of cleverness and military prowess, while in *Nem.* 5 he emphasizes Peleus' piety and reverence for Zeus. Similarly, the treatment of Thetis varies from one ode to the next: in *Nem.* 4 she is conquered by Peleus in a wrestling match, while in *Nem.* 5 she is given to Peleus as a reward for his piety. In examining the two odes, we may learn much about Pindar's ability to select mythic variants to fit his particular epinician purposes, and also understand why a myth with such apparently limited potential for *kleos*—turning down a sexual advance being less obviously heroic than sacking Troy—represents in two different odes the pinnacle of Aiakid glory. We shall see that the myths of *Nem.* 4 and 5, far from being mutually exclusive, are in fact complementary treatments of the problems of gender, speech, and power, each selected and shaped to fit its ode's epinician program.

Hippolyte's attempt on Peleus, as an example of the well-known "Potiphar's Wife theme,"[1] is located at the intersection of Greek conceptualizations of gender, kinship, marriage, *xenia*, and exchange. In

1 Here I use a non-Greek designation for the mytheme to avoid the suggestion of hierarchy among the various surviving Greek versions. For the cross-cultural prevalence of the theme, see Yohannan 1968.

Arethusa 29 (1996) 15–55

sorting out this complex tangle of associations, I will first briefly outline the ways in which the myth functions *qua* myth—i.e., as background or subtext for the ode—and then show the means by which Pindar has adapted his inherited thematic material. An individual, psycho-sexual reading of the myth is an obvious starting point, given the quasi-incestuous nature of the proposed liaison. In cases such as those of Hippolytos/Phaidra and Oedipus' sons/Astymedousa, a woman attempts to seduce her stepson(s); in the cases of Peleus/Hippolyte and Bellerophon/Stheneboia, the attempt is made on the *xenos* of the woman's husband.[2] The Potiphar's Wife mytheme is in fact an inversion of the story of Oedipus, as Edmund Leach and Kenneth Walters have pointed out.[3] These two variants not only result from myth's natural tendency toward inversion, but present alternate ways of avoiding the problem of male incestuous desire: in the case of Oedipus the desire is removed by making the hero's actions unwitting (or, as we would say, unconscious), while in the Potiphar's Wife motif the desire is removed by projecting it onto the desired woman.[4] In support of this view we may note the universality of retribution: such acts do not go unpunished, and the "intention" of the accused victim has no bearing on his treatment.[5] Similarly, the hostility of the father-figure in the face of the son's innocence can be attributed to projection: given myth's strong founding in infantile fantasy, it is the anxiety and fear of the son which are at issue here.[6]

---

2 Hippolytus: Eur. *Hipp*., passim; Apollod. epit. 1.18–19; the sons of Oedipus: Schol. A ad *Il*. 4.736. Other cases include the sons of Phineus (Asclep. fr. 31 Jac.), Phoinix (Hom. *Il.* 9.444–77), and Tennes (Plut. *Q. Graec*. 27–28, 40). Bellerophon is the earliest Greek example of the motif (*Il.* 6.160–95; also Apollod. 2.3.1). In addition to Joseph and Potiphar's Wife (Gen. 39:7–20), Near Eastern parallels include the Egyptian "The Story of the Two Brothers," in Pritchard 1955.23–25, and Gyges and Candaules' wife (Hdt. 1.8–12).

3 Leach 1970.80, Walters 1984.342–43.

4 This universalization of male desire reflects the dynamics of Greek myth, where women exist only as foils for men. Myth is conceived and transmitted within a male-dominated society, so it is only to be expected that instances of "female desire" are in every sense projections of what men desire and/or fear. On the problems of female desire and speech in *Nem.* 5 and their relation to the male Symbolic, see pp. 42–45 below.

5 Mythic characters do not have real intentions or motivations, and mythic logic does not differentiate between the consequences of intentional and unintentional actions. Narrative treatments of myth are of course another matter: Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* is unintelligible apart from the intentions of its main character. While Hippolyte's offer is "really" an expression of Peleus' desire, this possibility is not considered by Pindar and his audience.

6 Reversal, especially reversal of motivation, is a common form of projection: see Freud 1964 and Caldwell 1989 on projection in Hesiod. On reversal in the Potiphar's Wife theme, see Slater 1968.279; for its expression of familial conflict, Simpson 1976.81–82.

The second major aspect of the myth to be examined is its focus, via the societal projection of father-son rivalry, on issues of kinship and exchange. Hippolyte's attempt on Peleus violates marriage (the archetype of exchange, in Lévi-Strauss' terms, and the cornerstone of culture as opposed to nature),[7] and is in many respects typical of those Greek myths which focus on the problems of exchange (whether between families or peoples). The Peleus version of the myth stems, as do some others, from an autochthonous tradition,[8] and as such participates in the problems of the vegetally-based (and thus anti-sexual) fictive autochthonous society. Chief among these are closure and denial of exchange (marriage exchange in particular), a tendency toward diminished fertility, fratricidal strife, and intense father-son conflict.[9] Peleus, exiled by his father for killing his half-brother Phokos, runs afoul of the substitute fathers who offer him shelter and purify him.[10] Hippolyte, as we shall see below, is an instantiation of the principle of queered exchange: a projection in female form of the essentially male conflicts generated by an autochthonous system.

The third main area of inquiry will be the outlandish nature of Hippolyte, who stands outside the norms of the Greek gender system. She is in both name and behavior linked to those most radically other of mythic women, the Amazons. Hippolyte is elsewhere an almost exclusively Amazonian name, given as the name of both the Amazon queen whose belt is stolen by Herakles (Di. Sic. 4.15, Apollod. 2.5.9) and of Theseus' wife (Stesich. fr. 16 Page, Isoc. *Panath*. 193, Istros ap. Athen. 13.557A). The name is typical of those aggressively masculine names which reflect the Amazons' status as *antianeirai* (man-doubles): in vase painting they exhibit cavalry names such as Hippomache and Hipponike; weapon names such as Toxis and Toxophile; and anti-male names such as Androdameia, Antianeira, and Andromache (the most common of all Amazon names).[11] Hippolyte

---

7 Lévi-Strauss 1967.548–50.

8 The importance of Greek autochthony and its relation to questions of kinship was first noted by Lévi-Strauss 1955 (defended and expanded in Walters 1984 and Peradotto 1977). Literal autochthony is present in some traditions (Joseph is descended from Adam, Oedipus from Cadmus); in others there occur various autochthony-linked mythemes (Bellerophon's exile for blood-guilt).

9 See Walters 1984 and Peradotto 1977.

10 The purifier is a subset of the host as a figure of paternal authority, and enjoys a divinely sanctioned relationship to the purified. Gould 1973.90–101 sees the mythic connection between sexual assault and supplication as a result of the threat implicit in the penetration of the innermost part of the household by outsiders; see also Vernant 1983.

11 On the pictorial tradition of the Amazons, see Gräf 1897.1771–89 and Bothmer 1957.

falls into the class of what we may think of as quasi-Amazons, women who exhibit untraditional behavior, particularly in the sexual sphere, and who bear appropriately masculine *redende Namen*: Hippodameia (Horse-tamer), Stheneboia (Ox-strength), Deianeira (Man-foe).[12] Like the literal Amazons, Hippolyte is unusual in her ability to control and express her own sexuality: like the Amazons, she is an erotically-charged figure, one who attempts to mate with men on her own terms, choosing her own partner and subverting the protocols of marriage.[13] Hippolyte and her analogues show the centrality of Amazonian motifs for the Greek conception of gender, what Froma Zeitlin calls the "'Amazon' complex which envisions that woman's refusal of her required subordinate role must, by an inevitable sequence, lead to its opposite: total domination, gynecocracy, whose extreme form projects the enslavement or murder of men."[14] Hippolyte's radical otherness provides the foil which makes possible the heroism of Peleus.

My reading of the myths and the texts which contain them is informed by psychoanalysis and Structuralism (including that of the "Paris school"), and to a lesser extent by post-structuralism. I therefore treat myth as a signifying system which is used (consciously or otherwise) to

---

12 Stheneboia, as attempted seducer of her husband's guest, provides the most direct formal parallel to Hippolyte (Apollod. 2.2.1, 3.9.1). Hippodameia, like Hippolyte, stands outside the normal exchange of women via her (paternally-mandated) refusal to marry (Apollod. epit. 2.4–7), exhibiting a variation on the Atalante motif. Deianeira is in some traditions a warrior (Apollod. 1.8.1), like Hippodameia is won in an athletic contest (Apollod. 2.7.5), and like Hippolyte is an active sexual subject: her attempted use of a love-charm provided by Nessus brings about the "man-slaying" implicit in her name (Apollod. 2.7.5–8, Soph. *Trach*. 555–1278).

The alternate names given for Hippolyte are also significant: the aggressively martial Astydameia (Apollod. 3.13.3, Schol. B ad Arist. *Nubes* 1063) and Atalante (Suda s.v. Ἀταλάντη), the name of the famous sexual self-negotiator (who, like Thetis, wrestles with Peleus [Apollod. 3.9.2, 3.13.3; also frequently in vase-painting]). Atalante is herself Amazonian in her control of her sexuality, her denial of marriage, her use of the *zoster* of Ares, and in the fact that she "assume pleinement le double sens traditionel de l'épithète *antiáneira*: semblable au mâle, et hostile à l'homme" (Detienne 1977a.85–86). Her name (ἀ-privative or -copulative + τάλαντον) seems to belong to a class of names which emphasize their bearers' roles as units of exchange (or thwarted exchange): Apriate (Unbought), Alphesiboia (Ox-earner), Pandora (All-gifts).

13 "(The Amazons) are beautiful women who arouse men sexually, but their erotic appeal cannot be civilized in marriage, its proper sphere, and so is loose, socially unproductive, and dangerous" (Tyrrell 1984.66). See also duBois 1982.110–28. Ancient sources on Amazon sexuality: Hdt. 4.113.2, Plut. *Thes*. 26.2, Strabo 11.5.1, Dio Chrys. 8.32, Quint. Smyrn. 1.658–74.

14 Zeitlin 1978.153.

formulate and resolve problems which are not part of its manifest content, and which, proceeding via opposition and mediation, will tolerate a degree of outright contradiction normally unwelcome in narrative. I treat the two versions of the Peleus/Hippolyte story as different expressions of the same mythic impulse; versions which vary from and in some ways even contradict one another, but which would nevertheless be seen by their original audience as being in essence the same myth. Non-Pindaric versions—even those found in later sources—are relevant to the study in that they provide further clues to the myths' latent content(s).

For reasons that will become clear below, I see psychoanalysis and Structuralism as complementary approaches to myth, illuminating respectively the individual and social facets of a set of myths concerning autochthony and the origins of human society. I hope, through the incorporation of the anthropological insights of Structuralism (and some of its post-structuralist correctives) to avoid the facile projection of the modern Western psyche onto the Greeks, and to avoid as well privileging the sexual code over all others.[15]

VARIATION 1: THE TAMING OF WILD WOMEN

We will begin by examining the myth as presented in *Nem.* 4.[16] Here Pindar concludes a catalog of the lands ruled by the Aiakidai with Peleus' sack of Iolkos (54–65):

Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκὸν
πολεμίᾳ χερὶ προστραχὼν
Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσιν
στρ. η΄ δάμαρτος Ἱππολύτας Ἀκάστου δολίαις
τέχναισι χρησάμενος.

---

15 On the limits of traditional psychoanalysis, see Lévi-Strauss' critique of Freud (1988.171–206); also the historically-informed psychoanalytic approaches of Slater 1968, MacCary 1982, and duBois 1988.

16 I do not mean to attribute chronological priority to *Nem.* 4, or ontological priority to its version of the myth. Rather, the order imposed by my own narrative treatment makes it simpler to discuss the ephebic rebellion of *Nem.* 4 before its apparent resolution in *Nem.* 5.

Citations are from the text of Bowra 1935; translations, which aim to be literal rather than artistic, are my own.

τᾷ Δαιδάλου τὲ μαχαίρᾳ φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον
ἐκ λόχου Πελίαο παῖς· ἄλαλκε δὲ Χίρων,
καὶ τὸ μόρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερεν·
πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς θρασυμαχάνων τε λεόντων
ὄνυχας ὀξυτάτους ἀκμὰν
καὶ δεινοτάτων σχάσαις ὀδόντων
στρ. θ΄ ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρεϊδων.

And by the foot of Mount Pelion, Peleus turned a warlike hand against Iolkos and gave it over to the Haimones, making use of the tricky wiles of Hippolyte, wife of Akastos. For the son of Pelias sowed death for him from ambush with the knife of Daidalos; but Cheiron saved him, and brought the Zeus-decreed destiny to fruition. And Peleus, withstanding all-consuming fire and the sharp claws and terrible teeth of bold lions, married one of the high-throned Nereids.

Pindar begins with the forceful acquisition of Iolkos, establishing the thoroughly martial tone of this telling of the myth. In contrast to *Nem.* 5, which emphasizes the piety of Peleus and presents a peaceful solution to father-son conflict, *Nem.* 4 displays such conflict in a starkly violent and irresolvable form. Within a flexible tradition, Pindar has chosen to valorize anti-social, ephebic behavior, with Peleus suppressing both feminine and bestial others. Here we find Peleus competing on a folktale level, with trick and counter-trick the means for his victory, not only over Hippolyte and Akastos, but over Thetis as well.

The clearest and most immediate example of "counter-intelligence" is that concerning Akastos' trap. First, the plot of the hostile host comes to naught owing to the intervention of an outsider: the thrust of ambush (ἐκ λόχου) is parried by the counter-thrust of rescue (ἄλαλκε). Second, two key elements of the story—the marvelous knife and the rescue by Cheiron—are both, in their relation to the mythic tradition, examples of sudden reversal of fortune, of the tricker being out-tricked. In non-Pindaric versions of the story, it is Peleus who has a magic or god-given weapon: the story may be traced back as far as Hesiod (fr. 209 M–W), where Akastos decides to hide the wondrous, Hephaistos-made knife of Peleus (κρύψαι δ' ἀδόκητα μάχαιραν / καλὴν, ἣν οἱ ἔτευξε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις) so that he will be killed by Centaurs. Other versions of uncertain date refer to

a knife or sword, either given by the gods to rescue Peleus after his abandonment in the woods (Schol. A ad Arist. *Nubes* 1063), or taken away from Peleus by Akastos and hidden, later to be restored by Cheiron (Schol. C ad Arist. *Nubes* 1063, Apollod. 3.13.3) or Hermes (Schol. ad Ap. Rh. 1.224).[17] Pindar's version is unique in that it seems to imply that the weapon is not merely taken away from Peleus, but actually used against him, and may indicate as well that Akastos was himself involved in the ambush.[18] Within a range of possible tellings of the story, Pindar has chosen to emphasize the stark military conflict between Peleus and Akastos and to show Peleus' own trick being used to his disadvantage.

Such a treatment reflects in microcosm the ode's overall emphasis on physical strength and reversal—both reversals of fortune and reversals of normal power and status relationships. A mortal is able to overcome an immortal in wrestling (a proverbially tricky contest), and become her partner in marriage; her wiliness in shifting shape is defeated by the wiliness of Peleus.[19] The sexual and then violent attack on a guest is

---

17 The weapon itself seems to have had some sort of magic power (cf. Zenobius 5.20), although this is de-emphasized in some "Olympian" versions, where the gods express their favor not by granting a magic weapon but by directly intervening to rescue Peleus. There is no meaningful difference between Hesiod's Hephaistos-made μάχαιραν καλὴν and the Hephaistos- or Daidalos-made weapon of other versions; we need not maintain, along with Bury 1890.74, that Daidalos is a name for Hephaistos.

18 While Akastos may have set a trap using the Centaurs (alluded to by the presence of Cheiron), he may have been directly involved in the attack, or even its sole agent: the compressed expression of φύτευε will admit either. The knife is seemingly to be used by Akastos against Peleus (taking the apparently instrumental dative τᾷ Δαιδάλου μαχαίρᾳ to mean "using the knife of Daidalos by taking it away from him" is quite a stretch, *contra* Köhnken 1971.203), but this too is not spelled out.

Against the possibility of Akastos' direct involvement we must reckon the tendency for myth to avoid direct and conscious host-guest conflict (cf. the scruples of Bellerophon's hosts at *Il.* 6.167–70 and 175–82), parallel to the avoidance of conscious father-son aggression (but see the statistics at Slater 1968.399–403). The guest/son is more commonly subjected to ordeal or exposure.

19 Sources on the perception of wrestling are compiled in Poliakoff 1986.14–15 n. 21; also Quintilian 2.12.2, who notes that wrestlers fall from their own momentum owing to their opponents' craftiness. Hippolyte's δόλιαι τέχναι echo the tricks used by Proteus in his attempt to escape Menelaos: οὐδ' ὁ γέρων δολίης ἐπελήθετο τέχνης (*Od.* 4.455). Hippolyte and Thetis correspond not only as users of tricks but as self-negotiating sexual subjects.

The craft of Peleus is re-emphasized by Thetis' frequent association with Metis; see Detienne and Vernant 1978.142–45, who note as well that the cuttlefish (Thetis' final theriomorph according to Schol. ad Lyc. *Alex.* 2.175, 178) was seen by Aristotle and others as "the paradigm of an animal possessing *mêtis*" (159).

reversed, becoming an attack on a much stronger host, ultimately leading to the marvelous and praiseworthy subjugation of the host's city.[20] And as Cheiron reverses the usual bestiality of Centaurs (the hypo-civilized and hostile has turned into the hyper-civilized and friendly),[21] so too is Hippolyte, via her unbridled sexuality, a reversal of all that is normal or desirable for women. This oppositional dynamic is found as well outside the ode's central myth section: in 36–41 Pindar introduces an agonistic motif in speaking of envy and the need to combat ἐπιβουλίᾳ.[22]

In this context we may resolve the small but vexing problem of the mss. reading δάμαρτος Ἱππολύτας Ἀκάστου δολίαις / τέχναισι χρησάμενος (57–58). The apparent absurdity of Peleus' "using the crafty tricks of Hippolyte" has led to a variety of emendations, yet the way to a solution is shown by the scholiast who suggests that Peleus uses Hippolyte's wiles as an αἰτίᾳ εἰς πόρθησιν, "a reason for sacking Iolkos."[23] I would

---

20 At *Nem.* 3.34 Pindar goes so far as to claim that Peleus sacked Iolkos single-handed (μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς). *Nem.* 4 does not repeat this claim, yet it is a plausible inference from (1) the existence of the μόνος-motif in Aiginetan tradition, combined with the absence of any statement to the contrary in *Nem.* 4; (2) Peleus' implied isolation as the *xenos* of Akastos.

21 On the Centaurs' relation to Hippolyte, see pp. 24–25 below. The opposition between Cheiron and his more bestial brethren reveals, as duBois 1982.30 points out, "the Greeks' fundamental ambivalence about nature and about the prehistory of mankind. The world before culture was viewed with nostalgia as well as loathing." Cf. also Redfield's observation (1983.242) that "the frivolity of hyper-culture has latent in it the savagery of hypo-culture." In structural terms, myth's tendency toward reversal allows us to posit for every x an anti-x. The contraries may occur within an individual (as with Herakles, the civilizing monster-slayer who is himself sociopathic), or may be situated in pairs of figures via decomposition (Cheiron/Centaurs, Phaiakians/Kyklopes).

22 Köhnken 1971.205–08, while rightly rejecting the pre-Bundian notion that Pindar is talking about specific personal rivals, goes too far in insisting that ἐπιβουλίᾳ must refer to the circumstances surrounding the patron and his family. We may rather read 36–41 in light of our understanding of epinician conventions: the jealousy or opposition motif is not only a common Pindaric topos, but one which is particularly appropriate for an ode which emphasizes struggle and the conquest of tricky opponents. The lesson applies not merely to the individual victor, but to all who by their success might inspire φθόνος, including the poet himself. See Miller 1982 and Carey 1980.150–51.

23 Schol. C ad 92a p.80 Drachmann; cf. also Schol. B ad loc. The principal objection to the scholiast's interpretation—that no good parallels exist for this extended use of χρῆσθαι to mean "use against"—is overly exacting. If we accept that χρησάμενος means "using," it is hardly surprising that the specifics of the use are not expressed; following Köhnken 1971.201 in referring the participle to Akastos leaves the semantic situation unchanged. Taking χρησάμενος to mean "experiencing," as suggested by Slater 1969 s.v. χράω, is problematic at best, since its objects are generally external events, such as fortune or

modify the scholiast's interpretation by supplying a more immediate referent: Peleus makes use of Hippolyte's tricks by turning them against her, just as Akastos attempts to do with Peleus, and as Peleus successfully does with Thetis. While the sacking of Iolkos is the final cause of Peleus' action (and the reason for the story's placement in the geographically-arranged catalogue of Aiakid homelands), the reference to his ephebic triumph over Hippolyte poses no difficulty for an audience familiar with the ode's mythic background (and, for a less informed audience, it becomes evident in retrospect after the narration of the trap of Akastos and the conquest of Thetis).

Nem. 4's emphasis on trickery[24] is appropriate to Peleus' liminal, ephebic status: as Vidal-Naquet 1986 has shown, deception and inversion of normal codes of behavior are typical of Greek rites of passage.[25] This emphasis is also significant in a psychoanalytic reading: Peleus, like other tricksters, is in combat with a more powerful father-figure and wins by the use of his wits rather than by brute force. His defeat of the father is here expressed in the most primitive and brutal terms: he out-tricks and conquers his more powerful adversary, with the strong wish-fulfillment element typical of folktales.

The most overtly familial element of the myth is the attempted punishment of Peleus: he is not merely exiled but exposed in the wilderness, made defenseless and left to the prey of the wild forces of nature as embodied by the Centaurs.[26] Such treatment is typologically similar to the

---

weather, which lie beyond human control; the obvious human agency of Hippolyte's δολίαις τέχναισι would seem to preclude this interpretation. The lack of explicit connection between the actions of Hippolyte and Akastos is, *pace* Köhnken 1971.201, inconsequential, given the allusiveness of the passage. I discuss the problem in more detail in Carnes forthcoming.

24 The myth's tendency toward tricksterism is also evident at Apollod. 3.13.3, where Peleus outfoxes his rivals in a hunting contest by cutting out the tongues of his victims as proof of his kills. On Pindar's use of folktale elements, see Grant 1968, and on the Greek conception of trickery, Detienne and Vernant 1978.27–53.

25 See also Winkler 1985, who argues that the Apatouria shows the connection between deception (*apate*) and enrollment of like-fathered (ἀ-copulative + *pater*) boys in their phratries. Tricking the father is paradoxically a way to become accepted as a father; flouting paternal authority serves under ritually-defined conditions to reinforce that authority.

26 See also Hesiod fr. 209 M–W, Schol. C ad Arist. *Nubes* 1063, Schol. Ap. Rh. 1.224, Apollod. 3.13.3. In Schol. A and B ad Arist. *Nubes* 1063 wild beasts substitute for Centaurs.

abandonment of young children, who are left helpless on the margins of civilization. In apparent contrast to historical practice, exposure in myth is reserved not for the weak but for the threatening: those children, like Oedipus, Perseus, and Cyrus (Hdt. 1.108), who will overthrow their fathers.[27] The stark Oedipal conflict of the myth also involves a symbolic castration: the removal of the sword or knife which leaves Peleus weaponless, and whose recovery is necessary for his revenge on Akastos.[28] Pindar's treatment follows an even more violent scenario: the knife is taken away and probably used against Peleus directly. In contrast to the more complex and father-respecting resolution of *Nem.* 5, the conflict in *Nem.* 4 is unresolvable except by violence.

The presence of Centaurs is especially significant given Hippolyte's status as a quasi-Amazon. The relation between the two groups is summarized by duBois: "(i)n the myths of the Greeks, the Amazons and the Centaurs were creatures at the boundaries of difference. Speculation about them constitutes part of the Greeks' thinking about sexual, cultural, and species boundaries."[29] Centaurs and Amazons are homologous in their embodiment of Greek ideas of difference. Both are opposed to marriage and exchange: the Centaurs owe their existence to Ixion's violation of the ties of marriage and *xenia*, and are themselves constant violators of those institutions.[30] The Amazons oppose marriage in their refusal to be subdued by men and in their insistence on mating with men on their own terms; like the Centaurs they act aggressively to disrupt or prevent marriage.[31] Both

---

27 Note also Tennes, who is put to sea in a chest after his stepmother attempts to seduce him (Plut. *Q. Graec*. 27–28, 40). Perseus and Cyrus pose threats to their grandfathers (Akrisios and Astyages), who, like the host/purifier, function as a type of paternal substitute. The important relational element is not literal paternity, but rather the superior social position of the older man and his control over female sexuality, be it of daughter or wife.

28 As Vidal-Naquet 1986.108–13 points out, young men in ephebic rites are typically sent out unarmed or lightly armed (*gymnoi*), in contrast to the full hoplite weaponry of the adult citizen. MacCary 1982.152–62 has shown the prevalence of modified castration in the *Iliad* and its tendency to assimilate naked (i.e., unarmed) men to women. The symbolic castration of Peleus is evident even within an ancient, non-psychoanalytic framework.

29 duBois 1982.27.

30 The best-known incidents are the battle with the Lapiths at the wedding of Peirithoos, Herakles' reception by Pholos and ensuing battle with the Centaurs, and the Centaur Nessos' attempt to rape Deianeira. Cf. duBois 1982.27–32, Detienne 1977b.86–90.

31 On their disruption of Theseus' marriage to Hippolyte, see duBois 1982.40 and Tyrrell 1984.3–22 and 82. The mythic complementarity of war and marriage (like that of

groups are characterized by liminality: both physical liminality, which places them on the fringes of the civilized world (the Centaurs in the woods, the Amazons in a variety of progressively far-flung locales),[32] and ontological liminality, which results from their bridging the gap between opposing states (human/beast, male/female).

Peleus himself enjoys both types of liminality: the physical, emphasized by Pindar, places him Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ (54), in the wilderness at the base of his eponymous mountain.[33] This marginalization serves, as it does for the Amazons, as an index of his ontological liminality, his position as both a young man undergoing *rites de passage* while in exile from his homeland, and as a "transitional autochthon," a scion of an autochthonous line attempting to participate in normal modes of exchange with other peoples. As an ephebe Peleus undergoes, in van Gennep's terminology,[34] separation and isolation, but fails to attain reintegration (for reasons having to do with his autochthonous heritage; see below pp. 27–30). His adventures while in exile—sexual temptation, a life and death conflict with a more powerful opponent, confrontation with wild animals, athletic competition—may be seen as a series of trials.[35] His confrontation of both bestial and sexual challenges reflects (via the decomposition of otherness into two separate but analogous mythemes), the tendency toward "deviant" sexuality in myths concerning hunting and the fringes of civilization. As Detienne has shown, the hunt "fait aussi figure d'espace

---

hunting and marriage) is linked to sexuality, placing the bellicose, masculine Amazons in opposition to marriage (see Hartog 1980.229–37): subject to rape and abduction (types of anti-marriage), they fight against the civilizing heroes Herakles and Theseus.

32 Töpfer 1897.1754–58 traces the progressive displacement of the Amazons as a result of the expansion of the known world. Tyrrell 1984.56 notes: "The edge of the *oikoumene* (inhabited world) is literally and metaphorically the frontier between civilization and savagery." Cf. the isolation of the sexually-aggressive Eos and Kalypso (Peradotto 1990.54–56).

33 The climax of the geographic catalog in Thessaly may also serve as part of a strategy of appropriation of non-Aiginetan traditions; see Lesky 1937.274 and Carnes 1996.

34 van Gennep 1960.10–13.

35 Female temptation of a hero is also geographically marginalized: cf. the seduction of the shepherd Anchises in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, Medea's seduction of Jason in Colchis, and the numerous female temptations faced by Odysseus.

The Peleus saga is rife with contests: the Calydonian Boar Hunt (depicted on the François Vase, also Apollod. 1.8.2), a wrestling match with Atalante (Apollod. 3.9.2, 3.13.3, vases in Brommer 1973.316–17), and the hunt or athletic competition leading to the death of Phokos (cf. Paus. 2.29.9, Apollod. 3.12.6). On athletic contests as *rites de passage*, see Nagy 1990.116–35.

extérieur au mariage, accueillant des formes de sexualité déviante . . . Forêts et montagnes composent un paysage masculin d'où la femme-épouse est radicalement absente."[36]

Women are not entirely absent, but are present only in perverted and masculine forms. Hippolyte displays masculine traits in her combination of sexual desire and aggression (the inverted, or projected, version of the Amazons' dual status as libidinally- and aggressively-invested objects).[37] She and Peleus share the sexual liminality which is typical of *rites de passage*:[38] as she is masculine, he is to some extent feminized by being the object of her desire. In Greek myth, the desiring subject is by nature masculine, and the object of desire, whether boy or woman, is necessarily of lesser social and sexual status.[39] Female desire may carry with it the threat of castration, as feared by Odysseus when seduced by Circe (*Od.* 10.337–44) and by Anchises when seduced by Aphrodite (*Hom. Hymn Aph.* 185–90). In other cases the male partner of a dominant woman is depicted as old and weak: Tithonos is the eternally-aging consort of Eos, while Peleus himself becomes a pathetic old man abandoned by his wife.[40]

---

36 Detienne 1977a.76; also 64–77 on the connections between hunting, gender, and the *ephebeia*. See also Vidal-Naquet 1986, Brelich 1958 and 1969 passim (s.v. *caccia* in the indices). Note as well Croesus' conscious expression of the dichotomy at Hdt. 1.34–37, where he cites his son's recent marriage to excuse him from a boar hunt.

37 The combination of libidinal and aggressive investment is clearest in Penthesilea's status as Achilles' victim and erotic object (Q. Smyrn. 1.658–74). Direct and projected versions are shown in Tyrrell's 1984.87 summation: "Men rape and sexually kill Amazons. Amazons, through their religion, castrate and sexually kill men."

Peleus' aggressive investment toward Hippolyte is implicit in Pindar, explicit in the Suda (s.v. Ἀταλάντη), Schol. ad Ap. Rhod. 1.224, and Apollod. 3.13.7, which relate her death at his hands.

38 Thus Scythian ephebes enjoy a sort of marriage with the Amazons (Hdt. 4.110–17, Hartog 1980.232–37). On gender ambiguity as a transitional status in ritual and myth, see Vidal-Naquet 1986.114–17, duBois 1982.69–71, and Tyrrell 1984.64–87.

39 Zeitlin 1978.154, in speaking of Aegisthus, notes that "(t)he subordinate male, the strengthless lion (*Ag.* 1224–25) is the only possible partner for the dominant female." Myth is largely congruent with the prescriptive erotic codes which operate in the social and scientific spheres; on their depiction of masculine desire see Halperin 1990.137–42.

40 Only goddesses may successfully maintain the relation of superiority: mortal women pose a threat which may be met successfully. On the old age of Tithonos, see *Hom. Hymn Aph.* 218–38; on that of Peleus, *Il.* 18.434–35, 24.538–42; Eur. *Androm.* passim; and n. 102 below. Eos, like Circe and Aphrodite, is sexually aggressive (see Tyrrell 1984.78–80).

The tendency to consider adulterers effeminate (Pembroke 1967.27–28) is a tantalizing detail (perhaps related to the desirability of boys and to male/female divisions of space): Peleus is threatened with feminization as both desired object and adulterer.

Hippolyte's desire for Peleus leads, on the narrative level, to his exposure in the woods; on the mythic level the two catastrophes are essentially the same. In each case Peleus is pushed away from the center, from the role of fully human adult male, and is assimilated to a lower status, whether of woman or beast. Hippolyte's desire feminizes him, while his exposure in the woods leaves him as prey; each version involves symbolic castration, whether through the loss of phallic, dominant sexuality, or through the loss of the magic knife which would protect him. Peleus is analogous to the suitors of Atalante—who are stripped of their weapons and pursued in a hunt-like contest—as both feminine and bestial; and to Adonis, the desired boy who cannot defend himself in the woods (and suffers what is close to literal castration).[41]

The desired boy is weak—just the sort who would get ripped up by boars—but Peleus turns out to be not that kind of boy. Desired by the formidable yet mortal Hippolyte, he is able to overcome her liminal challenge; but he achieves in the end only a partial triumph. Peleus, like most of his mythic counterparts, differs from real-world initiates both in the involuntary nature of his trials and in his ultimate failure to win homecoming. We may best understand the situation represented by these myths in terms of the second of the above-noted mythic patterns: the Greek conception of the autochthonous origin and development of human society. Peleus, as the son of the autochthonous Aiginetan hero Aiakos, instantiates the conflicts and contradictions typical of an earth-born system. Autochthony myths, while seeming at first glance to provide a simple and elegant solution to the problem of the parentage of a city's first parents, in reality become part of a complex chain of oppositions concerning the origin of humankind. Although often valorized at the narrative level (particularly in political contexts),[42] autochthony exhibits a number of unpleasant side effects. Being inherently anti-sexual, it founders on the transition from

---

41 Adonis' effeminacy is evident in his preference for defenseless prey such as hares and his inability to confront boars, the quintessential beasts for *rites de passage*; see Detienne 1977a.78–80, 87–89.

Peleus' use of trickery is somewhat feminizing in light of Greek views on language and the feminine; see pp. 42–45 below.

42 In addition to autochthony's favorable association with Golden Age myths, autochthons are often depicted as culture heroes and *prôtoi heuretai* (Dem. 60.5, Plato *Menex*. 237E–38A, Pliny *NH* 7.197). On autochthony and politics in Athens, see Walters 1980 and Loraux 1981; for Aigina, Carnes 1996.

vegetal to sexual reproduction: autochthons typically experience infertility, inability to produce male heirs, difficulty in securing peaceful and ordered succession, fratricidal strife, and father-son conflict.[43] Autochthony myth depicts a closed and anti-social system in which there is no exchange with other peoples and in which there are no sanctioned outlets for sexuality or aggression: no exchange of women, no warfare, no athletic contests. Intra-familial conflicts, such as incest and deadly competition among males (the only significant actors in the anti-female world of autochthony), become inevitable, with exile presenting the only solution to the problem of continued endogamy.[44]

The exile of Peleus for the killing of his half-brother Phokos conforms to the autochthonous pattern: its relation to the encounter with Hippolyte is not mere accidental juxtaposition, but rather a reflection of the essential complementarity of the two mythemes. Peleus' exile, maintained through the severity of his father Aiakos (Apollod. 3.12.6, Paus. 2.29.10), replicates the motif of father-son conflict via his difficulty in finding refuge, purification, and atonement. Peleus brings destruction, or the threat of

---

43 Infertility: Laios and Aegeus. Lack of male heirs: the Athenians Aktaios and Kekrops. Difficult succession: Oedipus; Aiakos; the Athenians Kranaos, Amphiktyon, and Erichthonios; Adam. Fratricidal strife: the Spartoi; Eteokles and Polyneikes; Peleus, Telamon, and Phokos; Abel and Cain. Father-son conflict: Laios/Oedipus; Oedipus/Eteokles and Polyneikes; Aiakos/Peleus and Telamon. Examples are drawn from four of the better-known autochthonous traditions: those of Thebes, Athens, Aigina, and Israel.

The autochthony of Aiakos and the Aiginetans is less literally expressed than that of Athens or Thebes, for reasons having to do with both myth and politics. On the "modified" autochthony of Aiakos as an attempt to overcome the inherent contradictions of the myth, see Carnes 1996; for the problem in general, Brelich 1958.138. Mediated or indirect autochthony is a common phenomenon, somewhat obscured by the paucity and haphazardness of our sources for the myths of smaller states. Athens' claim to exclusive autochthony (cf. *inter alia* Hdt. 7.161, Thuc. 2.36.1, Lys. 2.17) may also, given the cultural dominance of Athens in later antiquity, have led to the devaluation or suppression of non-Athenian autochthonous traditions.

44 Cf. the exiles of Oedipus, Polyneikes, Telamon, and Cain. The incest problem is insoluble within a closed system: the descendants of autochthons must break out, or be cast out, to establish marriage exchange with other peoples (even in those cases, such as that of Cain, where the existence of other peoples is logically precluded on the narrative level). Here (and in my discussion of totemism and father-son conflict below), I differ from the well-known model of Girard 1972 (esp. 39–67), in which fratricidal strife is a manifestation of the "sacrificial crisis."

Ephebes and autochthons share a common alterity, which isolates them now geographically (ephebes on the fringes of civilization), now chronologically (autochthons in primordial times); see Brelich 1955–57.475.

destruction, to those who take him in: a ravening wolf attacks his cattle when in Trachis (Ov. *Met*. 11.349–412), he accidentally kills his host/purifier Eurytion during a boar hunt (Pindar fr. 26; Apollod. 1.8.2, 3.13.1; Ant. Lib. 38), and he has a fatal conflict with his subsequent purifier Akastos.[45] The mythic reduplication serves not to show Peleus' extraordinary bad luck, but rather to make clear the content encoded by the myth's structure: the irresolvability of father-son conflict and the impossibility of atonement or recompense. Peleus, scion of an endogamous tradition, acts out the conflicts endemic to a closed system.

Attempts to break out of the endogamous system via exchange and exogamy are generally thwarted, and *Nem.* 4 presents not a model of marriage exchange, but rather one of incest or theft.[46] Instead of a daughter to be given freely (in return for future considerations),[47] Peleus confronts a wife who cannot be given, and who moreover contravenes the rules of civilized exchange by trying to give herself.[48] The Aiakid attempt to establish exogamy does not meet with normal exchange among equals: rather it encounters the extremes of excessive endogamy (the incestuous mother-figure) and excessive exogamy (the radical otherness of the Amazonian Hippolyte, coupled with the bestiality of the Centaurs). Hippolyte and the Centaurs express opposition to the "normal" human male along different axes: deviations in the direction of the female and the bestial,

---

45 The Oedipal nature of the killing is emphasized at Apollod. 3.13.1, where Eurytion is said to have made Peleus his son-in-law.

Here I replicate for convenience the received narrative chronology; I do not mean to suggest that there is any significant diachronic dimension to these reduplicated myths. The varying "intent" of Peleus is likewise irrelevant.

46 The tentative resolution with Eurytion fails (previous note); so too does the winning of Thetis (which Pindar seemingly portrays as an unalloyed triumph; but see below), owing to its implicit acceptance of Thetis' status as a self-negotiator as well as to the perishability of god-mortal unions.

Thwarted exchange of goods, rather than of women, is found at Ant. Lib. 38.4, who notes Peleus' unsuccessful attempt to pay a *poinê* for Eurytion's slaying.

47 While myth typically portrays the movement of goods in one direction or another, reciprocal exchange is to be inferred. As Redfield 1983.242 notes concerning *xenia*: "Entertainment, properly, involves generalized exchange; the same person is at one time guest, at another time host."

48 Rubin 1975.182 assesses the problematic nature of female desire in a male system of exchange: "From the standpoint of the system, the preferred female sexuality would be one which responded to the desire of others, rather than one which actively desired and sought a response." Hippolyte illustrates not only the difficulty of establishing a system of exchange, but the internal contradictions of any such system; see pp. 42–45 below.

respectively.[49] Each is created as part of the development or definition of the Greek citizen male; each must be overcome, not merely for the sake of the individual hero's triumph, the completion of his *rite de passage*, but for the establishment of society as a whole. Peleus' avoidance of monsters, of the dangers of the bestial other, is paired with his conquest of the sexual other; variations on the ensemble are found in the myths of Ixion, Bellerophon, and Hippolytos.[50]

The mythic structure is, however, complex and open-ended: the finding of the "right" proportion of exogamy and endogamy (or, in slightly different terms, the proper valuation of kinship), is complicated both by myth's inherent resistance to giving rational, unambiguous answers and by the tremendous anxiety which surrounded real-world questions of community and exchange. Autochthony presents a fantasy of self-sufficiency (*autarkeia*) which is both sexual (the dream of a world without women)[51] and political (a self-contained polis not subject to or dependent on the outside world). Yet this fantasy, in addition to being unstable in mythic terms, conflicts with real-world imperatives to recognize the existence of women and citizens of other communities.[52]

---

49 duBois 1982.67–71.

50 Ixion may be viewed as the prototype of Peleus, with complete inversion of motivation and consequence: the *prôtos heuretês* of blood-guilt, he murders his father-in-law rather than pay a bride-price; unable to find purification among humans, he flees to Zeus. His attempt on Hera leads to his punishment (Zeus deceives him with a Hera-shaped cloud), and eventually to the birth of the Centaurs—a sort of charter myth for the connection of illicit sexuality and bestiality (see Pind. *Pyth.* 2.21–48, Di. Sic. 4.69.3–5, Apollod. epit. 1.20).

Bellerophon's rejection of Stheneboia, like Hippolytos' rejection of Phaidra, leads to expulsion from the community and confrontations with bestial forces (the Chimaira and the Amazons in the case of Bellerophon, Poseidon's bull from the sea for Hippolytos). Pembroke 1967.24 notes Bellerophon's connection to the legends of Lycian matriarchy.

Aesch. *Choeph.* 585–601 also asserts the bestial-sexual connection; see Zeitlin 1978.164–65.

51 On the anti-female nature of autochthony, see Saxonhouse 1986. Detailed expressions of the fantasy of a world without women are found in Eur. *Hipp.* (616–68) and *Medea* (573–75), texts which deal with incest and the foreignness of women. Note also Hesiod's tale of Pandora (*WD* 55–106), where masculine *autarkeia* is shattered as punishment for improper exchange in the form of division of sacrificial meat.

52 Autochthony was used at Athens to bolster the city's claims to uniqueness and self-sufficiency, with the Athenians consistently characterized as *monoi* and *prôtoi*. Yet such claims reflected as well the Athenians' sense of isolation; see Walters 1980. The degree of recognition of other communities was subject to great variation in terms of both myth and practice; note the extreme endogamy in Athens reflected in the Periclean citizenship law and, as Vidal-Naquet 1986.215–16 suggests, in Athens' lack of the myths of foreign- and slave-marriage found elsewhere in the Greek world.

Pindar has told the tale of Peleus and Hippolyte in a way that valorizes the violent suppression of the feminine and bestial other; his treatment of Peleus' acquisition of Thetis is of a piece with this confrontational aesthetic. Peleus, the liminal ephebe in exile, wrestles with and overcomes the liminal Thetis, who embodies the oppositional status not only of the Centaurs and Amazons, but of the gods as well. She is the bestial other, in turn anthropomorphic and theriomorphic; the abnormal feminine other, who participates in the masculine rites of athletic competition and the bestowal of women in marriage (like Atalante, she sets herself up as the prize for victory); and the immortal other, who becomes subject to a mortal (and, by extension, to mortality).[53] Peleus' defeat of Thetis reduplicates and reinforces the meaning of his equally physical and crafty defeat of Hippolyte and Akastos.

Pindar's self-conscious narrative presentation of the myth seems to reinforce our synchronic reading of its latent structure. The poet highlights the uniquely female nature of the threat and the means of its resolution by the emphatic position of δάμαρτος and ἔγαμεν at the beginning of the eighth and ninth strophes: it is the establishment of marriage, and the attendant suppression of women (who must be exchanged by others, not by themselves), which forms the basis of Peleus' victory. Marriage and other forms of exchange, particularly *xenia*, are of central concern throughout the Pindaric corpus, and to a great extent serve as defining metaphors for the propagation of epinician song. Peleus is, like Herakles and Theseus, a culture hero, one who tames the wild forces on the fringes of the world and establishes civilization. He makes the ultimate civilizing move—establishing marriage, and thus civilization—and in so doing secures his status as a hero worthy on both mythic and epinician grounds to be the culmination of Pindar's catalog of Aiakid glory.[54]

---

53 For Thetis' loss in status through contact with mortality, see *Il*. 18.432–41, Pind. *Isth*. 8.38–41, and Slatkin 1991.17–52. Cf. Aphrodite's *ainon achos* at sleeping with Anchises (*Hom. Hymn Aphr*. 198–99).

54 While Peleus is not the literal *prôtos heuretês* of marriage, he is the Aiakid who breaks out of the closed, incestuous pattern of autochthony to establish exchange with other peoples (Telamon's similar achievement is largely ignored by Pindar).

Pembroke 1967.30–33 discusses the "discovery" of paternity (often attributed to the Athenian autochthon Kekrops; cf. Charax (FGrHist 103 F38), Suda s.v. Κέκροψ, Schol. ad Arist. *Plutus* 773) in connection with the notion that injustice may lead to uncertain paternity: offspring will not resemble their parents and may be monstrous in form. An Amazonian refusal to accept the Name of the Father may be depicted as a causal mechanism of Centaurism.

Yet there remain certain paradoxes, certain unresolved (because unresolvable) tensions within the system. Since Peleus is not a real individual who lives through time and learns from experiences, he does not progress—as if fixed in amber, his myth presents a synchronic set of contradictions (as we shall see, the apparent resolution found in *Nem.* 5 is in reality a further displacement). His ephebic actions—trickery, the overthrow of the father, the taking (rather than the receiving) of a bride—are precisely those actions which are inimical to the peaceful co-existence of a human community (and are thus, in rituals such as the Apatouria, placed outside it). As in the *Iliad*, the conflict of two men over a female prize allows for the display of individual *arete*, yet provides no satisfactory resolution for society—the exchange value of women is yet to be established. The Peleus of *Nem.* 4, like Herakles, wins a civilizing yet individual victory which stands him outside normal society:[55] having overcome the female and the bestial, having challenged the smothering power of the father, he yet remains in exile and has not resolved the problems of his autochthonous heritage. Even Peleus' ultimate triumph—his marriage to Thetis and his vision of the gods' εὔκυκλον ἕδραν (66–68)— is by nature individual, since direct participation in the community of the gods is not to be enjoyed by his descendants (nor, in the long run, by Peleus himself).

Confronted with a mythic tradition which contains internal narrative inconsistencies (such as the circumstances of Peleus' securing marriage with Thetis), Pindar must make a selection; when the chosen version of the myth cannot fully and successfully resolve the issues it is created to deal with he must adopt an ameliorative strategy within the constraints of the epinician program. The epinician imperative to praise the victor, his clan, and his city requires that mythic events receive the best possible "spin," a task which Pindar carries out in at least three ways. First, he passes over some of the harsher aspects of the myth, such as the repetition of exile (Iolkos, not Peleus' final destination, is the place allotted to him in the catalog) and his separation from Thetis (who is said in 50–51 to rule in Phthia). Second, he expands the hero's individual triumph into a charter myth for Aiakid glory: Peleus' wedding gifts from the gods include power

---

Pindar's valorization of the establishment of exchange implicitly redounds to his credit as a poet, given his frequent use of *xenia* and exchange as metaphors for epinician song; see Kurke 1991.85–159.

55 On the contradictory nature of Herakles, see Slater 1968.387–88 and Loraux 1990.

for his descendants (δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφανον [sc. οἱ θεοὶ] ἐς γένος αὐτῷ [66]—"the gods revealed to him their gifts and the power that would belong to his people"). Third, by locating the actions of Peleus within a geographically-arranged catalog, he implicitly follows the marginalizing strategy of ritual, whereby ephebic actions are physically removed from the community which they would threaten.

Yet beyond this strategy of amelioration and containment, Pindar exerts a positive and creative force as the practitioner of healing song. The opening lines of the ode declare his intention with respect to the victor: Ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων / ἰατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ / Μοισᾶν θύγατρες ἀοιδαὶ θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι (1–3)—"Joy is the best healer of pain when a crisis is past; and songs, the Muses' wise daughters, charm the athlete with their touch." Healing song is also useful for heroes,[56] and the Aiakidai are in need of healing. Exile, despite its function in the export of Aiakid glory, is not on the whole a positive thing, and Peleus' triumph does not secure his return home. While serving as a model for the *laudandus* and for those who might emulate his victory, Peleus' value is potentially restricted by the limitations of his myth: a journey which wins *kleos* without *nostos* is incomplete. Kurke speaks of the "loop of *nostos*,"[57] the circuit which must be completed for glory to accrue to an *oikos* or polis: the loop of Peleus (like that of Telamon, Aias, Teukros, and Achilles) remains open. Pindar's song provides one part of the loop for the victor, providing the song without which he will languish in darkness and obscurity; for the Aiakid heroes he provides as well a second part of the loop—the *nostos* itself. The poet's journey of song (his poetic persona is said to come to Aigina at 22–24 and 73–75), engages in both export and import, and in visiting the places where the Aiakidai hold sway he brings them and their *kleos* back home.[58]

---

56 Especially so in *Nem.* 7 and *Nem.* 8, which focus on the destructive power of language (with Aias as cautionary example) and on the power of epinician song to cure old wounds. See also Kurke 1991.108–34 on πόνος.

57 Kurke 1991.15–34.

58 The limit case of the loop involves the sending of a song to the victor's dead father in Hades; see Segal 1985, along with Kurke's discussion (1991.64–70) of the intergenerational reciprocity of *kleos*.

The use of the *oikos* or polis as the metaphorical center of an ode replicates the centering of the citizen male in the mythic discourse of difference and geographical distance; see duBois 1982.60–61, 70–71.

Pindar's healing song must contend with the fact that Peleus' triumph is limited not only by exile, but by mortality. Reaching the limits of human excellence in his marriage to Thetis and his admittance to the company of the gods, he not only fails to attain immortality, but is rather dishonored while alive.[59] In treating this problem Pindar goes beyond the mere omission of unpleasant details, taking the myth's implicit concern with limitation and standing it on its head. His reference to Peleus' wedding is immediately followed by a break-off formula (69–72):

> Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν· ἀπότρεπε
> αὖτις Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα ναός·
> ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ
> παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν.
>
> The darkness beyond Gadeira is not to be crossed: turn the ship's sails back to the mainland of Europe. For it is impossible for me to go through the whole tale of the sons of Aiakos.

While asyndeton is common in break-off formulas, it nevertheless creates an effect of abruptness that is reinforced by the lack of a clear referent for lines 69–70. The generically-aware reader will have two conflicting expectations: the implicit limitations reached by Peleus make him a likely tenor for the metaphor, given Pindar's habit of using the Pillars of Herakles in break-off formulas to represent the limits of athletic and heroic achievement (cf. *Ol.* 3.42–45, *Nem.* 3.22–31, *Isth.* 4.9–15). Yet break-off formulas are notoriously common sites for self-referential statements about the poet's task (*Nem.* 5.16–18, to cite but one example), and there is perhaps an equal expectation that the statement of limitation will apply to Pindar. The question remains unresolved for at least two more lines, during which time Pindar takes advantage of the momentary ambiguity to effect a subtle revaluation of the idea of limitation.[60] Limitation, which is negative when

---

59 Peleus' limits find expression as well in the fate of his son Achilles, who perhaps more than any other Greek hero embodies the hopeless ineluctability of mortality. Thetis is punished by his mortality (n. 53 above), which she unsuccessfully tries to cure (Ap. Rhod. 4.866–79, Apollod. 3.13.6, Stat. *Achil*. 1.134).

60 The tension between the two possible referents is perhaps heightened by the fact that the approach of the break-off formula can be seen from a long way off: the conclusion of the catalog is evident on mythological grounds (all major Aiakidai down to the third

applied to Peleus, here becomes positive: what lies beyond the straits is not perfect happiness or immortality, but only darkness, and there is nothing to be gained by venturing further. This positive valorization of limitation is in accord with the geographic pattern of the preceding catalog. Coming back home—Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον—is good because it completes the loop of *nostos*,[61] but also because it marks a return from the dangerous exteriority of places inhabited by monsters like Hippolyte. Yet the limit, it soon turns out, is the poet's: here limitation remains positive, but the area beyond the limits has been refigured. The glory of the Aiakidai, like the Ocean beyond Gadeira, is limitless and all-encompassing. While we might at first glance think that the metaphoric field has shifted (the deeds of the Aiakidai cannot be equated with darkness), what we have in fact is a hint of the Pindaric conceit that great deeds remain in darkness when uncelebrated.[62] The ambiguity of 69–72 suggests the symbiosis of poet and hero (and by implication of patron as well), with the poet taking upon himself the burdens of limitation and mortality, but with the hero and patron dependent upon the poet for praise and *nostos*.

VARIATION 2: THE NAME OF THE FATHER

We may most profitably begin our examination of *Nemean* 5 not with Pindar's treatment of Peleus and Hippolyte, but with his earlier depiction of the Aiakid origins of Aigina's glory. This section functions on the narrative level to show both the source of Aiginetan glory and the reasons for the spread of that glory outward from Aigina: namely, the exile of Peleus and Telamon for the killing of their half-brother Phokos. Pindar's account of the killing takes the form of an elaborate *praeteritio*. After showing the three sons of Aiakos praying at the altar of Zeus Hellenios, he continues (14–18):

---

generation have been mentioned), and generic ones (the amount of time devoted to Peleus marks his tale as the climax of the series). The ambiguity begins to resolve itself only with the word λόγον and is removed entirely only by μοι διελθεῖν at the very end of the strophe. The change in referent is noted by Kurke 1991.50; Carey 1980.155 maintains that the motif "is applied to the poet's song, but suggests also that Peleus, whose tale precedes, reached the limit of mortal prosperity."

61 Kurke 1991.50–53 notes that the image of Pindar's return to the victor and his family is not only expanded upon in the following lines (Θεανδρίδαισι δ' ἀεξιγυίων ἀέθλων / κάρυξ ἑτοῖμος ἔβαν [73–74]), but in fact "participates in a system of imagery which structures the entire ode" (51).

62 Kurke 1991.52–53.

αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν
ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον,
πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον,
καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους
δαίμων ἀπ᾽ Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν.
στάσομαι· οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων
φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει᾽ ἀτρεκής·
καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώ-
τατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι.

I hesitate to speak of a great feat not ventured in justice: how they left the famous island, and what daimon drove these mighty men from Oinona. I will stand still: not every precise truth, you know, is better for showing its face, and silence is often the wisest precept for a man to heed.

Pindar's sense of shame seems to be a formal device, given his lengthy and unmistakable allusion to the killing: he spends nearly the whole of the first epode explaining that he will not tell us about the fatal deed. (Given the poet's fondness for compressed, allusive expression, he may have spent less time on the matter if he *had* in fact decided to tell us about it.) We must infer, given Pindar's skill in dealing with this particular group of patrons, that mere reference to the incident would not greatly discomfit an Aiginetan audience.[63]

As far as the poet is concerned, the murder of Phokos, far from being a true source of shame, instead furthers his narrative and thematic goals—there is a wound to be healed, a foil for later triumphs, and a necessary mechanism for the export of Aiginetan glory.[64] Yet, as in *Nem.* 4, there is a complex interplay between narrative and myth. The killing of Phokos, despite its salutary effects for the Aiginetan people, is rather a curious event to celebrate, and may best be understood as an example of the

63 *Contra* the pre-Bundian readings of the passage, which generally take Pindar's embarrassment at face value: Wilamowitz 1922.171, Finley 1955.47, Bowra 1964.67–68, and Gärtner 1978.34. Contrast the generically-informed treatment of poetic "embarrassment" in Nagy 1990.126–35.

64 The story has in this regard important affinities with colonization narratives, in which murder is often the impetus for the founding of a colony; see Dougherty 1993.31–44.

nexus of kinship and exchange conflict spawned by autochthony. The question of the Aiakids' chthonic origin lies close to the surface here, being hinted at throughout the first antistrophe. The Aiakids as a whole are described in vegetal terms as ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας (7), while Peleus and Telamon are referred to periphrastically as sons of the chthonically-marked Endeis (Ἐνδαίδος ἀριγνῶτες υἱοὶ, 12).[65] As remarked above, autochthony myth typically features both father-son conflict and fratricidal strife; these are in a certain sense identical. In a closed system, with no hope of exchange, all males are in competition: both fathers and brothers block access to women, making them unavailable as sexual objects and as material possessions. Aggression and competitiveness, lacking external outlets such as war and athletic contests, must be directed inward.[66]

This situation will seem perilously close to Freud's theory of the primal horde; and indeed, the killing of Phokos as presented by Pindar looks like a textbook example of Freudian totemism. Phokos is particularly well suited to play the role of totem: born of the sea-nymph Psamathe ("Sand,"), his name is merely φώκη, "seal," with a masculine ending, lacking even the guise of a derivative termination such as -ευς. The circumstances surrounding his death reflect Freud's observations on attitudes toward totemic killing:

> Psycho-analysis has revealed that the totem animal is in reality a substitute for the father; and this tallies with the contradictory fact that, though the killing of the animal is as a rule forbidden, yet its killing becomes a festive occasion—the fact is that it is killed and yet mourned. The ambivalent emotional attitude, which to this day

---

65 While φυτεύω, when used for human birth, is not always a strong metaphor, in Pindar it retains its strong chthonic associations: five of his twelve metaphorical uses of the verb occur in the Aiginetan odes. The most clearly metaphorical of these describes Zeus' "planting" of Aiakos "with mother-received seeds" (*Nem.* 7.84). See Carnes 1996.

Endeis (ἐν +δᾶ) betrays possible autochthonous origin, as do the names Aiakos and Aias (αἶα) and Peleus (πηλός, a connection made by numerous ancient authors). The tendency to portray the nymph Aigina as imperfectly anthropomorphized, as in some sense the literal soil from which the Aiakidai spring, may be present in v. 8, ματρόπολίν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν, where the very land of the mother city is friendly to strangers.

66 This contrasts with the idealized contemporary world of the epinician, where, as Kurke 1991.15–34 points out, the zero-sum nature of *kleos* renders competition within the polis inappropriate: athletic competition is inherently inter-city competition.

> characterizes the father-complex in our children and which often persists into adult life, seems to extend to the totem animal in its capacity as substitute for father.[67]

Totemism, to be sure, is not a common feature of Greek myth or ritual;[68] yet the Aiginetans' recognition of the myth as a great yet unjust deed corresponds to Freud's "ambivalent emotional attitude." The totemic model explains as well the severity of Aiakos, who refused to allow his sons to return from exile even after they had been purified of blood-guilt (Apollod. 3.12.6, Paus. 2.29.10): the conflict is not merely fraternal but paternal, and is depicted as irresolvable within the autochthonous system.[69]

As in societies with a more obvious totemic heritage, the killing of Phokos serves as an *aition* for the division of society into clans. The Aiginetans now become not *the* people of their universe, but one people among many, establishing contact and exchange with the outside world.[70] The land-based sons of Endeis destroy their sea-born half-brother; yet in doing so they ensure that their people will embrace the sea both in myth (where the sea functions as the medium of exchange *par excellence*),[71] and

---

67 Freud 1953.141.

68 "Hot" cultures like the Greeks' typically exhibit little totemism; vestiges may include the use of animals as emblems (the Athenian owl, the Aiginetan turtle) and certain archaic rituals such as the Bouphonia (where the death of an ox is treated as homicide).

69 Freud's primal-horde hypothesis, based in part on the facile assumption of fairly precise correspondence between the mental processes of children and "primitive" peoples, has long since been discredited as a real-world model of social development; see the critique in Lévi-Strauss 1967.98–113. The model remains useful, however, to the extent that it replicates the Greeks' own views. The famous formulation "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" must be reversed: it is phylogeny—not real Darwinian phylogeny but the fictive sort found in autochthony myth—that replays and projects ontogenic concerns with questions of incest and intra-family aggression.

70 Greek culture is rich in myths of heroic exile (Brelich 1958.300–01), often linked to foundation myths. The division implied by the killing of Phokos may also have had internal political reference; see Figueira 1981 on internal divisions within Aigina.

71 Greek myth sometimes associates the sea with abnormal marriage exchange: witness Danae (Apollod. 2.2–4), Arethusa (Paus. 5.6.2–3), Diktynna (Paus. 2.30.2–3, Di. Sic. 5.76.3–4), and the significantly-named Apriate (Parthen. *Narr. Am*. 26). See also Bergren 1983.75–78 on the series of *harpagai* by sea in Hdt. 1.1–5 and Carnes 1993 on seafaring and exchange among the Phaiakians.

The identification with the totem and the acquisition of its powers is perhaps also relevant here; see Frazer 1910.i.118–24. The killing of Phokos is in some ways a counterpart to the modified autochthony of Aiakos: Aiakos mediates between earth and sky, Phokos earth and sea, with the Aiakidai partaking of all three elements. A similar synthesis of the three realms is found at *Nem.* 4.66–68, where the gods of sky and sea bestow gifts upon the chthonic Peleus and his race.

in real life. In no other ode does Pindar give such prominence to the Aiginetans' sea-faring:[72] his song is to go forth from Aigina ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ᾽ ἀκάτῳ (2), serving as a vehicle for the export of glory. Pindar begins by affirming that he is not a sculptor, that he does not make ἀγάλματ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἑσταότ(α) (1–2). Elsewhere ἀγάλματα are things to be sought: at *Nem.* 8.16 Pindar speaks of bringing his song as an ἄγαλμα to Aiakos. Yet here the demands of the particular ode require a different valorization: the ἄγαλμα, while not denigrated, is the less vital member of the opposition. There exists throughout the ode, as Charles Segal has shown, a thematic contrast between fixity and motion, a contrast which on our reading corresponds to the fixity of the Aiginetans' autochthonous origins and the mobility of their exiled yet ultimately triumphant heroes.[73] Interacting with the tension of motion and stasis are the various tensions created by the murder of Phokos—the blood guilt of the killing, the exile of Peleus and Telamon, the rebellion against paternal authority—all of which demand resolution.[74]

The problem of exile has been partially resolved in advance: when Pindar says that Peleus and Telamon λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον, their action may immediately be read within the paradigm created in the opening strophe. First they, like the poet, take part in the *kleos* export trade, leaving behind their renowned island that they may carry its fame to the rest of the world. Second, the murder, while not a thing to be approved of, is linked with the prayer to Zeus Hellenios (9–12[b]) as an act by which the sons of Aiakos ensure the success and fame of their native land. Beyond merely juxtaposing the prayer and the murder, Pindar establishes formal and linguistic correspondences between the two events: εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλυτὰν of 9 is echoed in εὐκλέα νᾶσον and ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους of 15–15[b]—the prayer to Zeus Hellenios seems to have already taken effect—while the

---

72 See Finley 1955.47–49, Stern 1971, and Segal 1974, who analyzes the sea's connection with the export of song.

73 Segal outlines the interrelation of the ode's main themes, which he classes as staticity, song, and the sea (1974.402). Although I would subsume the sea under the motion/stasis dichotomy, I am in agreement with his assessment of the ode's tendency toward bipolar but ultimately non-hierarchical oppositions (on which see Hubbard 1985). Gärtner 1978, while suggesting the limits of Segal's approach, does not undermine his thesis.

We may also see the breaking away from the autochthonous world as a revaluation of an earth-based maternal principle. *Nem.* 5, as Robbins 1987.31–33 points out, places extreme and surprising emphasis on maternity, which must ultimately be left behind in the name of *kleos* and civilization.

74 On the ode's thematic and verbal coherence as *Ringkomposition*, see Stern 1971.170–72.

static-dynamic opposition is underlined by πάρ βωμὸν . . . στάντες (10–11) contrasting with λίπον and ἔλασεν (15, 17).[75] Yet there is a strong suggestion that the murder is at least as important for Aigina's success as the prayer, and is in some sense the fulfillment of the prayer: Aiginetan glory cannot remain at home[76] and the heroes' exile is the necessary impetus for the Aiginetans to become "renowned for ships." Without the *kindunos* of the murder, no *kleos* can accrue.

Paternal authority—its rejection and ultimate reinstatement—remains the central unresolved question. Like exile, this theme has been adumbrated in the early part of the ode: it is specifically the πατὴρ ῾Ελλάνιος who guarantees the future fame of the island.[77] The specific, individual, human father—whether Aiakos or Akastos—is a reflection of the universal and divine Father, author of the Law; and while rebellion against the father is possible, even necessary, the order of the Father must eventually prevail. Such a triumph is instantiated in vv. 33–34, when Peleus rejects Hippolyte's advances specifically because he fears the wrath of Zeus, god of strangers (ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον δείσαις), and is subsequently rewarded with marriage to Thetis. In contrast to *Nem.* 4's focus on individual heroic achievement, *Nem.* 5 is societally-oriented, emphasizing the need for the individual ephebe to accept the Law and accede to the demands of the polis.[78]

The emphasis on paternal authority begins with the end of the transitional section of the second strophe. The complex imagery of motion and stasis concludes with the observation that πέραν πόντοιο πάλλαντ' αἰετοί—eagles fly beyond the sea. The eagle, Zeus' bird, stands for the

---

75 The polarity of motion and stasis is in constant flux: standing still at the altar is good, as is the silent immobility urged by the break-off formula beginning with στάσομαι (16–18). Against Segal's view of the heroes' exile as a negative valorization of mobility, we must reckon not only the ambivalent treatment of the killing of Phokos, but its important practical function of giving the Aiginetans a claim on a set of essentially foreign heroes (Lesky 1937.274, Carnes 1996).

76 See Robbins 1987.32–33.

77 The cult of Zeus Hellenios was traced to Zeus' intervention at the behest of his son Aiakos to end a Panhellenic drought (Schol. ad *Nem.* 8.19a, p.142 Drachmann; Isoc. 9.14–15; Di. Sic. 4.60–61; Paus. 2.29.6–8). Similarly Zeus populates the island with Myrmidons as a favor to his son (Hesiod fr. 205 M–W). Aiakos comes to take over the paternal privilege which is the Law, and to be identified with Zeus.

78 On the compatibility and complementarity of the two versions of the myth, see pp. 50–52 below.

poet (as at *Nem.* 3.80–82), who is, as in the opening triad, implicitly linked with the Aiakidai in terms of mobility. The indirect association of the poet with Zeus is particularly appropriate given the following lines' emphasis on paternal control of speech, wherein speech serves as the fount of patriarchal authority. Peleus' adventures are set within a framing device in which the Muses, accompanied by Apollo, sing on Mount Pelion, probably on the occasion of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. The Muses are traditionally aligned with paternal authority: they are the virgin daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne, who functions in many respects as a double of Metis. Both the Muses and Metis instantiate paternal authority as embodiments of paternal control of the Word, and the Muses appropriately begin their song with Zeus (Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι, 25; so, too, at Hes. *Theog*. 47–49).[79] In the subjection of female language to Zeus we see the triumph of the Symbolic, the language-ordered realm which creates the individual subject and replicates structures of gender and power.[80]

After Zeus, the Muses sing of (25–34):

> σεμνὰν Θέτιν
> Πηλέα θ', ὡς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ Κρηθεὶς Ἱπολύτα
> δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι
> ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπὸν
> πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν,
> ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον,
> ὡς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα
> κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου

79 Greek myth and archaic literature often attribute to women skill in language (deceptive language in particular), which skill is then reappropriated by men. "The female as weaver of *mêtis* thus (re)-enters the divine cosmos as a perpetually virgin daughter, loyal solely to her father. And Zeus as sovereign male appropriates a quality that the text has attributed to him from the start" (Bergren 1983.73). The Muses, who are in general associated with male control of language, are positively valorized as possessed and controlled females, in contrast to the self-controlling (and self-speaking) Hippolyte. Zeus, unlike mortals, possesses sufficient *mêtis* to control female sexuality and reproduction and to avoid Oedipal rebellion. In the absence of other divine communities, exogamy is impossible, and the gods' problems are displaced onto humans (so, too, the analogous problem of distinguishing true from false speech: Bergren 1983.75). Zeus comes close to having a true primal horde.

80 See Lacan 1966.277–81 for his definition of the Symbolic and its relation to the Name of the Father; also Lee 1990.31–71 and Gallop 1985.105–07, 160–63.

ἐπ. β′ εὐνᾶς· τὸ δ᾽ ἐναντίον ἔσκεν·
πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ
παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.
τοῖο δ᾽ ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·
εὐθὺς δ᾽ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν,
ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον
δείσαις·

(They sang of) holy Thetis and Peleus, and how the delicate Hippolyte, Kretheus' daughter, wished to bind him with her treachery, persuading her husband with her cunning plans. For she fashioned a false, made-up story, about how Peleus tried to have sex with her in Akastos' bed. But it was the opposite: she begged him much, with all her heart, seducing him, but her destructive words roused his anger, and he refused her straightaway, fearing the wrath of Father Zeus, god of strangers.

It is, appropriately enough, the rejection of Hippolyte which forms the heart of the Muses' song; appropriate insofar as it is the rejection of incest, and along with it the renunciation of claims to the mother and the acceptance of the Name of the Father, which allows the individual to create (or take his place in) the Symbolic which the Muses represent.[81] Appropriate as well in that Hippolyte exists in reference to Peleus as the Muses exist in reference to Zeus: as the locus of male concerns about speech and sexuality. While she is the ostensible subject of the Muses' song and the mover of the action which leads to Peleus' triumph, Hippolyte turns out to be a male fiction, an absent presence; her female speech turns out to be a male-imposed silence. She is not in fact a woman, but a fictive, projected male; an example of what Luce Irigaray calls hom(m)osexuality—the projection of male desire and a male Symbolic order onto women.[82] If hom(m)osexuality dominates and defines women in the contemporary world, it does so even more with Hippolyte, who is inscribed within a

81 Lacan suggests that Oedipal rebellion succeeds and is a necessary step in the creation of the Symbolic: "the appearance of the signifier of the Father, as author of the Law, (is linked) to the death, indeed the murder, of the Father . . . the symbolic Father inasmuch as he signifies this Law is indeed the dead Father" (Lacan 1966.556).

82 Irigaray 1985.13–129 (especially 90–104).

system of male representation, and a prescriptive mythic one at that, which does not even pretend to describe its audience's lived social reality. Hippolyte is a creature not only of the Freudian projection noted above, but of a Lacanian projection, wherein female sexuality (whether "normal" or "abnormal") is a creation whose function is to define, via back-formation, categories of male power and desire.[83] She signifies within this system—not as an active, independent subject, but as a signifier in a discourse on gender, kinship, and society; while seeming to speak her own desire, she is in fact spoken through, and spoken for.[84]

Yet in a certain sense Hippolyte *does* speak. While we must not, from the seductiveness of mimetic fallacy or from a desire to remake the past in our own image, attribute any female authenticity to her voice, the mere fact of her speech and the emphasis lent to its duplicitous character are in themselves significant. That Hippolyte uses speech at all points up a contradiction within the patriarchal Symbolic: the fact that women are exchanged as signs, yet are themselves producers of signs. This is in fact the central contradiction of the system of kinship and exchange, one which delights the modern critic with the possibility of deconstructing the system, but which provokes anxiety in the writers and thinkers who are the system's adherents.[85] The problem is disturbing since language and society are largely coterminous: female speech is for the Greeks inherently problematic, concerned with questions of truth and deceit which are only occasionally at issue in male speech. There is, Bergren shows, an "analogy between the (re-)production of legitimate or only apparently legitimate children and the utterance of true or only apparently true words, an analogy that suggests that the power of language ascribed to the female may be a reflex of the role she plays in the social process by which her re-productive role is assured, namely, the process of marriage exchange."[86]

---

83 A projected other is necessary for self-definition, a notion anticipated, on MacCary's reading (1982.99–126), by Hegel and Homer. Hippolyte's Amazonian status is vital for both individual and social development.

84 On the male strategy of silencing women by recreating them mimetically and speaking for them, see Bergren 1983 and Halperin 1990.142–51.

85 The paradox is noted by Lévi-Strauss 1967.569, who speaks rather naively of the system's "richesse affective" and "mystère"; Rubin 1975 (esp. 200–10) provides a more trenchant feminist analysis.

Euripides' complex portrayal of Phaidra as sign and producer of signs suggests that the paradoxical nature of female speech is central to the Potiphar's Wife theme; see Zeitlin 1985.68–69 and n. 91 below.

86 Bergren 1983.75.

Hippolyte disrupts both language and society. On the linguistic level, her speech is first of all a corruption of the male standard by which speech reflects a pre-existing reality. She proceeds by seeking to bind Peleus with trickery (δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι, 26),[87] persuading her husband with ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν (28), and cobbling together a false, created tale (ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον, 29). All of this, we are simply but emphatically informed, is the exact opposite of what really happened: τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν (31). While her speech to her husband is falsehood built upon falsehood,[88] her speech to Peleus is corruption of a slightly different sort, consisting not of falsehood but of misused language. The phrase πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν indicates not insincerity (*contra* Slater 1969 s.v. πάρφαμι) but impropriety; there is present perhaps the older, more morally neutral sense of παράφημι ("urge, persuade"—but with the distrust of persuasion evident in πείσαισ', 28) alongside the morally suspect connotations of παρά. Only here and at *Nem.* 8.8 does Pindar use λιτανεύω and its cognates for entreaty of mortals rather than gods; and here alone does the word have a negative moral force.[89] Hippolyte's speech is corrupt and profane not only in its aim but in its very form.

The second and analogous disruption caused by Hippolyte is in the social realm. Her action would make true attribution of paternity impossible, and her speech reflects this cognitive dissonance. With a challenge to the certainty of paternity, she threatens the whole system of exchange of women and the Name of the Father: she, like the Phoenicians' version of Io (Hdt. 1.5.2), is a woman who has "stolen or exchanged herself,"[90] disrupting the symmetries of male exchange. The consequences of this are presented in immediate, concrete terms: in female hands, language is

---

87 Binding and immobility elsewhere represent female sexual threats: cf. the various traps avoided by Odysseus, as well as Phaidra's "binding" of Hippolytos (Detienne and Vernant 1978.279–326, Zeitlin 1985.58 and n. 33).

88 The intense semantic over-determination perhaps reflects, as does a similar nexus at *Nem.* 8.19-34[b], the poet's anxiety concerning the word-based, and thus fallible, nature of his craft. On the *Nem.* 8 passage see Carey 1976.30–33 and Carnes 1996.

89 The use of λιτανεύω in *Nem.* 8 is only a slight deviation from the norm, since the object of entreaty is the semi-divine Aiakos. The rather close verbal similarity between the *Nem.* 5 and *Nem*. 8 passages (πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν and πολλά νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν) emphasizes (at least for the modern reader, who may readily compare the passages), the inconcinnity between λιτάνευεν and the nature of Hippolyte's actions.

90 Bergren 1983.78.

harmful, exchange—including marriage and *xenia*—is queered, and men must suffer unjustly. Female misuse of language bears with it the threat of destruction and death—not only here, but in the other versions of the Potiphar's Wife tale.[91] Lévi-Strauss' dictum that incest is misuse of language[92] is valid on more than one level: incest is an ungrammaticality in the signifying system that is kinship; yet it is also, in this myth complex, consistently implicated in the abuse of the more "literal" form of language which is speech, and in ways that emphasize that speech itself has the power to kill.[93]

The disruption of exchange is of course a fiction of the system of exchange itself; the system is "always already there," with the attempts of women to violate exchange not aberrations from a pre-existing tradition, but rather defining moments of the system.[94] Yet such moments produce anxiety and serve as cautionary tales—they are *agents provocateurs* whose disruptions serve not to undermine the system but to reinforce it. The Potiphar's Wife theme, like the Amazon myth to which it is related, demonstrates the dangers of the ambiguous situation of having women as signs and producers of signs; and the recognition of this inherent ambiguity leads not to deconstruction, but to repression.[95] Strategies for dealing with the system's inherent tensions may take the form of the re-appropriation by men of cunning and duplicity, which had originally been projected onto women;[96] or of appeal to a higher authority, one beyond the inevitable

---

91 To the list of male "victims" (Bellerophon, Hippolytos, Joseph) may be added Candaules (Hdt. 1.8–12), who is done in by his wife's refusal to be silently exchanged as an object for visual consumption. On female speech and sexuality in Euripides' *Hippolytos*, see Rabinowitz 1987.129–30 and Goff 1990.27–39.

92 Lévi-Strauss 1967.568.

93 Lacan's structurally-informed psychoanalytic theory makes explicit the connection between the two types of language (Lacan 1966.277–79).

94 Within a synchronic mythic system, the conceptualization of exchange and its ruin by women are simultaneous (although a diachronic narrative may suggest otherwise): the notion of perfect exchange is a Golden Age fantasy akin to the fantasy of slippage-proof communication.

95 Bamberger 1974 suggests that gender-deviant myths arise to sanction the historical suppression of women. Cf. Lévi-Strauss' observation (1967.563) on the normative impulse behind father-killing myths: "Les fêtes jouent la vie sociale à l'envers, non parce qu'elle a jadis été telle, mais parce qu'elle n'a jamais été, et ne pourra jamais être, autrement."

96 Bergren 1983.69–75. Potiphar's Wife examples include Proitos' use of σήματα λυγρά (*Il*. 6.168–70; see duBois 1988.136–37) and Theseus' curse against Hippolytos (Eur. *Hipp*. 886–90; see Goff 1990.74–75). In addition, the *Iliad* and *Hippolytos* associate

ambiguity of mortal discourse, and one capable of restoring speech—both male and female—to its proper function.

It is the latter course which Pindar favors in *Nem.* 5, with the tricksterism of *Nem.* 4 almost entirely absent. Pindar's emphasis on Peleus' rejection of Hippolyte (and his omission of her punishment) not only accords with the ode's movement toward resolution of conflict, but emphasizes as well the triumph of the Symbolic: the misuse of language is countered not by force but by the proper use of language. The phrase τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν (31) highlights the conceptual distance between the two odes: while seeming to hint at the dynamic of reversal and trickery dominant in *Nem.* 4, it in fact does the opposite. Opposition is now a matter of cognitive dissonance, the failure of Hippolyte's speech to match the reality embodied in the paternally-guaranteed, totalizing discourse of both poet and hero: trickery and ambiguity have been completely projected onto the female. Peleus' refusal of this slippery speech redoubles the force of the Muses, whose presence as a framing device has already prepared the audience for the acceptance of Zeus' paternal order. They serve as both an emblem of and a strategy for containment: their circumscribed sexuality and controlled discourse allow the male order to flourish, while the representation of Hippolyte's wiles within their narrative frame assures the audience of the ineffectuality of such stratagems. Peleus' language-based rejection of Hippolyte affirms both the power of the word (indeed, its near omnipotence: the refusal of one woman leads immediately to the granting of another), and the safe reappropriation of language from those women who will not be spoken for (literally or figuratively).

The male order also triumphs in Peleus' acceptance of Zeus in his role as protector of *xenia* (εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν, 33–34). The emphasis on *xenia* accords with the ode's epinician program: it shows Peleus' acceptance of civilized traditions of hospitality and exchange, providing a sort of atonement for his murder of Phokos. Moreover, it completes the revalorization of involuntary exile as the export of glory, with Peleus becoming in effect the founder of the Aiginetans' oft-cited adherence to *xenia* (the island is called a φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν, "land friendly

---

female duplicity with writing (which is often its analogue; see duBois 1988.130–66, Rabinowitz 1987.134). Writing, like the female, is treated as a *supplement* to an already-existing and complete system; yet the *supplement* is necessary for the system to function (Derrida 1982, Culler 1982.89–110). The presence of a master signifier may guarantee speech against female ambiguity: Pindar's use of Zeus in this way at 33[b]–37 is analogous to the (wished-for) use of the *oikos* at *Hipp.* 415–18, 1074–75, and Aesch. *Ag.* 36–38.

to strangers," in v. 8). As noted above, *xenia* is one of the forms of exchange which are typically flawed in autochthonous systems: its successful establishment here represents the ultimate triumph of culture over the closed, pre-cultural world of autochthonous origin.

Or rather, it would represent such a triumph were it not for the unfortunate existence of women: the system is plagued by female trouble. Problems which are themselves manifestations of internal contradictions within the system are recast in terms of gender, with the female as a sort of *pharmakos*, capable of absorbing the system's contradictions and being driven out. Heretofore exchange was impossible; now *xenia*—perhaps the most highly idealized and problematic form of exchange, demanding of its participants restraint, trust, and delayed gratification—is said to work just fine, so long as women are absent. Exchange and community have been defined so that women are excluded as others, as outsiders who will not participate in the ordered processes and transactions of the polis, which will consist of homosexual and homosocial exchanges among men.[97]

Finally, in viewing Peleus' rejection of Hippolyte as a rejection of incest, we may understand the implicit role of Zeus in the development of exchange. The renunciation of the maternal Hippolyte is part of a double movement in which both paternal and filial incestuous desires must be suppressed. Such a movement, as Jane Gallop points out, is the *sine qua non* of exchange and the Symbolic:

> If the father were to desire his daughter he could no longer exchange her . . . If you cannot give something up for something of like value, if you consider it nonsubstitutable, then you do not possess it any more than it possesses you. So the father must not desire the daughter for that threatens to remove him from the homosexual commerce in which women are exchanged between men, in the service of power relations and community for the men.[98]

---

97 The mythic development of exchange may be viewed as the projection of the subject's individuation and ego development, a process which is responsible for the creation of gender. Thus Hippolyte illustrates the social projection of the individually-based creation of gender, whereby Woman is formed in opposition to Man (both as counterpart and obstacle), with Man defined via back-formation from Woman.

98 Gallop 1982.76. The centrality of the problem in Greek thought is attested by its role in the largely pre-Oedipal *Iliad*, where the over-valuation of Chryseis and Briseis leads to

Zeus' renunciation of Thetis is the paternal half of the double movement.[99] By giving up Thetis Zeus secures his continued dominance: his position as head of a primal horde is modified to ensure that no rivals will arise from within the group. While Thetis is not literally his daughter, she is one of a group of subject females who must be renounced and given away.[100] Zeus and Peleus have complementary interests: Zeus needs a son-in-law to displace his Oedipal conflict, while the ephebic Peleus must accept paternal authority. Beyond this, Peleus follows in extra-Pindaric texts the pattern pointed out by Rubin 1975.192–98, whereby the boy's renunciation of the mother leads not only to his ability to receive other women, but to his identification with the oppressive father. Peleus assumes precisely those paternal functions which he challenges as an ephebe: he becomes a father whose son is greater than he is (rather than a rebel against his literal and symbolic fathers; cf. also his exile at the hands of the sons of Akastos, reversing his earlier triumph);[101] a husband weaker than his own wife (rather than conqueror of Hippolyte and Thetis); and the receiver and purifier of murderous (and often Oedipally-rebellious) exiles (rather than being such an exile himself).[102]

Achilles' ultimate rejection of the principles of exchange (9.408–09, 9.632–39; see MacCary 1982).

99 Pindar's lengthy treatment at *Isth*. 8.29–38 suggests that Zeus' renunciation would have formed part of the audience's immediate background. The role of Themis in Pindar's version implicitly recognizes the connection between sexual renunciation and the Law. On Themis, see Slatkin 1991.70–74 and Köhnken 1975.33 n. 19.

100 As a Nereid Thetis is more closely connected to Poseidon, which perhaps explains his presence as Zeus' co-suitor in *Isth*. 8. The tradition, possibly dating back to the *Cypria* (see Reitzenstein 1900), in which she is Hera's foster child, creates an implicit symmetry with Peleus: each is the object of quasi-incestuous desire. Thetis, like Peleus, cannot readily attain a "proper" degree of exogamy: prevented from an overly-endogamous liaison with Zeus, she is subject to the indignity of an overly-foreign—if not bestial—marriage to a mortal (cf. her complaint at *Il.* 18.429–34).

101 Eur. *Tro*. 1126–30 and Schol. ad loc., Dict. Cret. 6.7, Apollod. epit. 6.13. His exile was a stock theme of Tragedy, according to Horace *AP* 95 (*Peleus pauper et exul*).

102 Exiles include the killers Epeigus (*Il*. 16.571–75) and Patroklos (*Il*. 23.84–90, Apollod. 3.13.8), along with the Oedipal refugee Phoinix, who seduced his father's mistress (*Il*. 9.437–84), or was accused of doing so (Apollod. 3.13.8). Various details of the latter version suggest that Phoinix is a doublet of Peleus; see also the interesting arguments of Mühlenstein 1981.

Zeus' Oedipal conflict is displaced onto Peleus, and Peleus, being mortal, comes out badly. His helplessness in old age was a constant in the mythic tradition (*Il*. 18.434–35, 24.538–42; Eur. *Androm*. passim; Horace *AP* 95), and he is sometimes credited with the indignity of being the putative father of a god's child (Apollod. 3.13.4, Melanippides ap. Schol. ad *Il.* 13.350).

Within this context of reconciliation and acceptance of paternal authority, the only logical conclusion to Peleus' adventures is the granting rather than the wrestling version of the winning of Thetis. The wrestling match, like the sack of Iolkos, belongs to the ephebic mode as an action contrary to civilization and exchange. The ephebic *Nem.* 4 implicitly accepts this wild feminine law of the jungle: the liminal Peleus, by engaging in combat with and for Hippolyte and Thetis, legitimizes their outlaw status as self-negotiators, capable of granting themselves in marriage. In *Nem.* 5 Peleus just says no, and receives as reward a tamed and paternally-bestowed wife. Zeus' benevolence toward Peleus (εὖ φράσθη κατένευσέν τέ, 34) and his persuasion of Poseidon (γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις, 37) emphasize the absence of violence.[103] The tameness and domesticity of Thetis are further hinted at in her description as χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νηρείδων (36), where the distaff is a sign of femininity (contrast her epithet ὑψίθρονος at *Nem.* 4.65, which stresses divinity but not domesticity).

The following lines refigure and revalue the violence which would subdue Thetis. Pindar expands his reference to Poseidon with a transitional relative clause: ὃς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλειτὰν θαμὰ νίσεται Ἰσθμὸν Δωρίαν· / ἔνθα νιν εὔφρονες ἵλαι σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾷ θεὸν δέκονται, / καὶ σθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θρασεῖ—"who often goes from Aigai to the glorious Dorian Isthmus; there festive crowds receive him as a god with the cry of flutes, and strive with the great strength of their limbs" (37–39). Athletic competition—and the language may suggest wrestling in particular—is relocated from the contest for Thetis to the divinely-sanctioned Isthmian Games. With these words we leave the central *mythos*, turning back to the victor and his family (Pytheas' maternal uncle Euthymenes had been a victor at the Isthmus); the reference to Poseidon's patronage of the Isthmian Games substitutes for a return to the opening framing device of the Muses.[104] Two anti-social, dangerous elements of the tale—violence and

---

103 The term γαμβρός is best understood as "suitor" or "betrothed," its meaning at *Ol.* 7.4 and *Pyth.* 9.116, as well as at Sappho 103; Theocr. 18.49, 15.129. There is on this reading some point to persuading Poseidon, since he is Zeus' rival (and, as *Isth.* 8.34–38 makes clear, a son by Poseidon poses the same Oedipal threat as a son by Zeus). The biographical reading of Gärtner 1978.39–40 is vitiated by the ode's consistently negative valorization of female strength.

104 Although the ὡς in 30 is the last formal indication of indirect discourse, the Muses' song can hardly end there; it must instead continue on to 37 (or 39). In the former case, there is a transition in the middle of a sentence; in the latter, the Muses suddenly shift from the

female speech—have here been shifted outward to frame the *mythos*, and to be subsumed within the divine order. Wrestling is no longer a dangerous, liminal activity in which women may participate; it is now controlled, divinely-sanctioned, and for men only; like female speech and sexuality, it is subject to a strategy of containment.[105]

The acquisition of Thetis forces us to re-evaluate the question of the compatibility or complementarity of the myths of *Nem.* 4 and 5. Up to this point it has been easy to speak of Pindar's differing emphases within a flexible tradition: there is no literal contradiction between the *Nem.* 4 and *Nem.* 5 versions on the matters of ephebe vs. adult, trickery vs. piety, military vengeance vs. plain refusal. In each instance we may say that Pindar is emphasizing one detail or set of details over another without producing actual contradictions: it is possible to believe that Peleus accepts the authority of Zeus *and* sacks Iolkos; that he out-tricks Hippolyte and Akastos *and* accepts the moral, patriarchal order. But it's hard to make the same case for the granting and wrestling versions of the winning of Thetis, since there is no credible motivation for a contest given the explicit connection between Peleus' piety and Zeus' reward.[106]

In fact the mythic tradition upon which Pindar draws is not merely flexible, it is self-contradictory, and deliberately so, since opposition is the essence of myth. Implicit in my treatment of the two variants of the Peleus myth has been the argument that linking them in a continuous narrative sequence is a distortion of their meaning. While it is possible to respect Zeus and then out-trick Hippolyte, to refuse her offer and then sack her city, a narrative synthesis of this sort ignores the fact that these individual

---

heroic past to make a present-tense statement about Poseidon which would more naturally be made by the poet. There is a certain studied ambiguity concerning the poet's resumption of his own voice: his account mingles with that of the Muses.

105 On athletic contests as inter-community exchange, see Kurke 1991.15–34 and n. 66 above.

There is a homology between self-negotiating women (Hippolyte and Thetis) and those who are paternally-controlled (Hippodameia and Danae). Each is a variation on the incestuous, anti-exchange theme, with links provided in some cases by the contest motif; Zeus' granting of Thetis stands at the center, as the norm of paternal renunciation and exchange from which the others deviate. Its position as the mythic climax of *Nem.* 5 stands it in explicit contrast to the maternally-directed incest of Hippolyte, and in implicit contrast to the filially-directed incest of *Isth.* 8 (perhaps alluded to in the words γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις).

106 Apollod. 3.13.5 juxtaposes the two versions with a mere οὖν by way of explanation, implying that the connection is obvious.

mythemes belong to mutually exclusive mythic discourses. The greater degree of narrative incompatibility in the Thetis myth may be troubling for the modern critic: yet not so for ancient audiences, used to hearing myths told in many and diverse ways and schooled in the grammaticality of opposition.[107]

In examining Pindar's practice in the face of this extreme license, we have been able to outline the details of each mythic variant and trace with relative ease its ramifications within its ode's epinician program; determining the rationale underlying a particular selection is quite another matter. Certain obvious and partial solutions present themselves: while it is true that wrestling receives particular prominence in *Nem.* 4, written for the wrestler Timasarchos, we cannot assume that this is a sufficient cause even for the selection of the wrestling version, much less for the poet's complex treatment of the myth. Nor does this assessment of causality speak to the pacific tone of *Nem.* 5, written for a pancratiast.[108] We may speculate that a certain deliberate poetic virtuosity plays its part, a desire to create in differing circumstances two complete and irreal worlds, whose rejection by Peleus not only reinforces the presence, obviousness, and unquestionability of Greek social reality, but also shows that Pindar in "speak(ing) negatively can be said to command and display a more complete view of things than one who makes positive assertions."[109] Nor is political motivation entirely out of the question: while *Nem.* 4 and 5 lack the seemingly overt political reference of *Nem.* 8 or *Pyth.* 8, Pindar's odes are, as I have argued elsewhere, political in every sense of the word,[110] while Athens' roughly

---

107 Mythographers, whose *raison d'être* is the creation of a reasonably coherent narrative sequence, are exceptions.

Mythic material from *Nem.* 4 exists in *Nem.* 5 only in transmuted form: even the pairing of the feminine and the bestial other receives an entirely different emphasis. The conquest of the bestial Phokos is separated from, and a necessary prelude to, the conquest of Hippolyte, while the violence inherent in the conquest is either suppressed (Hippolyte) or censured (Phokos).

108 Gärtner 1978 is a cautionary example: a well-thought-out reading of *Nem.* 5, *Isth.* 5, and *Isth.* 6 which founders in its speculation about the causal relationship between the circumstances of the victor's family and the epinician program. Tracing the relation between an ode and the large-scale political circumstances of its composition is fraught with uncertainty (see Carnes 1996); when the circumstances are personal rather than public the task is well-nigh impossible.

109 Carson 1988.149. Pindar elsewhere uses a Simonidean sort of negativity to express the failure which did *not* occur for victors and heroes (e.g., *Nem.* 3.13–16, *Pyth.* 8.81–87).

110 Rose 1992 is a particularly effective rebuttal of those who would adopt overly narrow Bundian/New Critical readings of the odes.

contemporaneous development of bellicose and overtly propagandistic mythic variants suggests that there is no *a priori* reason to exclude such a possibility here.[111] Such questions, however, lie in the darkness beyond Gadeira, and here we, like the poet, must admit our *aporia* and turn back.

Syracuse University
jscarnes@mailbox.syr.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bamberger, J. 1974. "The Myth of Matriarchy: Why Men Rule in Primitive Society" in M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere, eds., *Women, Culture, and Society*, 263–80. Stanford.

Bergren, A. 1983. "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought," *Arethusa* 16.69–95.

Bothmer, D. von. 1957. *Amazons in Greek Art*. Oxford.

Bowra, C. M. 1947. *Pindari Carmina Cum Fragmentis*. Oxford.

———. 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.

Brelich, A. 1955–57. "Les monosandales," *La nouvelle Clio* 7–9.469–89.

———. 1958. *Gli eroi greci*. Rome.

———. 1969. *Paides e parthenoi*. Rome.

Brommer, F. 1973. *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensagen*. Marburg.

Bury, J. B. 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London (repr. Amsterdam 1965).

Caldwell, R. 1989. *The Origin of the Gods*. Oxford.

Carey, C. 1976. "Pindar's Eighth Nemean Ode," *PCPhS* 202.26–41.

———. 1980. "Three Myths in Pindar: *N.4, O.9, N.*3," *Eranos* 78.143–62.

Carnes, J. 1993. "With Friends Like These: Understanding the Mythic Background of Homer's Phaiakians," *Ramus* 22.103–15.

———. 1996. *The Uses of Aiakos: Pindar and the Aiginetan Imaginary*. Lanham, Md.

———. forthcoming. "The Tricker Tricked: A Reinterpretation of Nemean 4.57–58," *Rheinisches Museum.*

Carson, A. 1988. "Simonides Negative," *Arethusa* 21.147–57.

Culler, J. 1982. *On Deconstruction.* Ithaca.

Derrida, J. 1982. "Plato's Pharmacy," in *Dissemination*, 63–171. Chicago.

111 Walters 1980 and Tyrrell 1984.15.

Detienne, M. 1977a. *Dionysos mis à mort*. Paris.
———. 1977b. *The Gardens of Adonis*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.
———. and Vernant, J.-P. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.
Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. New York.
duBois, P. 1982. *Centaurs and Amazons*. Ann Arbor.
———. 1988. *Sowing the Body*. Chicago.
Figueira, T. 1981. *Aigina: Society and Politics*. New York.
Finley, J. 1955. *Pindar and Aeschylus*. Cambridge, Mass.
Frazer, J. G. 1910. *Totemism and Exogamy*. London.
Freud, S. 1953. *Totem and Taboo* in J. Strachey, ed., *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud*, v. 11. London.
———. 1964. "The Antithetical meaning of primal words" in J. Strachey, ed., *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud*, v. 11. London.
Gallop, J. 1982. *The Daughter's Seduction: Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. Ithaca.
———. 1985. *Reading Lacan*. Ithaca.
Gärtner, H. A. 1978. "Die Siegeslieder Pindars für die Söhne des Lampon," *WJA* n.f. 4.27–46.
Gennep, A. van. 1960. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago.
Girard, René. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore.
Goff, B. 1990. *The Noose of Words: Readings of Desire, Violence and Language in Euripides'* Hippolytos. Cambridge.
Gould, J. 1973. "Hiketeia," *JHS* 93.74–103.
Gräf, B. 1897. "Amazones," *RE* 1.1771–89. Stuttgart.
Grant, M. 1968. *Folktale and Hero-tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar*. Lawrence, Kans.
Halperin, D. 1990. "Why is Diotima a Woman?" in *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*, 113–51. New York.
Hartog, F. 1980. *Le miroir d'Herodote*. Paris.
Hubbard, T. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind*. Leiden.
Irigaray, L. 1985. "The Blind Spot of an Old Dream of Symmetry" in *Speculum of the Other Woman*, 13–129. Ithaca.
Köhnken, A. 1971. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*. Berlin.
———. 1975. "Pindar's Eighth Isthmian Ode," BICS 22.25–36.
Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise*. Ithaca.
Lacan, J. 1966. *Écrits*. Paris.

Leach, E. 1970. *Claude Lévi-Strauss*. New York.
Lee, J. S. 1990. *Jacques Lacan*. Boston.
Lesky, A. 1937. "Peleus," *RE* 19.271–308. Stuttgart.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1955. "The Structural Study of Myth" in T. A. Sebeok, ed., *Myth: A Symposium*, 81–106. Bloomington.
———. 1967. *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*. Paris.
———. 1988. *The Jealous Potter*. Chicago.
Loraux, N. 1981. *L'Invention d'Athènes*. Paris.
———. 1990. "Herakles: The Super-male and the Feminine" in D. Halperin, J. Winkler, F. Zeitlin, eds., *Before* Se*xuality*, 21–52. Princeton.
MacCary, T. 1982. *Childlike Achilles*. New York.
Miller, A. 1982. "*N.* 4.33–43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *CJ* 78.202–20.
Mühlenstein, H. 1981. "Der homerische Phoinix und sein Name," *Živa Antika* 31.85–91.
Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer*. Baltimore.
Pembroke, S. 1967. "Women in Charge: The Function of Alternatives in Early Greek Tradition and the Ancient Idea of Matriarchy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30.1–35.
Peradotto, J. 1977. "Oedipus and Erichthonius: Some Observations on Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Order," *Arethusa* 10.85–101.
———. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice*. Princeton.
Poliakoff, M. B. 1986. *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 146). Meisenheim.
Pritchard, J. B. 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton.
Rabinowitz, N. S. 1987. "Female Speech and Female Sexuality: Euripides' *Hippolytos* as Model," *Helios* 13.127–40.
Redfield, J. 1983. "The Economic Man" in C. Rubino and C. Shelmerdine, eds., *Approaches to Homer*. Austin.
Reitzenstein, R. 1900. "Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis," *Hermes* 35.73–105.
Robbins, E. I. 1987. "Nereids with Golden Distaffs: Pindar, *Nem*. 5," *QUCC* 54.25–33.
Rose, P. 1992. "Historicizing Pindar: *Pythian* 10" in *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth*, 141–84. Ithaca.
Rubin, G. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy'

of Sex" in R. Reiter, ed., *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, 157–210. New York.

Saxonhouse, A. 1986. "Myths and the Origins of Cities: Reflections on the Autochthony Theme in Euripides' *Ion*" in J. P. Euben, ed., *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, 252–73. Berkeley.

Segal, C. 1974. "Arrest and Movement: Pindar's Fifth Nemean," *Hermes* 102.397–411.

———. 1985. "Messages to the Underworld: An Aspect of Poetic Immortalization in Pindar," *AJP* 106.199–212.

Simpson, M. 1976. *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks: The* Library *of Apollodorus*. Amherst.

Slater, P. 1968. *The Glory of Hera*. Boston.

Slater, W. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.

Slatkin, L. 1991. *The Wrath of Thetis*. Berkeley.

Stern, J. 1971. "The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5," *CP* 66.169–73.

Töpfer, J. 1897. "Amazones," *RE* 1.1754–71. Stuttgart.

Tyrrell, W. B. 1984. *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*. Baltimore.

Vernant, J.-P. 1983. "Hestia-Hermes: The Religious Expression of Space and Movement in Ancient Greece" in *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks*, 127–75. London.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986. "The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian *Ephebeia*" in *The Black Hunter*, 106–28. Baltimore.

Walters, K. R. 1980. "Rhetoric as Ritual: the Semiotics of the Attic Funeral Oration," *Florilegium* 2.1–27.

———. 1984. "Another Showdown at the Cleft Way: An Inquiry into Classicists' Criticism of Lévi-Strauss' Myth Analysis," *CW* 77.337–51.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. von. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.

Winkler, J. 1985. "The Ephebes' Song: *Tragoidia* and Polis," *Representations* 11.26–62.

Yohannan, J. D. 1968. *Joseph and Potiphar's Wife in World Literature*. New York.

Zeitlin, F. 1978. "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*," *Arethusa* 11.149–83.

———. 1985. "The Power of Aphrodite: Eros and the Boundaries of the Self in Hippolytus" in P. Burian, ed., *Directions in Euripidean Criticism*, 52–110. Durham, N.C.