

PINDAR ON ARCHILOCHUS AND THE GLUTTONY OF BLAME (PYTH. 2.52-6)\*

**Abstract:** In *Pyth.* 2.52-5 Pindar describes Archilochus as ‘growing fat on dire words of hatred’. This article argues that Pindar portrays Archilochus as a glutton in the manner of iambic invective. A glutton is seen as a person who grows fat at the expense of others, and so fails in the matter of χάρις. In this light, Archilochus, the poet of blame, stands with Ixion in the poem as a negative paradigm, serving as a foil to Pindar’s praise of Hieron. Praise is thus placed in a setting that recognizes its opposite: praise is only meaningful when seen in relation to blame. Pindar’s poetry is not the product of gluttony; it is a return that offers a necessary recognition of excellence.

ἔμὲ δὲ χρεῶν  
φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν καταγοριᾶν.  
εἶδον γὰρ ἑκάς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ’ ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ  
ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν  
παινόμενον· τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ σὺν τύχᾳ  
πότμου σοφίας ἄριστον.

But I must flee the persistent bite of censure, for standing at a far remove I have seen Archilochus the blamer often in straits as he grew fat on dire words of hatred. And possessing wealth that is granted by destiny is the best object of wisdom.<sup>1</sup>

THE Second Pythian, one of Pindar’s darkest poems, has remained a central challenge of Pindaric scholarship, and few passages have occasioned more discussion than the lines printed above.<sup>2</sup> Although commentators differ over the interpretation of details, there is broad acceptance of the view that Pindar is approaching the praise of Hieron by rejecting the poetry of blame, here exemplified by Archilochus, the poet most closely identified with early ἴαμβος.<sup>3</sup> What seems to have been little remarked, however, is that the description of Archilochus as παινόμενος brings us into the world of early Greek invective and so of ἴαμβος itself,<sup>4</sup> and I propose to argue in the present paper that Pindar is rejecting blame-poetry by using a familiar typology of Greek invective.

\* For comment and advice I am grateful to Professors D.E. Gerber, R.D. Griffith, B.C. MacLachlan, A. Suksi and the anonymous referees of this journal.

<sup>1</sup> Pind. *Pyth.* 2.52-6; references to the text of Pindar follow the Teubner edition of H. Maehler (Leipzig 1987/1989). The translation follows W.H. Race’s Loeb edition (Cambridge, MA 1997), except that I have rendered παινόμενον more literally. All translations from Pindar in this paper follow Race (albeit with minor modifications).

<sup>2</sup> For scholarly discussion of the ode, see D.E. Gerber, *Lustrum* 31 (1989) 226-36. The following will be cited by author’s name in the present paper: J.M. Bell, ‘God, man, and animal in Pindar’s Second Pythian’, in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico 1984) 1-31; R.W.B. Burton, *Pindar’s Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962); C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York 1981); T.N. Gantz, ‘Pindar’s Second Pythian: the myth of Ixion’, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 14-26; B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1890); G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar* (Chico 1982); L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise* (Ithaca, NY 1991); H.

Lloyd-Jones, ‘Modern interpretations of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes’, *JHS* 93 (1973) 109-37 = *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 1990) 110-53; A.M. Miller, ‘Pindar, Hieron and Archilochus’, *TAPA* 111 (1981) 135-43; G.W. Most, *The Measures of Praise (Hypomnemata 83, Göttingen 1985)*; G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore 1979) 222-42 (esp. 224-5); D. Steiner, ‘Indecorous dining, indecorous speech: Pindar’s First *Olympian* and the poetics of consumption’, *Arethusa* 35 (2002) 297-314.

<sup>3</sup> Miller (n.2) has been the most influential recent treatment; cf. also Lloyd-Jones (n.2) 121-3 = 129-31, and Most (n.2) 89-90.

<sup>4</sup> An important exception is Steiner (n.2), who explores the affinities between transgressive behaviour at dinner and the language of abuse with particular reference to *Ol.* 1; see also N. Worman, ‘Odysseus, ingestive rhetoric, and Euripides’ *Cyclops*’, *Helios* (September 2002) 101-25. Seminal for both of these papers is the discussion of Nagy (n.2) 222-42.

tive. In this way Archilochus is slyly presented as a victim of his own genre,<sup>5</sup> and this treatment of Archilochus will be seen to touch on larger thematic concerns of the poem.

παίνομαι means literally ‘to grow fat’, and can be used metaphorically of corruption or degeneracy.<sup>6</sup> But the literal import of the description of Archilochus readily recalls the use of images of obesity and gluttony in early Greek invective.<sup>7</sup> It is hardly surprising that such imagery occurs with some frequency in a literature in which the communal feast is regularly used as a vehicle for the exploration of social *mores*.<sup>8</sup> While obesity is most obviously an aspect of τὸ αἰσχρόν,<sup>9</sup> invective directed against such individuals regularly betrays deeper concerns: the glutton is someone who grows fat at the expense of others, often by neglecting social obligations. In fact, Archilochus makes this clear himself in his invective against Pericles, which has been partially preserved by Athenaeus (1.7-8 = Archil. *fr.* 124 West<sup>2</sup>).<sup>10</sup> We are told that Pericles forced his way into *symposia* uninvited ‘in the manner of men from Mykonos’ (*fr.* 124a). People from that island seem to have had a reputation for stinginess and greed. So far as Pericles is concerned, Archilochus spells out the implications (*fr.* 124b):

πολλὸν δὲ πίνων καὶ χαλίκρητον μέθυ,  
οὔτε τίμον εἰσενείκας (— √ — x — √ —)  
οὔδὲ μὲν κληθεῖς (√ — x) ἤλθεσ οἶα δὴ φίλος,  
ἀλλὰ σεο γαστήρ νόον τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν  
εἰς ἀναιδείην.

Although you consumed a large quantity of unmixed wine, you did not contribute to the cost ... nor again did you come invited ... as though a friend, but your belly led astray your mind and wits to shamelessness.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> We might compare the way in which Pindar uses and manipulates the conventions of martial elegy in *Isthm.* 7: see D.C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian 7. Myth and Exempla* (Leiden 1971) 20 (and *passim*). At *Ar. Ran.* 1471 there is a much broader use of this technique when Dionysus uses *Eur. Hipp.* 612 against its author. Similarly Plato transforms Aristophanes into a comic figure by giving him a case of hiccups (*Sym.* 185c).

<sup>6</sup> Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 276 speaks of ‘fatty degeneration’. On the range and meaning of the verb, see also G. Thomson’s lengthy note on *Aesch. Ag.* 276 (*The Oresteia of Aeschylus* (rev. edn, Amsterdam 1966) 2.28).

<sup>7</sup> In this paper I am using gluttony in the narrow sense of unrestrained – and fundamentally selfish – desire for food and drink (the most prominent adjective is μάργος; see n.38, below). Less relevant to my argument is the figure of the ὀψοφάγος, who is devoted to eating expensive delicacies: ‘the *opsophagos* is thus a particular type of glutton, a man who is not only greedy but greedy for the most expensive food ...’ (S.D. Olson and A. Sens, *Archeostratos of Gela* (Oxford 2000) 1). The preoccupations of the ὀψοφάγος were charged with social significance in the Classical period, and have figured prominently in recent discussions of the social history of the fourth century BC: see J. Davidson, ‘Fish, sex and revolution in Athens’, *CQ* 43 (1993) 53-66, and *id.*, *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (London 1998) 3-35. Of course, there are occasions when the gourmet is also a gourmand: see Olson and Sens on *Archeostratos fr.* 22.1-2

<sup>8</sup> See (e.g.) S. Saïd, ‘Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d’Ulysse et les festins de l’*Odyssee*’, *Études de littérature ancienne* (Paris 1979) 9-49; P. Schmitt-Pantel,

*La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* (Rome 1992); W.J. Slater, ‘Symptotic ethics in the *Odyssey*’, in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica* (Oxford 1990) 213-20.

<sup>9</sup> See R. Garland, *In the Eye of the Beholder* (Ithaca, NY 1995) 135. It is also relevant to note in this regard the padded bellies of figures in vase-paintings that have been connected with comic performance: see (with reference to further discussion) A. Seeberg, ‘From padded dancers to comedy’, in A. Griffiths (ed.), *Stage Directions. Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E.W. Handley* (*BICS* Suppl. 66, London 1995) 1-12; T.J. Smith, ‘Dancing spaces and dining places: Archaic komasts at the Symposion’, in G.R. Tsetskhladze *et al.*, *Periplus. Papers on Classical Art and Archaeology Presented to Sir John Boardmann* (London 2000) 309-19. I have not seen D. Gourevitch and M. Grmek, ‘L’obésité et ses représentations figurées dans l’antiquité’, *Archéologie et médecine* (= *VIIème Rencontres internationales d’archéologie et d’histoire d’Antibes*, Juan-les-Pins 1987) 355-67.

<sup>10</sup> Pericles is named along with Lycambes as the object of Archilochus’ invective by *Arist. Or.* 46 (2.380.21 Dindorf: printed by West *ad loc.*)

<sup>11</sup> Translated by D.E. Gerber, *Greek Iambic Poetry* (Cambridge, MA 1999). The precise constitution of the text and number of *lacunae* are uncertain: see F. Bossi, *Studi su Archiloco* (2nd edn, Bari 1990) 181-3. Athenaeus also cites a number of comic passages on the uninvited guest: see J. Wilkins, *The Boastful Chef. The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2000) 71-2; *cf.* also Bury on *Pl. Sym.* 174b.

Pericles consumes without making an appropriate contribution; his appetite (γαστήρ) has led him astray so that he behaves in a way that is socially unacceptable (ἀναιδείη). Pericles is thus reminiscent of Irus in the *Odyssey*, a beggar whose most characteristic feature is his 'greedy belly' (γαστήρ μάργη).<sup>12</sup> Irus' corpulence identifies him as a glutton, and his lack of strength (... οὐδέ οἱ ἦν ἴς / οὐδέ βίη ...) suggests that he does not perform physical labour.<sup>13</sup> It is with evident irony that Irus competes with Odysseus, who is also disguised as a beggar, for the prize of a stuffed goat's paunch (γαστήρ, *Od.* 18.43-9).<sup>14</sup> In his greed Irus is aligned with the suitors, the most salient gluttons in the poem, who, although belonging to the aristocratic class, nonetheless consume the material substance of Odysseus' οἶκος without recompense.<sup>15</sup> Central to hospitality is the idea of reciprocity, and it was expected that reciprocal obligations would be honoured.<sup>16</sup> In this way we can see how gluttony can become a convenient image to describe a certain kind of political corruption. Achilles reproaches Agamemnon by calling him a 'king who devours his people' (δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, *Il.* 1.231),<sup>17</sup> and, like Pericles in Archilochus' poem, Agamemnon is reproached for ἀναιδείη.<sup>18</sup> Alcaeus, in a similar way, calls Pittacus 'pot-belly' (ὁ φύσκων, *fr.* 129.22 Voigt),<sup>19</sup> and condemns him for devouring (δάπτει) the city in contempt of his oaths (23-5). Alcaeus here condemns a ruler who exploits his position for his own aggrandizement without offering any return.<sup>20</sup> These passages illustrate how easily the language of gluttony moves from the literal to the metaphorical.

<sup>12</sup> Hom. *Od.* 18.2-4. For Irus as a figure associated with blame and blame-poetry, see Nagy (n.2) 228-32; A. Suter, 'Paris and Dionysos: *Iambos* in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 26 (1993) 1-18; W.G. Thalmann, *The Swineherd and the Bow. Representations of Class in the Odyssey* (Ithaca and London 1998) 102-3; Steiner (n.2) 299; for Irus' associations with the suitors, see D.B. Levine, 'Odyssey 18: Iros as a paradigm for the suitors', *CJ* 77 (1982) 200-4. For γαστήρ as an abusive term, see West on Hes. *Theog.* 26; further bibliography in Arnott's introductory note to Alexis *fr.* 215 K-A. Cf. also n.19 below (on γάστρων).

<sup>13</sup> νεικείων in line 9 seems to align Irus with the language of blame; see Steiner (n.2) 297.

<sup>14</sup> Odysseus is also driven by his γαστήρ, but his need is genuine, and in this way Irus serves as a foil to the returning hero. See Russo on 18.44 for the γαστήρ-motif in connection with Odysseus; P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polytropos. Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey* (Ithaca, NY 1987) 173-87.

<sup>15</sup> Eumaeus makes the point explicitly at 14.417, ἄλλοι [i.e. the suitors] δ' ἡμέτερον κάματον νήποινον ἔδουσιν. With νήποινον, cf. ποίνιμος at *Pyth.* 2.17 (see below). Thalmann (n.12) 102 writes, 'Shepherds, beggars, and other dependents or peasants must always be concerned with getting enough food for subsistence, as aristocrats do not; theirs is consumption of surplus. And so it is with the suitors and their perpetual eating.' See also R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford 1994) 58, on the suitors' conduct as indicative of a lack of reciprocity.

<sup>16</sup> At *Od.* 11.185-187 Telemachus is described as 'apportioning equal feasts, in which it is fitting that a man of authority partake' (δαίτας εἴσας / δαίνονται, ἃς ἐπέοικε δικασπύλον ἄνδρ' ἀλγύνειν), but these feasts are complemented by reciprocal invitations (πάντες γὰρ καλέουσι). It is in this light that Telemachus can reproach Antinous for preferring 'to eat much more him-

self than give to another' (αὐτὸς γὰρ φαγέμεν πολὺ βούλευαι ἢ δόμεν ἄλλω, *Od.* 17.404). On the meaning of the phrase δαῖς εἴση, see Seaford (n.15) 48-9. At *Od.* 1.226 Athena remarks of the feasting of the suitors, οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ' ἐστίν; on ἔρανος S. West observes (*ad loc.*), 'a dinner to which all contribute ..., ruled out by the general extravagance and lack of restraint'. For the importance of reciprocal obligations in early Greek discussions of feasting, see Gerber on Pind. *Ol.* 1.38 (ἔρανος); W. Donlan, 'Reciprocities in Homer', *CW* 75 (1982) 137-75, at 164.

<sup>17</sup> Achilles has just called Agamemnon οἰνοβαρής (225), which also suggests gluttony; from this exchange Duris of Samos infers a general truth (*FGrHist* 76 F 15): ἦν τὸ παλαιὸν τοῖς δυνάσταις ἐπιθυμία τῆς μέθης. Hesiod calls the kings 'gift-devouring' (δωροφάγου) in the *Works and Days* (38-9, 263-4); on the derogatory force of the word, see West on 39.

<sup>18</sup> *Il.* 1.149, 158. Agamemnon is also called κυνώπης (159), which may connote gluttony as well as shamelessness: see M. Graver, 'Dog-Helen and Homeric insult', *CA* 14 (1995) 41-61.

<sup>19</sup> Alcaeus seems also to have reproached Pittacus with the abusive epithet γάστρων (*fr.* 429e Voigt), a reproach which recurs at *Ar. Ran.* 200; cf. also γάστρις at Plato *Com. fr.* 219 K-A with Austin and Olson on *Ar. Thesm.* 816, and γαστρῶδης at *Ar. Plut.* 560. The name Gastrodore at *Anacr. fr.* 48.3 Gentili = *PMG* 427.3 (Page prints the name as second declension) may also have been abusive. Prof. R.D. Griffith makes the interesting suggestion that Pittacus' voracity explains his association with the grain-mill in *PMG* 869.

<sup>20</sup> See W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe* (Munich 1980) 191-204; G. Liberman, *Alcée* (Paris 1999) 1.61-2. *Thuc.* 1.17.1 records a similar complaint against the tyrants: τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν μόνον προορώμενοι ἕξ τε τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἕξ τὸ τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον αὐξέειν. It is striking to

Among the remains of early ἵαμβος there are a number of fragments that seem to derive from passages of invective against gluttons,<sup>21</sup> but it is difficult to see how the abuse worked within the larger setting of a complete poem. An important exception, however, is Semonides' long ἵαμβος against women (*fr.* 7 West<sup>2</sup>).<sup>22</sup> This poem gives us some idea of the way the invective of ἵαμβος works, although the victims in this case are not specific individuals. Types of women, viewed in their rôles as wives, are described as created from various animals; the poet uses a variety of modes of invective, among which is abuse for gluttony.<sup>23</sup> The first type, the woman created from a sow, does nothing to maintain the household, but sits in squalor by the dung heap and grows fat (5-6):

αὐτὴ δ' ἄλουτος ἀπλύτοις ἐν εἵμασιν  
ἐν κοπρίησιν ἡμένη πιαίνεται.

and she herself unwashed, in clothes unwashed, sits in the dung and grows fat. (tr. Gerber)

The use of πιαίνεται recalls πιαινόμενος in Pindar's description of Archilochus, and here strikingly suggests useless self-indulgence. The theme recurs in line 24: the only task that the earth-woman understands is eating (ἔργων δὲ μῶνον ἐσθίειν ἐπίσταται).<sup>24</sup> The ass-woman can be forced to work, but her natural inclination is to eat day and night (46-7, τόφρα δ' ἐσθίει μὲν ἐν μυχῶ / προνύξ προῆμαρ, ἐσθίει δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάρη).<sup>25</sup> It is a sign of the depravity of the weasel-woman that she eats unburned offerings (56, ἄθυστα δ' ἱρὰ πολλακίς κατεσθίει).<sup>26</sup> Like the suitors in the *Odyssey*, the women of Semonides' poem are condemned for consuming without requital; they contribute nothing to the οἶκος, but consume its substance,<sup>27</sup> and in the end Starvation (Λίμος) pushes a man from his home (101).

observe the emphasis on the satisfaction of bodily needs. Obesity also occurs in accounts of later rulers (in particular as an indication of the deleterious effects of τρυφή): see Athen. 12.549ff. (especially the passages taken from Nymphis, *FGrHist* 432 F 10, and Posidonius *fr.* 58 Edelstein-Kidd<sup>2</sup> = 126 Theiler).

<sup>21</sup> In addition to the passages cited above, see Archil. *fr.* 167 West<sup>2</sup>; Hippon. *fr.* 26, 114c, 118, 128 West<sup>2</sup> (for a different view of *fr.* 128, see C.A. Faraone, *CA* 23 (2004) 209-45). There are also numerous later passages from comedy: see J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane* (2nd edn, Paris 1965) 94-6; Wilkins (n.11) 69-70; Olson and Sens (n.7) li; cf. N. Fisher in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds), *The Rivals of Aristophanes* (London 2000) 355-96, esp. 372ff.; Steiner (n.2) 298ff. Gluttony is often a conspicuous feature of the κόλαξ or παράσιτος in comedy, the *edax parasitus* (Ter. *Haut.* 38, *Eun.* 38; Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.173): see H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog* (Berlin and New York 1985) 88-121; C. Damon, *The Mask of the Parasite* (Ann Arbor 1997) 25-9; for the figure, see J. Diggle, *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge 2004) 181-2 (with reference to earlier literature). It is also noteworthy that the name of the eponymous 'hero' of the *Margites* seems to be derived from μάργος; cf. Nagy (n.2) 259. On the significance of the word μάργος, see n.40 below.

<sup>22</sup> On this poem, see H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species. Semonides on Women* (London 1975); E. Pellizer and G. Tedeschi, *Semonides: Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Rome 1990) 119-55; R.G. Osborne, 'The use of abuse: Semonides 7', *PCPS* 47 (2001) 46-64; T.

Morgan, 'The wisdom of Semonides *fr.* 7', *PCPS* 51 (2005) 72-85. For a general view of the poem, see also my discussion in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden 1997) 72-8.

<sup>23</sup> It is an assumption of this poem that women were, to a much greater extent than men, dominated by their appetites (especially for food and sex), and this is a common ancient view. According to Plato *Com. fr.* 105 K-A, without constant punishment a woman is ὑβριστόν ... χρήμα κάκόλαστον; cf. also Pomeroy on Xen. *Oec.* 7.6, and the general remarks by R. Just, *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London 1989) 163-4.

<sup>24</sup> ἔργον is used here with some irony: eating would not normally be classed among ἔργα, which are productive, not indicative of consumption. For the ἔργα of women, cf. *Il.* 9.128, 390; *Od.* 20.72, 22.422.

<sup>25</sup> For the gluttony of the ass, cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 1306, Pl. *Phaed.* 81e6; Steiner (n.2) 298-9. The ass was also notoriously randy, cf. Archil. *fr.* 43 West<sup>2</sup> (with ὄτρυγηφάγος perhaps suggesting gluttony as well); see Bömer on Ov. *Fasti* 1.391; Courtney on *Juv.* 9.92.

<sup>26</sup> Commentators illustrate this line by citing Ter. *Eun.* 491 and Catull. 59.1-3. In the celebrated epode against Lycambes, Archilochus told the Aesopic fable of the fox and the eagle (1 Perry), in which the eagle brings destruction on itself by stealing a smouldering offering from an altar (cf. *fr.* 179-80 West<sup>2</sup>). Also relevant is the abusive term βωμολόχος: see Wilkins (n.11) 88-90.

<sup>27</sup> For the comparison with the suitors, see my remarks in Gerber (n.22) 77. Hesiod launches a similar attack on women at *Theog.* 594-9: they are like the drones

If we turn to Pindar's treatment of Archilochus in *Pythian* 2, we can now see that there are affinities between the tradition of abuse for gluttony that we have been discussing and the description of the Parian poet as 'growing fat'. Pindar, however, is not using *παινόμενος* in a literal sense, as commentators have seen, but recognition of the literal import of the word can enrich our understanding of the poet's purpose. In Pindar no metaphor is dead; he is always alive to the full semantic range of a word, and this contributes to the intricate verbal texture that characterizes his poetry. In this light, it is striking to observe how often the imagery of food and eating is used of human morality, and in epinician poetry such images regularly occur in passages on greed and envy. At *Nem.* 8.21 Pindar remarks, 'words are a delicacy to the envious' (*ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν*),<sup>28</sup> and in a poem also addressed to Hieron Bacchylides opposes praise and envy in language strongly reminiscent of Pindar's description of Archilochus (3.67-9):

εὖ λέγειν πάρεστιν, ὅς-  
τις μ]ῆ φθόνῳ παιίνεται,  
...]λη φίλιππον ἄνδρ' ἀρήϊον ...

He who does not grow fat on envy can praise the ... horse-loving warrior ...

Indeed, envy and blame seem so important to certain individuals that they constitute 'sustenance' for them, as an anonymous tragic poet observes: 'There are now people who are nurtured by envy' (*εἰσὶν τινες νῦν οὐς τὸ βασκαίνειν τρέφει*, *TrGF* adesp. F 532). The connection between appetite and moral conduct is explicitly made in a gnomic passage of Chares:<sup>29</sup>

δαπάνην ἄκαιρον μηδαμῶς προσίεσο,  
γαστρὸς δὲ πειρῶ πᾶσαν ἠνίαν κρατεῖν.  
μόνη γὰρ ὧν πέπονθεν οὐκ ἔχει χάριν,  
ἀεὶ δὲ τοῦ δέοντος ἐνδείτῃ πλέον.  
ὅστις δὲ γαστρὸς μὴ κρατεῖν ἐπίσταται,  
οὗτος τὰ πλείω τῶν κακῶν ἔχει κακά.

In no way permit inappropriate expense, but try to control all the reins of your stomach. For it alone feels no gratitude (*χάρις*) for what is done to it, but is always in need of more of what it lacks. And so the man who does not know how to control his stomach has the worst of suffering.

For our discussion line 3 is important: the stomach alone has no *χάρις* for how it is treated. Indeed the consequences of failing to control the appetite are ruin; the implications of *οὐκ ἔχει χάρις* are spelled out with *ἔχει κακά*. We are thus reminded of Pindar's description of the gluttonous Archilochus as being *τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ*.

in a beehive that merely consume the toil of others (599, *ἀλλότριον κάματον σφετέρην ἐς γαστέρ' ἀμῶνται*). It is noteworthy that the suitors are accused by Eumaeus of devouring 'our κάματον' (*Od.* 14.417, quoted n.15). One of the complaints made against the athlete by the speaker of *Eur. fr.* 282 *Kannicht* is that gluttony (*γνάθου τε δοῦλος νηδύος θ' ἠσημένους*, 5) prevents him from increasing the inherited *οἶκος*; on the gluttony of athletes, cf. also A. Sens on *Theoc.* 22.115 (*Theocritus*: *Dioscuri* (*Hypomnemata* 114, Göttingen 1997) 154-5).

<sup>28</sup> See A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin and New York 1971) 30-1, who compares the passage with *Pyth.* 2.55-6.

<sup>29</sup> Chares *fr.* 2 Jäkel (p. 29) = 3 Young (p. 117). For the tradition to which this passage belongs, see W.G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments* (Cambridge 1996) 613. On the language of line 2, cf. *Hippon. fr.* 118.2 West<sup>2</sup>, καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρα[τεῖς; *Men. Mon.* 425 Jäkel, καλὸν γε γαστρὸς κάπιθυμίας κρατεῖν. The reference to *δαπάνη ἄκαιρος* seems to allude to the willingness of the *ὄψοφάγος* to pay any price for delicacies: cf. (e.g.) *Archestratus fr.* 16.2-3 Olson-Sens = 146.2-3 *SH*, τὸν κάπρον ['boar-fish'] ... ὄνου ... / κᾶν ἰσόχρυσος ἔη.

At the heart of this complex is the word κόρος, which literally means ‘surfeit’ or ‘fullness’ (it is cognate with κορέννυμι), but occurs early in extended senses.<sup>30</sup> In the account of Tantalus in *Ol.* 1, also composed for Hieron of Syracuse,<sup>31</sup> Pindar sets κόρος in a context that reminds us of both literal and figurative meanings (55-7b):<sup>32</sup>

ἀλ-  
 λὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι  
 μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρω δ' ἔλεν  
 ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἄν τοι πατήρ ὑπερ  
 κρέμασε καρτερόν αὐτῶ λίθον ...

He, however, could not digest his great good fortune, and because of his greed he won an overwhelming punishment in the form of a massive rock which the Father suspended above him ...

Pindar assumes a progression of moral corruption of a familiar sort (ὄλβος – κόρος – ἄτη),<sup>33</sup> but the striking use of καταπέσσω with its literal meaning, ‘digest thoroughly’, draws attention to the literal meaning of κόρος (cf. ἔψοι, 83).<sup>34</sup> Tantalus’ crime is accordingly one of moral gluttony, born of surfeit, and that is thematically at home in a poem in which Pindar praises Hieron for his hospitable table (17), condemns Tantalus for his theft of the food and drink of the gods (60-4), distances himself from false stories about gluttonous gods (52, ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν),<sup>35</sup> and pictures the heroized Pelops reclining, as at a feast, amid blood-offerings at Olympia.<sup>36</sup> In the contemporary *Olympian* 2 Pindar presents κόρος as the enemy of praise (95-6):

ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος  
 οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν

... but upon praise comes excess which does not keep to just limits, but at the instigation of greedy men ...

κόρος unaccompanied by δίκη obscures praise, which characterizes healthy reciprocal relationships among people and so is a facet of proper praise,<sup>37</sup> but κόρος comes under the influence of ‘greedy men’, and with this we recall the paradigm of the glutton who consumes without requital.<sup>38</sup>

In *Pythian* 2 the passage on Archilochus develops the theme of χάρις that is central in the poem: the deeds of benefactors such as Cinyras and Hieron demand public praise, and it is the function of epinician poets to give such praise appropriate poetic expression. Commentators reg-

<sup>30</sup> See A. Micheli, ‘YBΠΣ and plants’, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 35-55, at 36; J.J. Helm, ‘Koros: from satisfaction to greed’, *CW* 87 (1993) 5-11; for discussion and further bibliography, see also C. Mülke, *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben* (Munich and Leipzig 2002) 114-15, 198-9.

<sup>31</sup> Although the precise date of *Pyth.* 2 is uncertain, it has often been placed close to *Ol.* 1 (476 BC). For recent discussion, B. Gentili *et al.*, *Pindaro: le Pitiche* (Verona 1995) 44-7; cf. the detailed survey in Gantz (n.2) 14-19.

<sup>32</sup> For the version of the myth of Tantalus assumed here, see R.D. Griffith, ‘The mind is its own place: Pindar, *Olympian* 1.57f.’, *GRBS* 27 (1986) 5-13. For detailed discussion of this passage, see Steiner (n.2) 306-8.

<sup>33</sup> Gerber (*ad loc.*) compares the progression ὄλβος - ὄβρις - ἄτη in the treatment of Ixion at *Pyth.* 2.26-8.

<sup>34</sup> Gerber (*ad loc.*) argues that κόρος is suggestive of gluttony here; see also W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar* 2 (Leiden 1988) 29; Steiner (n.2) 307.

<sup>35</sup> For γαστρίμαργος, cf. Iru's γαστέρι μάργη at *Od.* 18.2 (quoted above)

<sup>36</sup> See Gerber on κλιθείς (92); cf. more generally W.J. Slater, *CJ* 72 (1977) 200-1, for the sympotic imagery of the poem.

<sup>37</sup> For δίκη and praise in Pindar, cf. *Nem.* 3.29, ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν; for the text, see the appendix in I.L. Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1999) 630-8 (though he seems curiously uninterested in the significance of δίκη here).

<sup>38</sup> It is noteworthy that the adjective μάργος and its congeners bring together ideas of greed, lust and gluttony: see Friis Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Suppl.*

ularly speak of the theme of gratitude in this ode; but the English word obscures an important feature of χάρις in Greek, and that is the idea of reciprocity. At the heart of χάρις is the idea of that positive exchange that characterizes proper relations among people.<sup>39</sup> The exemplar of Cinyras is introduced to illustrate the general statement that various kings receive ‘a resounding hymn in recompense for excellence’ (ἄποιν’ ἀρετᾶς, 14); Cinyras not only receives the public praise of the Cyprians (κελαδέοντι ... φᾶμαι, 15-16), but is beloved by the gods.<sup>40</sup> The implicit hierarchy is paradigmatic for the poem: a human ruler and benefactor enjoys the just praises of his subordinates and the favour of the gods who ensure that the world works as it should. At line 17 Pindar makes the point in gnomic form:<sup>41</sup>

ἄγει δὲ χάρις  
φίλων ποίνιμος ἀντὶ ἔργων ὀπιζομένα.

but reverent gratitude leads them [*sc.* the Cyprians] in recompense for deeds of friendship.

χάρις leads the Cyprians, and this χάρις is characterized by awe (ὀπιζομένα) and comes as requital (ποίνιμος) for acts of φιλία. Pindar has set out both Hieron and Cinyras as figures who receive due gratitude, and in both cases their standing is supported by divine favour.<sup>42</sup>

Requiting a benefactor appropriately is also the ‘lesson’ taught by the paradigm of Ixion that follows (24):

τὸν εὐεργέταν ἀγαναίς  
ἀμοιβαίς ἐποιχομένους τίνεσθαι.

go and repay your benefactor with deeds of gentle recompense.

The myth of Ixion serves as a striking negative paradigm for this positive aspect of χάρις. Pindar focuses on the treatment of Zeus, the most powerful benefactor, who purified Ixion of the murder of his father-in-law, and took him into his home on Olympus. Ixion, however, like Tantalus in *Ol.* 1, could not sustain (ὑπέμειναν, 26; *cf.* καταπέψαι, *Ol.* 1.56) his happiness, and conceived a passion for his host’s wife. His ὕβρις drove him to ἄτη (28-9) with the result that he tried to rape Hera. Ixion’s crime is interestingly reminiscent of the crime of Paris, who violated the ties of ξενία by abducting his host’s wife (and κτήματα πολλά, according to *Il.* 13.626).<sup>43</sup> Hospitality, of course, falls into the same general category of social conduct as the banquet. These offences constitute a breach of the basic rules that govern human conduct, and are severely punished by Zeus. In the case of Ixion, the rape is thwarted by Zeus, who replaces Hera with a cloud

741 (‘This word [μάργος] and its derivatives, which can cover almost any kind of madness or fury, usually imply a violent appetite for something, the nature of which is often indicated by the context’). That one word can reflect this range of meaning indicates that these ideas were closely connected in Greek thought. For the close connection between gluttony and sexual desire, see Hippon. *fr.* 118 West<sup>2</sup> with the remarks of R.M. Rosen, *TAPA* 118 (1988) 29-41, at 40; D.E. Gerber, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 161-5.

<sup>39</sup> This general view of χάρις is argued at length by B.C. MacLachlan, *The Age of Grace* (Princeton 1993), who discusses *Pythian* 2 on pp. 119-23; see also Most (n.2), especially 68-76; Kurke (n.2) 67-8.

<sup>40</sup> For a detailed discussion of the figure of Cinyras in the ode, see B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford 2005) 258-95.

<sup>41</sup> For the text printed here (Spigel’s ποίνιμος instead of the manuscript reading ποί τινος), and the transitive sense of ἄγει, see Cingano’s note *ad loc.* in Gentili *et al.* (n.33). On the meaning of ὀπιζομαι, see W. Burkert, *Mus. Helv.* 38 (1981) 195-204, at 200-1 = *Kl. Schr.* 1.95-104, at 102-3.

<sup>42</sup> Hieron’s victory is supported by Artemis and Hermes (7-10), and Cinyras is a favourite of Aphrodite and beloved by Apollo (16-17). Apollo’s propitious affection (προφρόνως ἐφίλησ’) is reflected in φίλων ... ἀντὶ ἔργων of line 17. J.T. Hamilton, *Soliciting Darkness. Pindar, Obscurity, and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA 2003) 66-7, notes the unusually rich profusion of gods invoked in *Pyth.* 2.

<sup>43</sup> For Paris as ξεναπάτης, see Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.15.2. Also essential to ξενία is the idea of reciprocity: see (e.g.) Seaford (n.15) 7-8.

on whom (which?) Ixion fathers Kentauros, the progenitor of the race of Centaurs.<sup>44</sup> Ixion is then bound to the wheel as an everlasting reminder of the wrong he committed.<sup>45</sup>

In light of the importance of this myth in relation to the theme of χάρις, it is interesting to note the occurrence of the word in Pindar's narrative (42-3):

ἄνευ οἱ Χαρίτων τέκεν γόνον ὑπερφιάλον  
μόνα καὶ μόνον οὔτ' ἐν ἄν-  
δράσι γερασφόρον οὔτ' ἐν θεῶν νόμοις.

Without the Graces, that unique mother bore a unique son, who was overbearing and respected neither among men nor in the ways of the gods.

The subject of τέκεν is νεφέλα, the cloud transformed by Zeus into a likeness of Hera; οἱ refers to Ixion. The child is born 'without the Charites'. This is an arresting phrase, and its meaning is far from straightforward. Commentators have generally followed the scholiast, who glosses the phrase with τὸν ἄχαριν γόνον (on 78c, 2.44.22 Drachmann). Gildersleeve (*ad loc.*), for example, translates 'unblessed by the Graces'. Carey (40) refines this sort of understanding:

This need not refer to physical ugliness. The Charites are responsible for all that is pleasant at O.14.5 f., and this extends beyond physical beauty to moral-intellectual qualities. Here ἄνευ Χαρίτων reinforces the idea of turpitude in ὑπερφιάλον.

This view can be accommodated to the general theme of χάρις. Kirkwood (151) sees a clear link between the actions of the father and the nature of the son, noting 'as χάρις follows for deeds well done, so the offspring of Ixion's impiety is without χάρις'.

On the usual sort of understanding, the phrase ἄνευ ... Χαρίτων concerns the son, both anticipating ὑπερφιάλον and setting him in relation to his father. Since a son inherited his father's φύά, this makes a certain amount of sense:<sup>46</sup> Ixion failed in the matter of χάρις, and, consequently, his son has nothing to do with the Charites. There are, however, problems with this view. Pindar does not present Kentauros as Ixion *alter*. The son is in a sense a victim too; marginalized and alienated, along with his non-human mother, he stands outside human society, and must mate with beasts (42-8).<sup>47</sup> Although Kentauros seems to have inherited his father's temperament (*cf.* ὑπερφιάλον), Pindar gives us no sense that he perpetuated his father's crimes; rather he represents the disturbing consequences of the lust that secured eternal punishment for Ixion.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Hamilton (n.42) 67, says that Chiron, a figure prominent elsewhere in Pindar, was believed to be among the offspring of Kentauros, but in myth Chiron is set apart from the other Centaurs by virtue of his birth from Cronus and Philyra: see *Titanomachia* fr. 10 Bernabé = 9 Davies (= ΣA.R. 1.554 [pp. 47-8 Wendel] = Soudas, *FGrHist* 602 F 1); Pherec. *fr.* 50 Fowler = *FGrHist* 3 F 50; Ap. Rhod. 2.1231-41, an extensive narrative (see H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich 1968) 317-18). As is regularly the case, the connection with Cronus suggests something better than whatever is possible under the reign of Zeus.

<sup>45</sup> I have here emphasized the portion of the myth treated by Pindar. The scholiasts on *Pyth.* 2.40b (2.38-40 Drachmann) and Ap. Rhod. 3.62 (p. 218 Wendel), reflecting a tradition that seems to have been derived from Pherecydes (*fr.* 51 Fowler = *FGrHist* 3 F 51), offer a fuller version of the myth, from which it is clear that

Ixion's murder of his father-in-law Eioneus involved a similar failure of χάρις: he married Dia with the promise to give her father gifts, but instead of honouring this obligation Ixion treacherously murdered Eioneus.

<sup>46</sup> On the Pindaric concept of φύά, see H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt 1935) 15-19.

<sup>47</sup> See Bell (n.2) 12 on their isolation. It may be noteworthy that in *Ol.* 1 the crimes of the father, Tantalus, are not reflected in his son.

<sup>48</sup> On Pindar's view of φύά, inherited traits sometimes skip a generation (*cf.* *Nem.* 6.8-11). Kentauros' offspring, the centaurs, seem thus to reflect the φύά of their grandfather, although Pindar does not develop the point. Their most conspicuous rôle in myth is as rapists, with Eurytion attempting to rape the bride of Perithous (disrupting a feast in the process), and Nessus assailing the wife of Heracles: see Seaford (n.15) 54-9.



The Charites and the general concept of χάρις are not commonly associated with birth,<sup>49</sup> but rather with the time of life at which girls (and, less commonly, boys) reach the ὄρα and are ready for marriage.<sup>50</sup> In this light, I would like to propose a somewhat different understanding of Pindar's phrase, one that is more consonant with the nature of the Charites and, at the same time, illuminates the father rather than the son. The phrase ἄνευ ... Χαρίτων, I suggest, indicates the nature of the conception: Kentauros is a child of rape, a one-sided act, not of the proper consensual union of a man and a woman.<sup>51</sup> Ixion thus anticipates the gluttonous Archilochus: he exploited a reciprocal relationship exclusively to satisfy his own desires.<sup>52</sup>

Pindar moves from the myth of Ixion to the exemplar of Archilochus with a passage that reflects on the power of divinity and the categories of gods, man and animal that inform the poem (49-52):

θεὸς ἅπαν ἐπὶ ἐλπίδεσσι τέκμαρ ἀνύεται,  
θεός, ὃ καὶ πτερόεντ' αἰετὸν κίχρ, καὶ θαλασ-  
σαῖον παραμείβεται  
δελφίνα, καὶ ὑψιφρόνων τιν' ἔκαμψε βροτῶν,  
ἑτέροισι δὲ κῦδος ἀγήραον παρέδωκ'.

The god accomplishes every purpose just as he wishes, the god, who overtakes the winged eagle and surpasses the seagoing dolphin, and bows down many a haughty mortal, while to others he grants ageless glory.

These lines have often been compared with the praise of Zeus's power at the beginning of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, but the emphasis on animals touches on themes prominent in the myth of Ixion.<sup>53</sup> The δέ in line 52 (ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶν) indicates that it is in light of this reflection on divine power and in recognition of the hierarchy over which the gods preside that Pindar sets out his own poetic obligations. It has been generally accepted by commentators that the lines on Archilochus should be seen as an example of the χρέος-motif,<sup>54</sup> but this passage is unusual in expressing the poet's obligation in negative terms, setting out what Pindar must avoid (φυγεῖν), and so praise is here defined against its opposite, the 'frequent bite of slander' (δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν).<sup>55</sup> It is clear that Pindar is not rejecting κακαγορία altogether, for the adjective

<sup>49</sup> There is a possible parallel at *Pyth.* 8.21-24: ἔπεσε δ' οὐ Χαρίτων ἐκὰς / ἄ δικαιοπόλις ἀρεταῖς / κλεινάσιον Αἰακιδᾶν / θηγοῖσα νᾶσος. These lines describe the appearance of the island in a way possibly reminiscent of the 'birth' of Rhodes (*Ol.* 7.62-3); πίπτω is used of birth at *Il.* 19.110 (Hera deceiving Zeus over the birth of Heracles), ὅς κεν ἐπ' ἤματι τῷδε πέση μετὰ ποσσὶ γυναικός. Although an interesting way of looking at the Pindaric passage, this understanding strikes me as doubtful. Commentators regularly see the familiar metaphor of the lot in ἔπεσε, and I would argue that Pindar is here saying that it is the lot of Aegina never to be far from the Charites and all that they represent (*cf.* the description of the Hyperboreans at *Pyth.* 10.37-8, Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμει / τρόποις ἐπὶ σφετέρους).

<sup>50</sup> See my paper, 'Anactoria and the Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματα: Sappho *fr.* 16.18 Voigt', *QUCC* n.s. 32.2 (1989) 7-15.

<sup>51</sup> In discussing the passage commentators usually ignore the scholion on 78a (2.44 Drachmann), which sets the phrase in a sexual context: ἄνευ οἱ χαρίτων· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔξω συνουσίας. χαρίζεσθαι γὰρ κυρίως λέγεται τὸ συνουσιάζειν. The scholiast illustrates the point by citing

Theopompus *Com. fr.* 30 K-A, *Ar. Eq.* 517, and Sappho *fr.* 49 Voigt. For this sense of χαρίζεσθαι, see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (2nd edn, New York and Oxford 1991) 160, who also discusses the sexual sense of χάρις; *cf.* Thgn. 1303, ἐμοὶ δὲ δίδου χάριν with Vetta *ad loc.*

<sup>52</sup> Lust and gluttony were similar sorts of appetites: see n.38.

<sup>53</sup> See Bell (n.2) on animal imagery in the poem.

<sup>54</sup> See generally E. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1962; repr. 1986) 1.10-11 (73 on *Pyth.* 2.52-6), and E. Thummer, *Die isthmische Gedichte* (Heidelberg 1968) 1.125-7. For the present passage, see Miller's influential paper (n.2); *cf.* Lloyd-Jones (n.2) 122 = 129.

<sup>55</sup> It seems likely that the plural κακαγοριᾶν means 'instances of slander', not slander as an abstract idea. For the force of plural abstract nouns, *cf.* Schwyzer, *Gr. Gram.* 2.43; Smyth, *Greek Grammar* §§ 1000, 1001; P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Louvain and Paris 1993) 53-4 (§38). Developing a point made by Graver (n.18) 58, Steiner (n.2) 301 sees δάκος as implicitly canine, but this seems to be going too far from the text; *Pyth.* 2 is a poem with an extraordinary number of precise references to animals – the epilogue is a virtual

ἀδινός is important: a focus on blame that fails to recognize the need to praise must be avoided.<sup>56</sup> Praise and blame, of course, are modes of behaviour that are central to the early Greek world view, and closely related to the familiar ethos of helping friends and harming enemies.<sup>57</sup> Pindar subscribes to this view, and offers a full expression of it later in the ode (83-5):

φίλον εἴη φιλεῖν·  
ποτὶ δ' ἐχθρὸν ἄτ' ἐχθρὸς ἐὼν λύκοιο  
δίκαν ὑποθεύσομαι,  
ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοῖς σκολιαῖς.

Let me befriend a friend, but against an enemy, I shall, as his enemy, run him down as a wolf does, stalking now here, now there, on twisting paths.

There is the crucial recognition here of the categories of friend and enemy, and those categories are maintained by responding appropriately. From the fragments it is clear that Archilochus shared this view; in fact the speaker of *fr.* 23 West<sup>2</sup> gives it memorable expression (14-15):<sup>58</sup>

ἐπίσταμαί τοι τὸν φιλ[έο]ν[τα] μὲν φ[ι]λεῖν[·]  
τὸν δ' ἐχθρὸν ἐχθαίρειν τ[ε] [κα]ὶ κακο[·]

Indeed I know how to repay love with love and hatred with hate and biting abuse (?) ... (tr. Gerber)

Later antiquity, however, seems to have focused on the striking invective of ἴαμβος, and Critias reproaches Archilochus for blurring the categories of friend and enemy by practising invective on each (88 B 44 *VS*, ὁμοίως τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κακῶς ἔλεγε). For Pindar, Archilochus' exclusive devotion to ψόγος is closely linked with hardship (τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανία), just as Ixion's failure in χάρις leads to ruin.<sup>59</sup> The precise nature of Archilochus' ἀμαχανία is not spelled out, and this seems to be deliberate.<sup>60</sup> After the gnomic passage on the power of the gods to affect human life for good or ill, Archilochus stands as a general paradigm of poetic failure, an implicit foil to the success of Pindar. Archilochus' hardship need not be based on any detail of biography or poetry: base poetry is composed by a base man, and his circum-

menageric – and it seems likely that the poet would have made an allusion to dogs explicit, if such had been his intentions (*cf.* Thgn. 347-9). The vagueness of δάκος is surely deliberate, and it allows the passage to be connected with the later passage on foxes (see below).

<sup>56</sup> Although understood by some to mean 'strong, violent' (e.g. Slater, *Lexicon* s.v.), the basic sense of ἀδινός is, as Most (n.2) points out (88 with n.69), 'abundantly present' and so, in the present passage, 'incessant'. Most also seems correct in holding that ἀδινός is applied to δάκος by enallage. On the meaning of the adjective, see further H. Erbse, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Berlin 1972) 189-91.

<sup>57</sup> See M.W. Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies* (Cambridge 1989) 26-59.

<sup>58</sup> The lacuna at the end of line 15 has not been supplemented satisfactorily, although the sense is clear. In addition to the suggestions recorded in West's *apparatus*, it is relevant to note here Bossi's κακο[ίς] δακεῖν, which raises the possibility that Pindar's δάκος κακαγοριῶν is an allusion to a specific passage of Archilochus: see Bossi (n.11) 107.

<sup>59</sup> In this way Ixion and Archilochus can both be seen as exemplars of failed reciprocity. For the latter, see Kurke (n.2) 100-1, who stresses Archilochus' selfishness: '... because he is unwilling to share with others the poetic nourishment of praise, no one else will share his substance with him'.

<sup>60</sup> Many scholars, however, have attempted to define Archilochus' ἀμαχανία. Poverty or a lack of material resources have been suggested (*cf.* Lloyd-Jones (n.2) 122 = 130; Cingano in Gentili *et al.* (n.31) *ad loc.*). Miller (n.2) 140 sees poetic hardship: '... a kind of poverty of poetic resource, a sterility or barrenness of *inventio*'. This view has been influential: see the survey in G.F. Held, 'Archilochus' Ἀμαχανία: Pindar, *Pythian* 2.52-56 and *Isthmian* 4.1-3', *Eranos* 101 (2003) 30-48, at 30-1 (this paper argues against Miller in favour of a vague 'sociopolitical' sense). It might be tempting to see Archilochus' ἀμαχανία as the result of his diet of hatred (so Steiner (n.2) 305), but this may be reading too much into the text; Pindar merely states that ἀμαχανία constitutes the circumstances in which Archilochus was seen.

stances are consonant with his nature.<sup>61</sup> Such men do not stand high in the favour of gods and men, as do good men such as Cinyras and Hieron. Pindar seems to develop this point in the epilogue to *Pythian* 2, especially the treatment of the consequences of slander (76-7):

ἄμαχον κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις διαβολιᾶν ὑποφάτιες,  
ὀργαίς ἀτενὲς ἀλωπέκων ἴκελοι.

Purveyors of slander are a deadly evil to both parties, with temperaments just like those of foxes.

These lines seem to look back to the description of Archilochus: the phrase ἄμαχον κακὸν seems to pick up ἀμαχανία, and the genitive plural διαβολιᾶν is reminiscent of κακαγοριᾶν.<sup>62</sup> More important, the fox is an animal that figured prominently in Archilochus' poetry and with which Archilochus may have identified himself.<sup>63</sup> Once again Pindar refuses to define ἄμαχον κακόν, but it is clearly ruinous for those involved in the slander. To clarify the reference of ἀμφοτέροις Carey (*ad loc.*) adduces an anonymous lyric (*PMG* 912a), which may be proverbial:

οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλωπεκίξειν  
οὐδ' ἀμφοτέροισι γίγνεσθαι φίλον.

It is impossible to play the fox and be a friend to both sides.

This cunning fox attempts to blur the distinction between friend and enemy by being a friend to both, just as Critias accuses Archilochus of blurring the distinction by abusing friend and enemy alike. For Pindar the ethos of the fox is an ἄμαχον κακόν, and brings no profit.<sup>64</sup> The deceitful citizen has no standing among the good, and makes his own ruin by fawning on all (81-2). Archilochus rejects the model of the fox in favour of that of the wolf (84) by firmly distinguishing friend and enemy (83-5; quoted above). Unlike the deceitful citizen, Pindar can utter a 'word of power' (ἔπος ... κραταίον, 81) among the good, and the present ode is clearly an instance of such utterance.<sup>65</sup>

Pindar presents Archilochus as paradigmatic of blame-poetry as a failure of χάρις, and he will avoid the Parian's fate by giving just praise to the virtues of Hieron (57ff.). That praise, however, is placed in a setting that recognizes its opposite: praise is only meaningful when seen in relation to blame, and the negative paradigms of Ixion and Archilochus serve as a foil to the praise of Hieron. Pindar's poetry is not the product of gluttony; it is a return that offers a necessary recognition of excellence (*cf.* ἄποιν' ἀρετᾶς, 14).

CHRISTOPHER G. BROWN  
*University of Western Ontario*

<sup>61</sup> *Cf.* Arist. *Poet.* 1448b25: διεσπάθη δὲ κατὰ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἦθη ἢ ποιήσεις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ σεμνότεροι τὰς καλὰς ἐμμοῦντο πράξεις καὶ τὰς τῶν τοιούτων, οἱ δὲ εὐτελέστεροι τὰς τῶν φαύλων, πρῶτον ψόγους ποιοῦντες, ὥσπερ ἕτεροι ὕμνους καὶ ἐγκώμια. It is likely that Aristotle would have included Archilochus among the composers of ψόγος; see H.D. Rankin, *AC* 46 (1977) 165-8; S. Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics* (Chapel Hill 1986) 270 n.27. See also M.R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore 1981) 26-7.

<sup>62</sup> Despite the differing quantities of the second alpha in ἀμαχανία and ἄμαχος, it is tempting to suggest that Pindar is playing on the similarity of the two words, implicitly suggesting a false etymology. Both words can be applied to persons and things that are 'irresistible' (*cf.* LSJ s.vv.).

<sup>63</sup> *Cf.* Archil. *fr.* 174.2, 185.5, 201 West<sup>2</sup>. The first two passages derive from Archilochus' treatment of the Aesopic fables of the eagle and the fox (1 Perry) and the fox and the monkey (81 Perry). For Archilochus' identification of himself with the fox, see Pl. *Resp.* 2.365c and Dio Chrys. *Or.* 55.10; *cf.* Brown (n.22) 64 with n.79.

<sup>64</sup> Note the emphasis on profit in the following lines (78ff.). It is striking that the description of Archilochus is followed by a reflection on wealth (56). The gluttonous (and canine) Agamemnon is also described as κερδαλέοφρων at *Il.* 1.149 (see above).

<sup>65</sup> We might compare the deleterious effects of the κακοῦργος λόγος of the κόλαξ in Diph. *fr.* 23.1-3 K-A (*cf.* Men. *Col.* 85-94 Sandbach = C190-9 Arnott).