

LEONARD WOODBURY

OF ALL PINDAR'S SURVIVING ODES the Seventh Nemean enjoys the reputation of being the most controversial and the most obscure. The comments of the scholiasts in our mediaeval manuscripts show clearly, not only the differences of interpretation that existed among the learned of antiquity, but also the extraordinary guesses and improvisations to which their perplexities drove them. In modern times learning has been no less active, often in combination with ingenuity and imagination, but without agreed success. The scholar of our own day must sometimes feel sympathy with the sceptical sigh of Wilamowitz: "nihil perspicio nisi nihil aliud admodum esse perspectum."¹

At the centre of the controversy has been the statement, which the scholiasts attribute to Aristarchus and Aristodemus, that in the poem Pindar defended himself against charges brought by the Aeginetans that he had, in a Paean composed for the Delphians, presented the hero Neoptolemus as a despoiler of the temple of Apollo. This view was generally accepted in the last century, though a few, such as Gottfried Hermann, rejected it as an invention. It appeared to be confirmed in 1908 when considerable fragments of the Paean were published by Grenfell and Hunt, and Wilamowitz at once published an interpretation based on its acceptance. In later studies W. Schadewaldt and E. Tugendhat held fast to the doctrine, while rejecting some interpretations of individual passages that rely upon it.

In 1962 E. L. Bundy, in a manifesto on the form and purpose of the Pindaric ode, incidentally rejected the Aristarchan opinion as an inference drawn in error from the Nemean itself. He has now been followed by E. Thummer, W. J. Slater, A. Köhnken, and C. A. P. Ruck, but opposed by G. F. Gianotti, C. Segal, E. Wüst, A. Setti, S. Fogelmark, H. Lloyd-Jones, G. M. Kirkwood, G. Huxley, and A. J. Podlecki, while D. C. Young has stood aloof from the controversy.²

¹U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in *SB Berlin* (1908) 328 = *Kleine Schriften* 6 (Berlin 1972) 286.

²The most recent discussions, in which references to earlier bibliography may be found, are: A. Setti, "Persona e 'Poetica' nella VII Nemea," *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi Sexagenario Oblata* (Rome 1970) 405-429; D. C. Young, "Pindar Nemean 7: Some Preliminary Remarks (vv. 1-20)," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 633-643; A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971) 37-86; S. Fogelmark, *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII* (Lund 1972) 41-48, 83-86, 89-90, 104-116; C. A. P. Ruck, "Marginalia Pindarica IV," *Hermes* 100 (1972) 143-153; H. Lloyd-Jones, "Modern Interpretation of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh

The question is large, complex, and difficult. In spite of the improvement of our understanding in a number of respects by recent studies, the interpretation of the ode remains for us, as it was for Gildersleeve, "the touchstone of Pindaric interpretation," to daunt and challenge the Pindarist.³ But I cannot here attack the whole problem in its range and depth. Instead I wish to consider one central factor, the nature and origin of the myth that is told of the death of Neoptolemus. That is a more manageable task, and yet one that has not been sufficiently attempted. If it is accomplished with success, I believe that some light may be shed thereby on the great question as well.

According to a myth that was known to Pindar and to later sources, Neoptolemus the son of Achilles, after he took Troy, found his way to Delphi, where he was involved in a violent affray, killed on the spot, and buried in the sacred place.⁴ The traveller Pausanias (10.24.6), in the second Christian century, found the tomb of the hero within a precinct on his left as he came out of the temple of Apollo and reports that the Delphians made to him each year an offering with heroic honours. Above his tomb, in the Lesche of the Cnidians, it was still possible to see the paintings made in the fifth century by Polygnotus of Thasos, including one representing the capture of Troy. Although the picture showed the city already taken, the dead fallen, Helen rescued, and the ships preparing for the voyage home, Neoptolemus, alone of the Greeks, was seen still engaged in destruction; for he was in the act of killing the young Astynous (10.26.4). The reason for this difference, according to Pausanias, was that the painting, placed as it was above the tomb of Neoptolemus, "was intended to relate wholly to him."⁵ It is a plausible conjecture that the act of Neoptolemus was picked out for its savage violence in order to suggest to the pilgrim on the spot that the end which the hero met in the sanctuary of the god was a merited punishment.

Nemean Odes," *JHS* 93 (1973) 109–137, especially 127–137; G. M. Kirkwood, "Nemean 7 and the Theme of Vicissitude in Pindar," *CSCP* 38 (1975) 56–90; G. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast 1975) 12; S. Fogelmark, "Pindar, *Nemean*, 7, 50–52," *AC* 45 (1976) 121–132; A. J. Podlecki in *Historia* 25 (1976) 410; W. J. Slater in *CJ* 72 (1977) 203–208; C. Carey, "Pindarica," in *Dionysiaca*, ed. R. D. Dawe et al. (Cambridge 1978) 21–44, especially 35–38, 43–44. For a good account of the question see S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958) 85 ff.

³B. L. Gildersleeve in *AJP* 31 (1910) 126.

⁴For the sources, see K. Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2440 ff.; E. Lepore, *Ricerche sull'antico Epiro* (Naples 1962) 44 ff. (hereafter "Lepore, *Ricerche*"); A. Severyns, *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (*Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres, Liège* 40 [1928]) 381–385; G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (London 1969) 156–157, 166–167.

⁵Cf. J. Defradas, *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*² (Paris 1972) 153 and note 1, with references to earlier publications.

This version of the myth was in fact offered by Pindar in his Sixth Paean (98–120), which he wrote for the Delphians.⁶ He related that Neoptolemus suffered within the precinct at Delphi the sworn vengeance of Apollo for his murder of the aged Priam of Troy beside his domestic altar. The “punishment of Neoptolemus” (Νεοπτολέμειος τίσις) was later to become a commonplace for a condign penalty.⁷ Later in the century, about 425, Euripides in his *Andromache* (1147–1149) has Apollo’s voice heard in the temple, rousing the Delphians to attack and kill the great intruder.⁸ This story, that of the victor returning from Troy who is punished by sudden death for an offense against the gods, had been a repeated theme of the *Nostoi*. We think of the fates of Agamemnon and the lesser Ajax and remember that the tale of the wanderings of Neoptolemus in Thrace and Epirus was narrated in that poem.

It is consistent with this conception of the end of Neoptolemus, which fits into a general pattern of the cyclic epic, that there was often attributed to him a motive of hostility to Delphi, which must have a local significance. According to some,⁹ he came in order to pillage the sanctuary or, as others said,¹⁰ to claim from Apollo recompense for the death of his father Achilles. Euripides (*Andr.* 49–55) distinguishes two visits to Delphi

⁶The date of the Paean is uncertain. See J. H. Finley, Jr., “The Date of Paean 6 and Nemean 7,” *HSCP* 60 (1951) 61–80, who argues for a date in Pindar’s middle period (478–460); S. L. Radt, (above, n.2) 90–93 and C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 410–411, who incline to 467, which was G. Hermann’s date. A much earlier date (487) for the Nemean was urged by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 160, and more recently E. Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 82–84 has argued for the early date. Fogelmark, *Studies* chapter 1, wishes to use the distribution of colour-words as evidence for the late date. Scepticism concerning the dates is expressed by Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 127, note 108 and by Kirkwood in *CSCP* 38 (1975) 89, note 47.

⁷Paus. 4.17.4. The symmetry that characterises Neoptolemus’ offence and punishment is preserved in differing versions of the details of the myth. Thus Pausanias says that Neoptolemus killed Priam by the altar of Zeus (so Arctinus *ap. Procl. Chrest.*: Allen, *Hom. Op.* 5.107) and was himself slain near the altar of Apollo. But, according to Pausanias’ account (10.27.1) of Lesches in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 16 Allen), Priam was dragged away from the altar to be slain at the doors of his palace; just so, Neoptolemus himself, according to Pherecydes (3 *FGrH* F64a) and Asclepiades of Tragilus (12 *FGrH* F15), was first buried beneath the threshold of the temple, presumably where he fell. Somewhat similarly, in a different version of the myth (Soph. *Hermione* (?) *ap. Eustath. Od.* p. 1479.10 (1.141 Pearson); Eur. *Or.* 1657 and *Andr.* 51–55, 1106–1108; Strabo 9.3.9: 421), Neoptolemus went to Delphi to seek redress for the death of his father only to fall victim to the same god.

⁸Pausanias (1.13.9) says that the killing was incited by the Pythian priestess, or (10.24.4) that it was committed by Apollo’s priest.

⁹Paus. 10.7.1; Apollod. *Bibl. Epit.* 6.14; Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7. 58 (3.125 Drachmann).

¹⁰Soph. *Hermione* (?) *ap. Eustath. Od.* p. 1479.10 (1.141–143 Pearson); Eur. *Or.* 1656–1657; Apollod. *Bibl. Epit.* 6.14; Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7.58 (3.125 Drachmann); Schol. *Paeans* (*POxy* 5.47); Schol. Eur. *Or.* 1655.

by Neoptolemus, of which the first was an attack and the second the occasion on which he met his death.

It is clear that one strand of tradition continued through antiquity to assert that Neoptolemus perished at Delphi as an offender against the god and an enemy of the sacred place. The evidence to this effect offered by the ancient literary witnesses receives some confirmation from the discoveries of modern archaeology. To the north-east of the temple of Apollo but within the polygonal wall that marks the northern limit of the terrace on which it stands, there is a small enclosure close to the fourth-century dedication of Daochus, which contained statues of eminent Thessalians. In this company, and in the area indicated by Pausanias, it is reasonable to recognise the precinct of Neoptolemus.¹¹ There the French excavators have found remains of a village of Mycenaean date. If the identification is correct, the cult offered on this spot may have been older than Apollo's temple. It is a possible inference also from the position of the shrine within the temple-precinct that, when this was laid out, there already existed a sacred place that could not be disturbed.¹² The story of the hostile Neoptolemus who came to his end at the hands of the god and his servants may be plausibly imagined, by a first approximation, as an aetiological myth arising from this fact. Here the tale of Apollo's killing of the dragon Python, which was the guardian of Delphi, is a ready parallel.¹³ The religious and mythopoeic imagination saw in the facts of the temple's topography and cult evidence of the intrusion into the sanctuary of a hostile power that was overcome and neutralised by the god.

The most persistent account of the occasion of Neoptolemus' death points in a similar direction.¹⁴ It tells, from the fifth century,¹⁵ of a quarrel that ensued when Neoptolemus objected to the division of the sacrificial meats that were being offered. The story resembles that told of the sons of Eli in I Samuel (2.12-17), except that in the Hebrew story it is upon the priests that punishment fell for their sacerdotal greed. The outcome for Neoptolemus was that he was killed by Machaireus, sometimes said to be the son of Daetas.¹⁶ The names are intended to reveal a truth, for μάχαιρα is the sacrificial knife and δαίς the feast of the divided meats.

¹¹Defradas (above, n.5) 147-148 and J. Fontenrose, *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi* in *Univ. Calif. Publ. in Class. Arch.* vol. 4, no. 3 (1960) 191-194 (hereafter *Cult and Myth*), with reference to archaeological publications.

¹²H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* 1 (Oxford 1965) 315-316. But cf. J. Pouilloux, *Fouilles de Delphes* 2.12 (Paris 1960) 49-60.

¹³Cf. J. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959) and *Cult and Myth*.

¹⁴For the references, see Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 1.319, note 22 and Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2454 ff.

¹⁵Pind. *Nem.* 7.42; Schol. ad loc. (3.125 Drachmann): Schol. *Paeans* (POxy 5.47); Pherecydes ap. Schol. *Eur. Or.* 1655 (3 *FGrH* F64a).

¹⁶Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 220 ff.

Pindar, even when following a different version, speaks allusively of a man who struck with a knife and Euripides incorporates the motif in his conglomerate version of the affair. It is attractive to see here the sense of a conflict between rival claims for sacrifices made on behalf of Apollo and of Neoptolemus and the vindication of Apollo's right. That was surely the view of the Delphic priesthood.

But the myth knows also another view of Neoptolemus, for which the classical form is offered by Pindar in the Seventh Nemean (34 ff.). He begins by telling that the hero is buried in Pythian ground. After sacking Troy, "Neoptolemus sailed homeward but missed Scyros and was carried off-course to Ephyra, after which he reigned briefly in Molossia. But he went off to visit the god, taking with him treasure from the first-fruits of the Trojan spoil, and at Delphi, as he was engaged in a fight over the sacrificial meats, he was struck by a man with a butcher's knife. Exceeding was the grief of the hospitable Delphians; but he paid by his death a debt owed to fate. For there was need that there should be within the venerable precinct for all time to come one of the royal line of Aeacus, beside the god's well-walled house, and that he should dwell there, keeping strict oversight over the heroes' processions with their many sacrifices."

Here the story, as shown by its self-enclosed form as well as by its theme, is centred on the dispensation of fate that brought Neoptolemus to the sanctuary of Apollo. The hero's motives were innocent, for he came, like some great ruler of the historical period, to offer a dedication from the spoils of battle, and there is no mention of an offence at Troy. The Delphians were hospitable rather than suspicious or hostile, and felt grief over his end. Of the details only the persistent motif of the quarrel over the meats and the stroke of the sacrificial knife remain, although this appears as something that he encountered (42) rather than, as in the Paean (117-119), as something in which he engaged. He is said now to preside over the good order of "many sacrifices" (47) whereas in the Paean (118) these were precisely the cause of the disorder in which he met his end. Machaireus and the Delphic priests,¹⁷ against whom Neoptolemus fought, are left unnamed, although the knowledgeable hearer is able to imagine their presence when he hears of "a man with a butcher's knife." The impression left is that the location and function of Neoptolemus within the god's precinct are right and proper, that the hospitality which the Delphians offered to all Greeks was not in principle denied to him,¹⁸ and that the pain and the loss are more than balanced by the power of the heroic presence.

¹⁷Euripides (*Andr.* 1151) says *Δελαφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρὸς* and Pausanias speaks (10.24.4) of a "priest of Apollo" or (1.13.9) of "Delphians."

¹⁸Neoptolemus' act conflicted with Delphic hospitality in one version of the myth of

But the hero's death remains, as a brute and unassimilable evil. The Delphians are not censured for their rapacity and violence, as they are by versions less friendly to them, but the narrative proceeds in such a way as to be compatible with the belief that Neoptolemus intervened in a disorderly brawl and perished as the victim of its violence. Pindar appears to follow a delicate line, by which he preserves the innocence of Neoptolemus without giving offence to Delphi, all within the frame of the traditional story.

Euripides knew the tradition of the friendly Neoptolemus, but combined it with the competing version in the *Andromache* (53 and 1094):¹⁹ on his second and fatal visit to Delphi the hero came in order to expiate his earlier attack. By another version, which Euripides was to turn to dramatic account in the *Orestes* (1654 ff.), Neoptolemus went to Delphi to seek advice by which his marriage to Hermione might become fruitful.²⁰ There he met the jealous Orestes, who slew him beside the altar. This motif also appears in the *Andromache*, where Orestes incites the Delphians to the killing. The myth is here adapted to the purposes of Athenian domestic drama, while the hero's connection with Molossia and the worship of Apollo at Delphi is loosened.²¹ Indeed, the scene of the action of the play is Phthia, not Molossia, and Euripides' attitude is as much anti-Delphian as anti-Spartan: Neoptolemus is represented as blameless (1161 ff.) and his tomb is said (1241–1242) to stand as a reproach to the Delphians for Orestes' act of murder.

The myth of the Neoptolemus who was a friend to Delphi has its most likely explanation, not in the pre-history of the place, but in an early, historical event. Concerning the First Sacred War our sources are meagre, late, and insecure, but, if we can grasp a historical fact at all,²² we seem to glimpse a situation in the seventh century when Delphi was under the influence of the neighbouring Crisaeans and the Amphictionic League still had its centre at the temple of Demeter at Anthela, near Thermopylae. Traditionally, the Amphictions were these: Thessalians, Boeotians, Dorians, Ionians, Perrhaebians, Dolopians, Magnetes, Locrians, Aenianes, Phthiotic Achaeans, Malians, and Phocians. The most important of these

the hostile hero, for his murderer seems to have been there called "Philoxenidas," according to Soudas 602 *FGrH* F9.

¹⁹Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2456–2457.

²⁰Pherecydes 3 *FGrH* F64a.

²¹Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 1.317 and 319, note 23.

²²*Ibid.*, 1.99 ff.; G. Forrest, "The Sacred War," *BCH* 80 (1956) 42–52; Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 221–222; L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece: The City-States c. 700–500 B.C.* (London and Tonbridge 1976) chap. 6. Most recently it has been argued that the Sacred War was an invention of the fourth century: see N. Robertson, "The Myth of the First Sacred War," *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978) 38–73.

were the Phocians and Thessalians, whose position and aspirations appear to be reflected in the identities of two heroes who were claimed as founders of the League.²³ These were Pylades the Phocian, whose grandfather was Crisus, the eponym of Crisa, and whose own name seems to echo that of the common meeting-place near Thermopylae, and Acrisius of Argos, who had connections in myth with Thessaly. In later times meetings of the Amphictions were held both at Delphi and at Anthela, but it is not certain when Delphi was incorporated into the League.²⁴ What may seem persuasive, where so much is doubtful, is the belief that in the war the Amphictions were successful in reducing Crisa, which they then destroyed, and in setting Delphi on a new footing under their administration. It is not irrational to believe that the Thessalians were the chief movers of the common enterprise,²⁵ and Eurylochus the Thessalian is said to have commanded the allied army.²⁶ This seems *a priori* more likely²⁷ than that the commander was either Solon of Athens or Cleisthenes of Sicyon, whose names are also proposed by our Athenian and Sicyonian sources. If so, it was under Thessalian auspices that Delphi was firmly set on a course that distinguished it from all other Greek states, as the most important pan-Hellenic centre of Greek religion.²⁸ The spirit of the new dispensation breathes in Apollo's command to his priests at the end of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*: "Let each of you take knife in hand and ever make slaughter of the flocks. All things shall you have in abundance that the renowned tribes of men bring here for me. Stand on guard over the temple and receive the tribes of men that gather here . . ." (535-539). It is the hospitable and confident spirit of Pindar's narrative in the Seventh Nemean.

²³Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 1.101-102 and 112, note 5. But cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* 2 (Basel 1956) 32.

²⁴In the seventh century, according to Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 1.103 and M. Sordi, *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Rome 1958) 51 (hereafter "Sordi"); at the time of the Sacred War, according to Forrest in *BCH* 80 (1956) 42-44.

²⁵On the preponderance of Thessalian influence in the Amphictiony, cf. G. Daux, "Remarques sur la composition du conseil Amphictionique," *BCH* 81 (1957) 95-120 and Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 207.

²⁶Ps.-Hippocr. *Ep.* 27.17; Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* Hypoth. (2.3 Drachmann).

²⁷Cf. however Sordi (54 ff. and 79), who holds that the Thessalian part in the Sacred War was minor and dates the Thessalian supremacy in the Amphictiony and at Delphi ca 500; it was then that the cult of Neoptolemus was instituted at Delphi. But see the important objections brought against the late dating of the Thessalian supremacy by J. A. O. Larsen in *CP* 55 (1960) 230-231, 235-239.

²⁸It seems possible that Pherecydes (3 *FGrH* F64a) and Asclepiades of Tragilos (12 *FGrH* F15) inform us of the earliest cult in stating that Neoptolemus was buried beneath the threshold of the temple. Heroes are sometimes buried at gates, as was Aetolus at Elis (Paus. 5.4.4) and Laomedon at the Scaean gate of Troy (Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 2.241). There the hero's power doubtless served as a protection: see M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der*

We cannot know when Neoptolemus was brought to Delphi, but there is room for speculation. It seems likely, because his ancestral home was in Phthia, that he came under the patronage of Thessalians. As Phthiotis seems to have been one of the original members of the league, it is possible to think of a date early in the seventh century,²⁹ before the district was absorbed by Thessaly, if Delphi fell under the influence of the Amphictions of Anthela so early.³⁰ But it might as well be later, when the Thessalians might have acted on behalf of the hero of Phthia, and it might very well be as late as the end of the Sacred War, when the opposing influence of Crisa was removed and Delphi fell into the power of the Amphictions. In this connection it is suggestive to read that Eurylochus, the Thessalian commander, was called a "young Achilles."³¹ It is unlikely to have been later than that war.³² In any case it is not important for the present purpose to determine the course and the dating of these events, providing that we can postulate the existence at an early period of Thessalian pressures southward, upon Phocis and Delphi, which introduced the cult of the hero into the sacred place.

*griechischen Religion*² 1 (Munich 1955) 189 and J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament* (London 1919) 11 ff. If this was the nature of the original burial of Neoptolemus, he was presumably buried where he fell, as a powerful assailant of the temple. Pindar (*Paeans* 6.120) says that he was killed near the *omphalos* and Pausanias (10.24.4), on the hearth (*ἑστία*) of the temple and visitors were shown the altar where Neoptolemus was killed by the priest of Apollo. In regard to Euripides' account in the *Andromache*, it is disputed whether he was struck down inside the temple or by the altar of Chios in front of it. The latest authorities place the killing inside: see Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 213 ff.: J. Pouilloux and G. Roux, *Enigmes à Delphes* (Paris 1963) chap. 4; and P. T. Stevens' edition of the Euripidean play (Oxford 1971) 225–226, who give references for the other view. But, whether Neoptolemus died inside or just outside, no one says that he fell on the site of his own precinct, where Pausanias found him and where Pindar (*Nem.* 7.64) reports his burial "beside the well-walled house of the god;" Euripides says only that he was buried beside the sacrificial hearth (*ἑσχαρά*). It is possible then to believe that at some time before Pindar the cult was transferred from the threshold of the temple to the hero's own precinct beyond. In that case, it was the veneration at the threshold that had a formative influence on the earliest myth. If it was by the influence of the Amphictions that Neoptolemus' status changed from that of an apotroptic power to an object of celebration and pilgrimage, they are likely to have been responsible also for attributing to Menelaus the transfer of his body to the new grave; for our sources say that this was done by that hero. The political implication, if it exists, is obscure.

²⁹Defradas (above, n.5) 155. If the *Little Iliad* knew of Neoptolemus' death at Delphi (fr. 21 Allen), we might think of an early date, but everything then depends on one's view of the authorship and date of that poem: see M. L. West in *OCD*² 389.

³⁰According to Schol. Eur. *Andr.* 32, Hermione gave birth to a son, Amphictyon, by Orestes after her marriage to Neoptolemus, in the tragedies of Philocles and Theognis.

³¹Euphorion fr. 80 Powell and Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* Hypoth. (2.3 Drachmann).

³²Cf. however Sordi (79), who puts the date a century later, with Larsen's objections, in *CP* 55 (1960) 230–233, 235–239, to her late dating of Thessalian power.

What is proposed here is that, not later than the early sixth century, the myth combined two disparate elements of cult: one that was instituted in a close of immemorial antiquity, obstinately and irremovably in place within Apollo's precinct, and the other in honour of the hero of the newly-victorious and now-dominant Thessalian Amphictions. It may seem imprudent, in our state of knowledge, to push the analysis further by surmising that the origin of the hostile Neoptolemus occurred in a time in the seventh century³³ when the dominance of Thessaly and its allies over Delphi was only a fear and not yet a fact. But even without such a surmise it is possible to conceive that the ambiguity of Neoptolemus' position in myth reflects a corresponding ambiguity in the Delphians' attitude to their over-lords³⁴ and in their professed receptiveness to all Greeks. In that case politics, as well as aetiology, played a part in the formation of the myth of the hostile Neoptolemus. That his friendly counterpart had a political origin is a hypothesis that is, if not beyond dispute, at least worthy of respect.³⁵

It is now appropriate to consider a much-controverted passage of the Seventh Nemean (31–36), in which Pindar begins his narration of the myth of Neoptolemus:

τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται

ὦν θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακόντων
 βοαθῶν, τοὶ παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου
 μόλον χθονός. ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις
 κεῖται, Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πρᾶθεν·
 τᾷ καὶ Δαναοὶ πόνησαν·

παρὰ in 33 is G. Hermann's emendation, made with the support of the scholion, for the γὰρ of the manuscripts. Similarly, on the basis of the ἔμολον of the scholion, the same scholar proposed μόλον in 34 for the ἔμολε that is offered by the manuscripts and accepted by Didymus. Both conjectures are firm, I believe, and no other change need be made. This

³³Defradas (above, n.5) 153–156 dates the introduction of Neoptolemus in the period 650–600. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 207 agrees in principle on this point, but thinks also of the period after the Sacred War. Sordi (53) believes that the Amphictions themselves were divided at the time of the War, with some of their members sympathising with the Phocians.

³⁴The "Delphic knife" later became a proverb for greed: see W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* in *RGVV* 32 (Berlin 1972) 135, note 10; Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 220 and 221–222 attributes the proverb, like the myth of the killer Machaireus, to the period after the Amphictions gained the ascendancy at Delphi and were pleased to blacken the name of their predecessors, the men of Crisa. But the proverb may be, as Fontenrose's parallels show, no more than a product of Greek comic and anti-clerical prejudices.

³⁵For Thessalian influences on the formation of the myth of Neoptolemus, see, e.g., J. Perret, "Néoptolème et les Molosses," *REA* 48 (1946) 5–28, especially 16 ff.; Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 73 ff.; Sordi 70–71.

may be called the old vulgate-text: details apart, it is printed, for example, by Disson, Cookesley, Donaldson, Mommsen, Bury, Gildersleeve, Sandys, Schroeder, and Turyn.

The scholarly discussion has centred on three questions, the meaning of *βοαθῶν*, the punctuation of lines 32–35, and the subject of *μόλον* (or *μόλεν*) in 34.

Hermann conjectured *βοαθῶν* (modifying *λόγον*), with apparent support from Pindaric usage but weaker sense;³⁶ Christ proposed *βίη θάνεν . . . μολών*, to the detriment of the sentence as a whole; Bergk read boldly *βοαθῶν . . . μόνος*, to like effect; and so others. Didymus, evidently finding, like Aristarchus, in *τεθνακότων βοαθῶν* a reference to the Trojan heroes who fell in the war, punctuated before this phrase and was willing to suspend the reader's understanding until the poet came to mention the sack of Troy in 35. Others, like Christ, punctuated after *τεθνακότων*, to uncertain effect upon the following words. Until half a century ago the choice between *μόλον* and *μόλεν* was one between a plural and a singular subject, and the critical question was one of continuity: in particular, where did the transition from general maxim to its application in Neoptolemus occur and how much strain was put upon the sentence by the change of subject imposed by *μόλεν*?

The modern discussion of this question, as of so many others, began with Wilamowitz who, in 1922, accepted Hermann's *βοαθῶν*, added a strong stop, and then read Mezger's *τῷ*, taking *μόλον*, after Fraccaroli, as first-person singular.³⁷ "Deswegen, weil der Nachruhm des Edlen einen λόγος βοαθῶς fordert, bin ich nach Delphi gegangen, wo Neoptolemos liegt." It is Pindar himself who bursts into the context, speaking of his visit to Delphi, evidently in connection with the Paean. But the phrase *ἄβρὸν λόγον τεθνακότων βοαθῶν* is heavy and doubtfully Pindaric and the intrusion of the poet, without so much as an *ἐγώ* or other unambiguous signal, between the maxim and the myth, is abrupt even by Pindar's standards, and is immediately repelled as the story begins.³⁸ At best, the text offers a strange, unprepared, and incomplete allusion to the occasion of the Paean.

A decade later, Farnell published in his Critical Commentary a long

³⁶A passage such as *Ol.* 1.110 *ἐπίκουρον . . . ὀδὸν λόγων* is not a true parallel, for there *ἐπίκουρον* governs *λόγων*, as Gildersleeve notes. So, at *Ol.* 13.96–97, Pindar comes as *ἐπίκουρος* to the Muses and the Oligaethids; at *Paeans* 6.9–10 he comes *ἀλέων* both the citizens and his own honours; and at *Ol.* 9.83–84 he has come, out of *προξενία* and *ἀρετά*, as *τιμᾶρος* to the Isthmian headbands of Lampromachus. Cf. also Farnell, *Works Crit. Comm.* 293.

³⁷U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 162, note 2. (hereafter "Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*").

³⁸At *Isthm.* 8.5–5a (*τῷ καὶ ἐγὼ . . . αἰτέομαι*), to which Wilamowitz appeals for a parallel transition with *τῷ*, the importance of *ἐγώ* is apparent.

and learned note, in which he accepted a strong stop after *τεθνακότων* and proposed, after Moriz Schmidt, to read the participle *βοαθοῶν* followed by *μόλεν* and to anticipate the mention of Neoptolemus.³⁹ He translates: "Verily Neoptolemos came to the great centre of the broad-bosomed earth with helpful intent—But he lieth now 'neath the floor of Putho—After he had sacked Priam's city, where the Danaoi also had hard stress."⁴⁰ This reading of the text has been influential, for it gained the acceptance of C. M. Bowra and B. Snell, and thus appears in the current Oxford and the last-but-one Teubner edition. It is unsatisfactory nevertheless.⁴¹ The emphasis of the participle at the beginning might provide a strong statement of Neoptolemus' good motive, but the transition from the preceding maxim is harsh, the anticipation of the new subject is strained, the assumption of a parenthesis is forced, and the whole sentence requires of the reader a *longue haleine* just short of Didymus'.

A reading that combines Wilamowitz with Farnell was put forward in 1967 by C. Segal and E. Wüst, and in 1968 by E. Thummer, who are now followed by H. Lloyd-Jones and by H. Maehler in the latest Teubner text.⁴² They begin with *βοαθοῶν* and continue with the first-personal *μόλον*. Pindar speaks: "It was to bring help that I came to Delphi." Appeal is made to various parallels in which the poet speaks of coming with song to the aid of the victor, and notably to two. In the Thirteenth Olympian he says (96–97) that he comes as an ally to the Muse and the family of the Oligaethids and in the Sixth Paean itself (9–10), that he came to save from frustration both the citizens and his own honours.⁴³

It is not, however, agreed what meaning is to be attributed to the sentence in its context. Segal finds a reference to "a figurative journey from the place of celebration to the setting of the myth." A close parallel is claimed in the Sixth Olympian, where Pindar speaks (22–28) of coming to Pitana on the Eurotas, where his myth begins. He understands that

³⁹*Works. Crit. Comm.* 291–295, who is now followed by Kirkwood in *CSCP* 38 (1975) 82, note 39 and by Slater in *CJ* 72 (1977) 206–207. Other conjectures are now conveniently collected by D. E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972* (Amsterdam 1976) 115.

⁴⁰*Works. Translation* 199.

⁴¹For criticisms of Farnell's reading, see (e.g.) G. Norwood in *AJP* 64 (1943) 325–326; C. Segal in *TAPA* 98 (1967) 446–447; E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtsschreibender Dichter* (Tübingen 1967) 145; H. Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 132.

⁴²E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte* 1 (Heidelberg 1968) 96, note 79 and the other references in my preceding note. A somewhat different proposal was made by E. L. Bundy in *Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Phil.* 18.1 (1962) 10, note 29: that we begin a sentence with *βοαθῶς* or *βοαθοῶν*, read the imperative *μόλε* in line 34, and compare lines 30–34 with *Isth.* 7.16–21. The reading is praised by Slater in *CJ* 72 (1977) 206.

⁴³On *Paeans* 6.9–10, see however Radt, (above, n.2) 111 and 114, who argues that *ἦλθον* in that passage does not refer to a journey to Delphi, but only to the poet's appearance on the scene.

Pindar "is defending himself, the hero, and his poetry," but "in all these cases he is defending truth, nobility, and justice . . . against falsehood, meanness, and treachery."

Lloyd-Jones, on the other hand, holds that the journey is historical and the help was given to Neoptolemus, "for the occasion on which Pindar came to Delphi to bring help to Neoptolemus in the sense of helping to preserve his fame can refer only to the occasion of the paean's performance."

These variations aside, the reading is open to objections in regard to its structure and form. We miss the presence of an ἐγώ that might signal the change of subject unmistakably, and find strange the subsequent transition to Neoptolemus:⁴⁴ "It was to bring help that I came to Delphi, and Neoptolemus lies in the land of Pytho, since he took Troy . . ."⁴⁵ Moreover, the brief sentence that is discovered between the maxim and the myth is not readily paralleled in Pindar,⁴⁶ whether we think of a literal, or of a figurative, journey. The motif of the poet as helper is used by Pindar on a more ample scale and in other connections than here,⁴⁷ nor does he use βοαθοῶν elsewhere of the help that he brings.

The eccentricities of form and uncertainties of meaning that infest the newer interpretations are such that it is prudent to consider once again the old vulgate-text from which Wilamowitz and his successors departed. There the form is straightforward and familiar. The relative clause serves to identify the dead Helpers just mentioned and makes the transition to Delphi. With δὲ Neoptolemus is introduced, as the particular instance for which the preceding generalisation had prepared, and he is identified in turn, with the narration of his myth. Everything is now formally in Pindaric order. "Honour befalls those, dead though they be, to whose tender glory⁴⁸ God gives increase,⁴⁹ the Helpers who came to the great navel of the broad-bosomed earth. For there in the ground of Pytho lies Neoptolemus, since [he came there after] he had sacked the city of Priam,⁵⁰ where the Greeks also were sore beset." The difficulties found in

⁴⁴For examples of the signalling ἐγώ in transition from the maxim to the myth, cf. *Ol.* 13.49 ff. and *Nem.* 1.33 ff.

⁴⁵In this version I combine two sentences that are printed separately by Lloyd-Jones.

⁴⁶R. Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (The Hague and Paris 1974) 52, note 10 rejects the reading βοαθοῶν μόλον on formal grounds of structure.

⁴⁷Cf. note 36 above.

⁴⁸Cf. κῦδος ἀβρόν in *Ol.* 5.7 and *Isth.* 1.50.

⁴⁹The image of organic growth is conveyed by the verb αὐξάνω. This is used literally of the growth of trees (fr. 153 Snell), by extension (e.g.) of the Muse (*Pyth.* 4.279), the native land (*Pyth.* 8.38), the θυμός (*Nem.* 3.58), fame (*Isth.* 7.29), and ἀρεά (*Nem.* 8.40). Cf. W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) s.v. (hereafter "Slater, *Lexicon*"). Repute is planted by a δαίμων (*Isth.* 6.12), the grace of song by θεός (fr. 141 Snell), and honours by the gods (*Pyth.* 4.69).

⁵⁰On the pregnant use of ἐπεί, by which it becomes a virtual synonym of γάρ, see Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 132–133 and note 125.

this version of the text have not been in its form, but in its meaning. Wilamowitz indeed dismissed it as "heller Unsinn," and others have been found to agree with him. But a satisfactory understanding may be won, I believe, with the smallest possible change. We should write *Boaθῶν*, with an initial capital if we like, because we recognise an historical allusion.

In the speech of Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* (3.107–112), which is the earliest of our existing sources for the Sacred War, it is possible to notice a revealing form of words. The Athenians who took part, he says, "swore a great oath that they would go to the aid of the god and the sacred land" (*βοηθήσειν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ γῇ ἱερᾷ* 109; cf. 122).⁵¹ Similarly, Plutarch, in his *Life of Solon* (11), says that the Athenians were advised that they "must go to the aid" of the oracle (*ὡς χρη βοηθεῖν*) against the men of Crisa. The same language is used by Diodorus in connection with the Third Sacred War (16.29.1: *τῷ ἱερῷ βοηθεῖν*) and occurs in a decree of the Amphictions and a letter of Philip of Macedon in connection with the war against Amphissa of 339, as quoted in our manuscripts of Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (155 and 157).⁵² We need not doubt that this is the language of those who spoke of the Sacred War, if they looked at it from the side of the Amphictions, and that it here possesses a Delphic flavour, though it is, of course, also used elsewhere in other contexts. It is a striking coincidence that George Forrest, speaking of that war without reference to Pindar, writes: "the allies won the war, it is their version that has survived, and I am quite prepared to believe that they claimed to be fighting for the liberation of Delphi."⁵³ It is interesting too that Socrates in the Platonic *Apology* (23b), when he describes his practice of the *elenchus* as a response to the oracle concerning his wisdom given to Chaerophon at Delphi, speaks of "going to the aid of the god" (*τῷ θεῷ βοηθῶν*),⁵⁴ no doubt judging the same idiom appropriate in a Delphic context.⁵⁵ It is still more interesting that *Boaθῶς*, "Helper," is the name of a month in the Delphic calendar and a cult-epithet of Apollo himself.⁵⁶

In these circumstances it is an act of less than Pindaric daring to

⁵¹Cf. the claim of retribution on the god's behalf in Pausanias 10.37.8: 'Αμφικτύονες δὲ ὡς εἶλον τὴν πόλιν, ἐπράξαντο ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ δίκας παρὰ Κιρραίων.

⁵²Cf. also ps.-Hippocr. *Ep.* 27.16 sub fin.

⁵³BCH 80 (1956) 45.

⁵⁴See E. Skard, "Zu Platons Apologie (23B)," *SO* 24 (1945) 151–153, who assembles the evidence for the Amphictions' use of *βοηθεῖν* and points to its imitation by Socrates, and D. E. Gerber in *AJP* 84 (1963) 187, note 18, who indicates that the Platonic usage is relevant to Pindar.

⁵⁵Cf. also *βοηθεῖν τῷ μαντείῳ* in Diod. Sic. 16.1.4, 25.1, and 64.3; similarly the decree of the Delphians in honour of the Messenians for their help in 207/6: *Syll.*³ 555A and D: *βοασήσαι τῷ τε ἱερῷ καὶ τῇ πόλει*; also 560.8–10. In *IMagn.* 215 = 338 Parke-Wormell the oracle addresses the Magnesians as *κτεάνοις ἐπαμύντορες ἡμετέροις*, in reference to the Gallic attack.

⁵⁶See LSJ s.v. *Boaθῶς* and Callim. *Hymns* 4.27.

suggest that upon occasion Delphi gave solemn recognition as "Helpers" to those who had performed some signal service,⁵⁷ and in particular to those, such as the Amphictions, who had intervened with military force at Delphi or on Delphi's behalf. If Pindar, in relating the myth of the friendly Neoptolemus, alludes to him, as seems to be the case, as one of these Helpers, the most likely explanation is that the status granted to the Thessalian hero, as well as the benign version of his Delphic myth, is due to the powerful influence in the sanctuary of the Amphictions of Anthela and their Thessalian leaders. On this view, their power secured for their hero from the Delphians the title that they claimed informally for themselves, "Helper of the God and of the Sacred Land."

An apparent analogue for this hypothesis is offered by the legend concerning the death of Aesop that was known to Herodotus and Aristophanes in the fifth century and is told in full in the *Vita Aesopi* and elsewhere.⁵⁸ According to this story, Aesop, because he had mocked the Delphians for their greed in regard to the sacrifices, was falsely charged with the theft of a cup from the temple's treasure and executed for his sacrilege. The Delphians being afflicted by a pestilence and rebuked by an oracle, the leaders of Greece and others assembled in Delphi and took vengeance for his killing. It has been conjectured, on the strength of a number of parallels, that the story reflects the events of the Sacred War, and that the people of Delphi here play the role of the people of Crisa there.⁵⁹ Among the most notable of the similarities are the rapacity of those who lived nearby, the avenging intervention of a coalition of Greek leaders, the plague, and the oracle. There appear to lie here the frame and details of a Delphic story, very possibly resting on the historical fact of the expedition of the Amphictions against Crisa.

⁵⁷Parallels are offered by names given to heroes by Greeks on other occasions (e.g., Alexanor, Amynus, Parastates, Phylacus, Promachus, Sosias, Sosipolis, Soter, Soteria, Symmachus, and others): see Eitrem in *RE* 8 (1913) 1114 and P. von der Mühl, *Der grosse Aias* (Basel 1930), especially 20–21. Von der Mühl argues that Ajax was such a "helping hero" and recognises Neoptolemus in *Nem.* 7.38 as another, who is celebrated at a festival of *βοῶθρία* at Delphi. The Dioscuri were celebrated as Saviours (*Hom. H.* 33.6, Eur. *El.* 1348, etc.) and are *βοηθοὶ* at Theocr. *Id.* 22.23. An epiphany of Asclepius as *βοῶθος* is related by Isyllus of Epidaurus ap. *IG* 4².128.60 = *Coll. Alex.* (Powell) p. 134. It was said (Plut. *Them.* 15.2) that before the battle of Salamis the Aeacids were invoked by prayers *ἐπὶ τὴν βοήθειαν* and (Diod. Sic. 5.79.4) that the Cretans invoked heroes as *βοηθοί*. See also Slater in *CJ* 72 (1977) 206, note 75.

⁵⁸Hdt. 2.134.4; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446 ff., *Pax* 129 ff; *Vita Aes.* sub fin. Cf. A. Wiechers, *Aesop in Delphi* (Meisenheim/Glan 1961).

⁵⁹The relation between the story of Aesop's death and that of Neoptolemus' end and the reflection in both of events of the Sacred War are explored by Wiechers. His hypothesis is accepted in principle by B. E. Perry in *Gnomon* 34 (1962) 620–622 but greeted with scepticism by J. Defradas in *RBP* 39 (1961) 1302, P. Bruneau in *REG* 77 (1964) 314–315, and S. A. Handford in *JHS* 84 (1964) 205.

One text dealing with the legend of Aesop provides a striking parallel of another kind.⁶⁰ When anyone came to offer sacrifice to the god, it is said, the Delphians took their stand round the altar, each one holding knife in hand. After the sacrifice had been duly made, they fell upon the remaining meat, each carrying off as much as he could, so that often the person offering sacrifice was left without a share of his own. It was this practice, according to the story, that provoked the mockery of Aesop; we see that it was also the occasion of the death of Neoptolemus.

It can hardly be doubted that we have elements of a common Delphic story, and it is interesting, for the student of Pindar, to notice that in differing versions Aesop is now the despoiler, and now the victim, of the Delphians⁶¹ and that there is an intervention by the Greek leaders. It seems likely that here the story of Neoptolemus has provided a type for the life of Aesop, for there appears to be no adequate motive that would account for the occurrence in the story of the intervention of the powers of Greece on behalf of a Samian slave. But if this conjecture is right, we have another reason to believe in the relevance of the Amphictions to the myth of Neoptolemus.⁶²

Pindar's meaning in the Nemean, it appears, is that although death is common to all, honour is the lot of those who are recognized at Delphi as Helpers, even after death. Neoptolemus lies buried there and, by implication, enjoys the title and honour of a Helper. His fame, though notable, was never raised to the first order in the epic, but it is here raised above the vicissitudes of poetry and public opinion, by which (as has just been said) Odysseus' merits were exaggerated while those of Ajax were diminished. If there were present in Aegina at the performance of the victory-ode some who remembered and resented Pindar's own treatment of Neoptolemus in the myth of the Paeon, it was open to them to infer that the hero's fame, being guaranteed by the god and his festivals, was not subject to damage by the publication of such poems, however disrespectful these might seem to them, as devotees of the hero and defenders

⁶⁰POxy 1800 = B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana, Ill. 1952) 221. Attention was called to the parallel with Neoptolemus by W. Burkert in *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 439-440; cf. also *Homo Necans* (above, n.34) 135-137.

⁶¹Wiechers (above, n.58) 48-49.

⁶²The myth of Heracles' attempt upon the Delphian tripod is seen as a reflection of the outcome of the Sacred War by H. W. Parke and J. Boardman, "The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War," *JHS* 77 (1957) 276-282, but of the antecedents of that war (Heracles representing the threat of the Amphictiony) by Defradas (above, n.5) 143-146. On the latter, see the comments of H. Berve in *Gnomon* 28 (1956) 177 and P. Amandry in *RPh* ser. 3.30 (1956) 274-276. P. Guillon, *Le Bouclier d'Héracles in Publ. des Annales de la Fac. des Lettres Aix-en-Provence* n.s. 37 (1963), wishes to date the Hesiodic *Shield* earlier, and the "Pythian Suite" of the *Hymn to Apollo* later, than the Sacred War; but note the objections of J. Ducat in *REG* 77 (1964) 283-290 and W. G. Forrest in *JHS* 86 (1966) 173.

of his name. What has been established by the god and by fate, the poet seems to say, cannot be affected either by the vagaries of poetry or by the blindness of human hearts. In a word, the honour of Neoptolemus is secure.

Pindar completes his narration of the myth of Neoptolemus by pointing to the end to which the whole story moves, the presence of the hero as overseer of processions and sacrifices within the precinct. By an easy transition, he then turns to a passage of praise, in honour of all the progeny of Zeus and Aegina, including Neoptolemus (48–52):

εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει·
οὐ ψεύδεις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ,
Αἴγινα, τῶν Διὸς τ' ἐκγόνων. θρασὺ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν
φαεινναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων
οἴκοθεν·

“Not false is the witness who has in his care, Aegina, the achievements of your descendants, and of Zeus’s.” Pindar is less than explicit, and the attention of commentators has been directed to the question of the identity of the witness.⁶³ Is he Neoptolemus, Apollo, or Pindar himself?⁶⁴ Because of this preoccupation a more fundamental question has been overlooked. It is this: why is Pindar so indefinite? Once asked, this question opens up a larger field, the vagueness of several features of the narrative. The occasion of Neoptolemus’ death is too firmly fixed to be changed, but Machaireus the priest is replaced by an anonymous “man with a butcher-knife.” The scene is the sanctuary at Delphi with its “venerable sanctuary” and its “well-walled house,” but Apollo is never mentioned by name. The impression that a reader receives is certainly that the roles of the god and his priests in the story are played down, and left quite implicit. In the opening maxim (31–32), the increase of the tender glory of the dead Helpers is said to be the work of “God” (θεός), and this indefinite word recurs twice (40 and 46) in the brief narrative of the myth. Once more, the attentive reader might supply the name of Apollo, by whose favour Neoptolemus must have been received as a benefactor within the precinct. But Pindar gives no name here, no more than in the mention of the true “witness” as the myth is

⁶³On the several opinions concerning the identity of the witness, see C. A. P. Ruck in *Hermes* 100 (1972) 146, note 3 and the discussion of the whole passage by C. Carey (above, n.2) 35–38.

⁶⁴None of the three fits the requirements exactly. Neoptolemus seems an insufficient witness to all the deeds of the Aeacids and to be in need of testimony on his own behalf, and Apollo’s relations with one of the Aeacids appear to be too delicate to permit him to serve comfortably. *ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ*, though applicable to Neoptolemus as *θεμισκόπος*, seems unsuited to Pindar or to any other poet. True, he calls himself *ταμίας* at *Isth.* 6.57, but of festivities, not of deeds. On *ἐπιστατεῖ*, see note 72 below.

concluded, almost a score of lines below.⁶⁵ The poet's reticence is sufficiently evident to deserve comment, though any explanation of a negative must be conjectural. But it is safe to say that the evidence here is consistent with the view that Pindar is very chary of giving to Apollo the same prominence that he had in the events of the myth of the Paean. That may have been a sore point, which he wished to avoid in composing for Aeginetans, with their traditional loyalties to the Aeacids. In any case, he is likely to have spoken indefinitely about the "witness" for the same reason, whatever it was, that inhibited him on other points earlier.

Honour (τιμὰ)⁶⁶ is current coin and a measure of value in the Pindaric world.⁶⁷ The goodness of a man must find recognition in the attitudes of his peers. Without the presence of a society of friends and the "good," ἀρετά itself must perish.⁶⁸ It is for this reason that "witnessing" has so prominent a place in the odes and that it implies testifying as well as observing. Poets are, of course, most important witnesses to the excellences of the good, and are sometimes mentioned in this capacity.⁶⁹ But the work of witnessing is carried on far beyond their circles, and may be said to be a function of the whole of society, including gods as well as men. Zeus himself is "witness" to an oath (*Pyth.* 4.167); for the acts of a great man, of whatever kind, there are ready "many witnesses" (*Pyth.* 1.88); when false tales, by the power of χάρις to confer honour and credibility, threaten to deceive, the succession of the ensuing days provides the "wisest witnesses" (*Ol.* 1.34). In speaking in the Sixth Olympian of the destiny of the Iamids, Pindar says (73–74) that "every thing gives a sign" (τεκμαίρει χρῆμ' ἑκάστων).⁷⁰ More especially appropriate to our line is a passage of the Sixth Nemean, in which he says (8–11) that Alcimidas, the boy-victor, "gives proof (τεκμαίρει) for all to see that his inherited prowess resembles the grain-bearing fields," which in alternation yield abundant crops or gather strength from their idleness.

In our passage of the Seventh Nemean, the motif of praise is the culmination of the myth that precedes, and by matching the maxim (31–32)

⁶⁵On "witnessing," see *Ol.* 4.3, *Isth.* 3/4.28, *Parth.* 2.39 Snell; on the praise and honour of the "good," *Nem.* 7.63, *Isth.* 7.26 and 8.69. On the indefinite θεός in Pindar, see the texts collected by Slater, *Lexicon* 233–235.

⁶⁶In connection with τιμὰ of line 31, it is noteworthy, and may be significant for the poem's relation to the Paean, that in the latter Neoptolemus is said (118) to have perished in a dispute περὶ τιμᾶν. The assurance given in this regard by the Nemean may be conceived as a response to the doubt implied by the myth of the Paean.

⁶⁷Cf. H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt 1935) 26–27, 118–119, note 108.

⁶⁸Cf. *Nem.* 10.78 οἷχεται τιμὰ φίλων πατωμένῳ φωτί.

⁶⁹So Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 133.

⁷⁰The reeds of pipes, an altar, the city of Ajax, and the pillars of Heracles are all witnesses: *Pyth.* 12.27, *Ol.* 13.108, *Isth.* 5.48, *Nem.* 3.23. Cf. *Ol.* 9.98, where the tomb of Iolaus is σύνδικος for the victory, and *Ol.* 13.98–100.

with which the myth began, completes an enclosing frame. In the maxim it is an indefinite "God" who fosters the tender glory,⁷¹ whereas in the praise it is an unnamed true "witness" who has in his care the achievements of the Aeacids. In neither case is a proximate cause mentioned, presumably for reasons of tact, but the divinity that favours the growth of glory must act through the festivals of Delphi and all occasions of celebration, including the performance of songs. We should not doubt that the indefinite "witness," who must also be divine,⁷² operates in a similar fashion, making use of many lesser testimonies,⁷³ until "every thing" bears witness to the excellences of the children of Zeus and Aegina. This reading of the line has the advantage of enabling us to give a single interpretation to the whole of the myth and its frame. The veneration of Neoptolemus' grave, which is the point of the myth, is seen as an instance of the care of God for the honour of dead Helpers and of the divine witness to the deeds of the Aeacids, which are the themes of the maxim and the praise. This in turn makes good the damage done by the lies of poets and the blindness of human hearts, which was an earlier theme of the poem (20-30).

Thus far line 49 in its relation to what precedes it; a similar meaning is implied by its connection with what follows. Contemporary editors, such as Bowra, Puech, Snell, and Turyn, follow Hermann in punctuating after *ἐκγόνων*, rightly rejecting the older preference for a stop after *ἐπιστατέι*. *ἔργμασιν* requires some specification from the context, which is emphatically supplied by the following apostrophe. This is, in fact, climactic, as befits the promised word of praise. The divine care is exercised, not only over Neoptolemus, but over all the Aeacids. *ἐπιστατέι* signifies that encompassing oversight, and the true witness that it bears is made evident by *ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων* that the poet boldly proclaims for the splendid excellences of all the descendants of Aegina and Zeus. The mention of the last names traces the descent of the line beyond the eponymous ancestor and suggests that the providence in question is from a higher source than a poet such as Pindar, a hero such as Neoptolemus, or even a great god such as Apollo. The climactic effect of the brief and bold word of praise comes

⁷¹At *Isth.* 5.6, it is because of the honours granted by Theia of the many names that victors are wonderful. Cf. *Ol.* 1.54-55, 7.88, *Pyth.* 4.51, 69, 260, *Isth.* 3/4.77, 6.12, fr. 141 Snell, and Bacchylides 13.79-81 and 17.68-69.

⁷²*ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατέι* (49) seems particularly appropriate to the indefinite divine witness. The phrase recalls *Ol.* 1.106-108; *θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ὦν τοῖσι μῆδεται/ἔχων τοῦτο κᾶδος*, 'Ἰέρων,/μερίμναισιν and verbs used with the names of the various Pindaric agencies of fate. Cf., e.g., *Pyth.* 3.109 (the *δαίμων* is said *ἀμφέπειν*), *Pyth.* 3.86 and *Nem.* 5.40 (*πότμος* watches and judges), *Ol.* 10.53 (the *Μοῖραι* stand near), *Pyth.* 4.286-287 (*καιρός* attends; cf. *Soph. El.* 75-76), fr. 311 Snell (*ξεινοδόκησέν τε δαίμων*) with Apollon. *Lex. Hom.* 117.26 Bekker (*ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαρτύρησε*).

⁷³At *Ol.* 4.1-3, Pindar is sent as witness by the Horae of Zeus.

from this appeal to the widest perspective of value. In the Pindaric world there is a close relation between deeds and words, and in this passage the *ἐργμασιν* of 49 receive their fulfilment in the *λόγων* of 51. The true witness that presides over their deeds is the high dispensation of praise for the native excellences of all members of the line.

As in the case of Alcimidas in the Sixth Nemean, the witness testifies to the work of an inherited power. "Bold is this for me to say, that the road for their splendid excellences, by virtue of their native worth, has glory within its power." The sentence is firm and concise, as befits its function as praise. So indeed the poet has just warned us, when he says: *εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει*, in effect, "For the sake of the good name of justice, I shall waste no words!"⁷⁴ But interpretation is needed, even by the wise.

The first words, whatever their construction, must mean something like, "I make bold to say this," but the best parallels are *Isth.* 6.56: *ἐμοὶ δ' μακρὸν πάσας ἀναγῆσασθ' ἀρετάς*, "long would it be for me to tell of all their excellences," and *Nem.* 10.19–20: *βραχύ μοι στόμα πάντ' ἀναγῆσασθ', ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος / μοῖραν ἐσθλῶν*, "brief is my utterance to tell of all the glories . . ." *τόδ'* must introduce what follows, in a relation of apposition. We require then an accusative and infinitive construction, which we may have if *εἶναι* is understood and *κυρίαν λόγων* is taken predicatively.⁷⁵ For this latter phrase support is offered by *Ol.* 1.110: *ἐπικούρου εὐρὼν ὁδὸν λόγων*, "having found a path that prompteth praises" (Sandys).⁷⁶ In Pindar *οἶκοθεν* must refer to the inborn and inherited powers, *φύα* or *τὸ συγγενές*, by which the dignity of the aristocracies was held to be maintained.⁷⁷ The sense of the passage is then: the destiny that presides over

⁷⁴"Kurz und gut!" is F. Mezger's paraphrase: *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880) 368. Cf. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1402: *οὐδ' ἂν τρί' εἰπεῖν ῥήμαθ' οἷός τ' ἦν πρὶν ἐξαμαρτεῖν* and the proverbial Latin *tria verba*, and A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890) 366–367. That the phrase *εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν* is traditional appears from Plato, *Laws* 6.754a: *πρὸς τούτῳ δὲ δίκην ὑπεχέτω τῷ βουλομένῳ μετιέναι μὴ καλὴν μηδ' εὐώνυμον ἀλλ' αἰσχροῖαν*.

⁷⁵For the construction with *κύριος*, cf. *Isth.* 5.53; *Zeὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος*, *Pyth.* 2.58, and LSJ s.v. I; for the sense, Aesch. *Agam.* 104: *κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν*. Formally similar is *Ol.* 7.90: *ὑβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδόν*.

⁷⁶On *Ol.* 1.110 Gildersleeve comments "The path is the path of song, which will help forward the glory of Hieron . . ."

⁷⁷*οἶκος* in Pindar is "house," either as "home" or as "family" (see Slater, *Lexicon* s.v.) and *οἶκοθεν* shows the same ambiguity. The latter word in the second sense signifies the *ἀρχή* of the native powers of the family: see *Ol.* 3.44 and *Isth.* 4.12; the scholiast (3.127 Drachmann) says: *ταῖς λαμπραῖς ἀρεταῖς, αἷς οἶκοθεν ἔχετε*. But the local sense is not lost, and it remains possible to imagine a contrast of a polar kind between the situation of the *οἶκος* and the pillars of Heracles at the end of the world, as in the two passages cited. The road that leads from the house of the Aeacids traverses the world and carries their praises. Just so, at *Ol.* 6.22 ff., Pitana is not only a place near Sparta and the heroine of a myth but also the *ἀνδρῶν γένος*, as the source of the family and its destiny. On *φύα*,

the Aeacids and their deeds has marked out for them a course, illumined by their ἀρεταί and inspired by their own φύα, that must make their glory secure.⁷⁸ The convention of the epinician ode required brevity in praise, but in this case it is because of this general truth regarding the Aeacids that it is possible to do justice to their good name in a word or two.

The theme recurs in Pindar. At *Isth.* 5.19–29 he speaks of a clear road of divinely-inspired deeds along which Aegina has turned and of honours that, by the grace of Zeus (Διὸς ἔκαστι), present a theme for poets. At *Isth.* 6.19–27 he says that there are countless broad roads of glorious deeds that extend to the ends of the world, so that there is nowhere a city, however barbarous or alien its speech, that does not know of Peleus, or of Ajax, or of Telamon. At *Isth.* 4.1–12, in an ode for a Theban, he speaks of having countless roads on all sides, and of the excellences of the Cleonymids, by which they are made to flourish, as they pass, by the grace of God (σὺν θεῷ), to the end of life; they have achieved, in full, witness to their fame throughout the world, whether they be dead or alive, and by their native powers (οἰκοθεν) the furthest bound, at the pillars of Heracles. "There are many roads," he says in the Eighth Olympian (13–14), "on which men fare well by the grace of the gods (σὺν θεοῖς)."⁷⁹

The point of our passage in the Seventh Nemean has been shown to be characteristically Pindaric, and it is the point to which Pindar has been driving since the maxim of lines 31–32. It expresses in a general form, for all the Aeacids, the assurance that he gave in the myth to Neoptolemus alone. For Sogenes the boy-victor, as for all the Euxenids of Aegina, it offers a mythical model of the destinies to which, it was said in the proem, Eleithyia gave them access. That must be proof against the deceptions of poetry and the blindness of human hearts.

According to the myth of the Seventh Nemean Neoptolemus, being carried off-course on his return voyage, missed his native Scyros, was driven to Ephyra, and thereafter reigned for a little time as king in Molossia:

see Gundert (above, n.67) 15–19. E. Tugendhat, in *Hermes* 88 (1960) 407, note 2, wishes to restrict φύα in the five passages in which it has the sense, "nature," to a meaning such as "by birth." But *Pyth.* 8.44–45 shows the connection with inheritance and *Nem.* 11.31–42 displays Pindar's view, though without mention of φύα. Cf. the remarks of P. W. Rose in *HSCP* 78 (1974) 154, note 22, the discussion by Fogelmark in *AC* 45 (1976) 129–131, and C. Carey (above, n.2) 36–37.

⁷⁸Other interpretations of the passage are mentioned by Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 133–134, who is inclined to follow Wilamowitz and Schadewaldt in conjecturing ὁδὸς κυρία. Lloyd-Jones finds that "Pindar is speaking of his own poetic art," concerning "a road of words from home that has power in respect of shining deeds of glory."

⁷⁹At *Nem.* 3.40, it appears that εὐδοξία may be συγγενής. At *Nem.* 6.45–49, the Aeacids, by their excellences, are said to provide broad avenues for the adornment of Aegina.

ὁ δ' ἀποπλέων
Σκύρου μὲν ἄμαρτε, πλαγχθέντες δ' εἰς Ἐφύραν ἵκοντο,
Μολοσσία δ' ἐμβασίλευεν ὀλίγον
χρόνον·

It will be useful now to consider what Pindar knew of that kingdom, and to begin with another poem.

The Fourth Nemean has a fine passage in praise of the Aeacids, each now established in his proper country (46–53). Teucer, the son of Telamon, rules in far-off Cyprus, Ajax is in possession of his ancestral Salamis, and Achilles lives on the shining island in the Euxine sea. The climax is offered by Thetis and Neoptolemus:

Θέτις δὲ κρατεῖ
Φθία. Νεοπτόλεμος δ' ἀπείρω διαπρυσία,
βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἐξοχοὶ κατάκεινται
Δωδῶναθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἴόνιον πόρον.

There then follows a brief narration of the myth of Peleus, Hippolyte, and Acastus.

Like Thetis, Neoptolemus reigns, but in Epirus, not in the Thessaly of his father and grandfather. It is true that *ἄπειρος*, as used here and generally in Pindar's time, is probably a descriptive term rather than a proper name. From the age of the *Odyssey* the word is often used of the western mainland of Greece, particularly Acarnania, and especially when contemplated with the eyes of an islander living off that coast.⁸⁰ Thucydides (2.81.4) calls those who lived there *οἱ ἐκείνη ἡπειρώται*, "the mainlanders there," and the earliest-known uses of *ἡπειρώται* as a proper name, "Epirotes," seem to be in Hellanicus at the end of the century (4 *FGH* F83) and in an inscription of 427/6 (*IG* 5.1.1231).⁸¹ But there can be no doubt of the reference of the term: it is to the land that was later called "Epirus."

The *πρῶνες* are mountains, which are plentiful in that country. If they begin, as the poet says, at Dodona, he must think there of Mount Tomarus, above Dodona, to which, he says in the Paean, Neoptolemus came. For Pindar and the tradition, Dodona was within Thesprotian territory.⁸² Aeschylus' Prometheus (*PV* 829–831) says to Io: "when you come to the Molossian plains and near steep-backed Dodona, where are the oracles and seat of Thesprotian Zeus . . ." The site is now identified at the south-west edge of the plateau of the modern Ioannina, from which it is separated by "a limestone ridge, which commands a magnificent view of the Pindus range." To the west "it is dominated by the towering mass

⁸⁰*Od.* 14.97 and 100, 18.84, 24.378; Thuc. 3.114.8; LSJ s.v. II. Cf. Lepore 8, note 10.

⁸¹N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 506 (hereafter, "Hammond").

⁸²See Hom. *Od.* 14.314–359; *Cypria* fr. 1: 5.117 Allen; the tragic poets *ap.* Strab. 7.7.10 (328); Hdt. 2.56; Paus. 1.17.5; *Suda* s.v. Dodona; Lenk in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 16.

of Mt. Olytsika," the ancient Tomarus.⁸³ Hecataeus (1 *FGrH* F108), writing early in the century, says: "the men of Dodona live to the south of the Molossians." Dodona and its mountain, it is clear from these texts, mark the boundary between Thesprotia and Molossia.⁸⁴ Pindar therefore uses the place, appropriately enough, as the southern limit of the kingdom of Neoptolemus.

From Dodona the axis of the kingdom, as it were, extends across the mainland (*ἀπείρῳ διαπρυσίᾳ*) to the "Ionian strait" (*πρὸς Ἴόνιον πόνρον*).⁸⁵ In antiquity the northern part of the modern Adriatic sea might be called either the "Adriatic" or the "Ionian."⁸⁶ When a distinction was made, the Ionian was the southern part. Thucydides (1.24.1) places the beginning of the Ionian at Epidamnus, Strabo (7. fr. 56(57) and 7.5.8 and 9) at Apollonia, and the latter puts the common mouth of the two bodies of water at the Ceraunian mountains of Epirus. As the north end of our Adriatic, the Ionian is appropriately called a "gulf" (*κόλπος*)⁸⁷ or, poetically by Aeschylus (*PV* 839), a "recess of the sea" (*πόντιος μυχός*). As *πόρος*, it is conceived as the narrow waters by which a crossing might be made, conceivably to the promontory of Mount Garganus, certainly to Iapygia or Tarentum at the heel of Italy (cf. Thuc. 6.30.1). By extension, the coastal passage to Sicily, by way of Iapygia and Tarentum, might be said to be by the Ionian "gulf" (Thuc. 6.13.1).⁸⁸ It is probably in this sense that Pindar (*Pyth.* 3.68) speaks of the Ionian "sea" (*θάλασσα*) in connection with a voyage to Syracuse. Further south, beyond the shipping lanes from Epirus, lies the Sicilian sea.⁸⁹

The waters of the Ionian strait or passage may then be thought to wash all the shores of Epirus from Acarnania to Acroceraunia. It is certain that Pindar extends the kingdom to the sea, but not immediately clear what

⁸³Hammond 168–169; cf. 479 and 491.

⁸⁴Lenk in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 16 believes that Molossia occupied Dodona, on the strength of *Nem.* 4.53 and Aesch. *PV* 830–831. But the latter seems to mark a boundary and the former is not a description of the Molossian state of the fifth century.

⁸⁵At Hom. *Il.* 17.747–748, a *πρὸν ὕλῃς* is said *πεδίοιο διαπρύσιον τετυχηκώς*. It is suggestive to discover two of Pindar's words in a Homeric description of a mountain that stretches down across a plain and resists water.

⁸⁶The following are on the Ionian sea: Istria (Hecat. 1 *FGrH* F91 f.; Hellanicus 4 *FGrH* F4), Epidamnus (Hdt. 6.127; Thuc. 1.24.1), and Apollonia (Hdt. 9.93). Cf. also G. Radke in *Der kleine Pauly* 2 (1967) 1438, Büchner in *RE* 9.2 (1916) 1896, and A. Ronconi in *SIFC* n.s. 9 (1931) 282–289.

⁸⁷For the Ionian as *κόλπος*, see Hecat. 1 *FGrH* F91 f.; Hellanicus 4 *FGrH* F4; Hdt. 6.127, 9.93; Thuc. 1.24.1, 2.97.5, 6.13.1, 30.1, 44.1, and 7.57.11.

⁸⁸The sea-crossing from Corcyra to Iapygia and Tarentum, and so to Sicily, is mentioned several times by Thucydides: 6.13.1, 30.1, 34.4, 44.1, 104.1, 7.33.3, twice as *ὁ Ἴόνιος κόλπος* (6.13.1 and 44.1), otherwise as *ὁ Ἴόνιος* only. At Eur. *Troad.* 225, the *Ἴόνιος* is the Tarentine gulf.

⁸⁹Cf. Thuc. 6.13.1 and Ronconi in *SIFC* n.s. 9 (1931) 283–284 and 289–291.

land-mark he intends. If, however, we accept his description, that the mountains, which begin at Dodona, descend to the Ionian strait, and we follow the general line of the mountains north-west from Dodona, we may reasonably arrive at Acroceraunia,⁹⁰ which was recognised by Strabo as the entrance to the Ionian gulf and must have been generally known as a sign of the Ionian. The massive mountains of the jutting promontory might well be said to be *πρῶνες ἑξοχοί*⁹¹ and, although it may be traditional that *πρῶνες* offer pasture to cattle,⁹² it is at the least suggestive that the monster Geryon, according to Aristotle (*Meteor.* 2.3: 359a25), must have kept his cattle nearby⁹³ and modern observers report the presence of herds not far away.⁹⁴ Finally, a line taken from Dodona to Acroceraunia might be reckoned to traverse Epirus from Thesprotia to Illyria, and so to mark out a recognised region.⁹⁵ If so, it is Epirus that is the kingdom of Neoptolemus.

It is a confirmation of this interpretation that Bylliace or Byllis, which tradition held to be a foundation of Neoptolemus, is not far from Acroceraunia.⁹⁶ It is attractive to suppose that it is because Pindar knows this tradition that he imagines the northern limit of the mythical kingdom as he does.

If this is a plausible explanation of the northern end of his traverse, it becomes desirable to understand why he fixes Dodona as its termination to the south. That Dodona has some importance for him in connection with the myth of Neoptolemus is shown, not only by its prominence in the passage from the Fourth Nemean, but also by the evidence of two other Pindaric passages. In the Sixth Paean (109) it is said that Neoptolemus, on his return voyage from Troy, ended in "the land of Molossia, near Tomarus,"⁹⁷ and in the Seventh Nemean (36–39) that he missed Scyros on his return but was carried off-course to Ephrya, and was for a little time king in Molossia. Tomarus is, of course Dodona's mountain,

⁹⁰So Hammond 384 and 491.

⁹¹At Hom. *Il.* 12.282 and 16.299, *πρῶνες ἄκροι* are the mountain-tops.

⁹²Cf. Bacchylides 5.66–67: "Ἴδας ἀνὰ μηλοβότους/πρῶνας ἀργηστάς.

⁹³Hecataeus (1 *FGrH* F26) places Geryon farther to the south in Ambracia and Amphilochia. Cf. also Ps.-Scylax 26 and Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 4.84 (3.78 Drachmann).

⁹⁴See Hammond 512, 523 and note.

⁹⁵It is remarkable that Pindar's traverse of the "mainland" resembles the route of Io's journey, from Dodona to "the great gulf of Rhea," afterwards called the "Ionian," in Aesch. *PV* 829–841. In both cases, presumably, we are to think of the extent of the "mainland" from the farthest Greek outpost (cf. note 107 below) to the end of the world in the north-west.

⁹⁶Steph. Byz. s.v. Byllis. The name *Βυλλιᾶκη* depends on emendations in Hecataeus 1 *FGrH* F104 and Strabo 7.5.8 (316). See Hammond 471–472 and Index s.vv. Hammond provides maps on pages 464, 674, and 700.

⁹⁷See however Radt (above, n.2) 158–159, who questions the text.

and Ephyra, which is Thesprotian, not Molossian,⁹⁸ and is not known to be connected with Neoptolemus, must be mentioned as a port that gave access to Dodona by way of the valley of the Acheron.⁹⁹ In a late source, Pyrrhus, with whom Neoptolemus was later identified, is said to have married Lanassa, whom he met at Dodona when he went to consult the oracle.¹⁰⁰ This story appears to reflect the marriage in 295 of Pyrrhus of Epirus to Lanassa, the daughter of Agathocles of Syracuse, and Pyrrhus' known devotion to Dodona, but there may be implied an older connection of Neoptolemus-Pyrrhus with that place.¹⁰¹ It is not difficult to sup-

⁹⁸Cf. Thuc. 1.46.4 and Paus. 1.17.4; Hammond 478.

⁹⁹The name of the river Selloeis, twice mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.659 and 15.531) in connection with Ephyra, seems to be related to that of the Selloi or Helloi, who are interpreters of Zeus at Dodona (*Il.* 16.234–235). The river is identified with the upper Acheron west of Tomarus by Hammond (372–373), but with the Achelous, farther to the east, by G. Restelli, *Arcana Epiri* (Florence 1972) 96 ff. In the *Odyssey* (14.316–330 and 19.287–299) Odysseus is said to have approached Dodona by way of Thesprotia, and "there is no doubt that Thesprotia includes the plain of the lower Acheron," according to Hammond (377). Cf. Lepore, *Ricerche* 14. In historical times the envoys of Periander who were sent to consult the Thesprotian Nekyomanteion made their way by the Acheron, according to Hdt. 5.92. η. 2; see Hammond 478–479. Hammond (285) says, "The route from the Acheron north to Dodona was of no possible use for trade; it served as a route for pilgrims who visited the Nekyomanteion on the way to Dodona." It may be therefore that Pindar attributes to Neoptolemus a sacred way that was used in his own time: see M. P. Nilsson, *Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epeiros* (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift 1.6.4 [Lund 1909]) 22 and 33 and J. Perret in *REA* 48 (1946) 8. This view receives some confirmation from Neoptolemus' later visits to Dodona (presumably) and to Delphi (certainly). Another myth told that Antiphus and Pheidippus, the sons of Thessalus king of Cos, landed at Ephyra and were buried there (Arist. fr. 640, no. 39 Rose) and their descendants journeyed thence to Thessaly (Strabo 9.5.23 [444]; cf. Hdt. 7.176). This story offers a variation of the version given by Apollodorus (*Ep.* 6.15 [2.256 Frazer]), by which Thessaly was associated directly with Cos. The parallel offered, by the alternation of the land-route and the sea-route, with the myth of Neoptolemus is striking, for the *Nostoi* transported that hero to Molossia by land (5.108 Allen), whereas Pindar gives him a sea-route in *Paeans* 6 and *Nem.* 7. (But contrast Hammond 383, note 5 on the Paean.) It is attractive to suppose that both myths have been affected by the memory of tribal migrations. For the myth of Neoptolemus, cf. the example of the Aenianes (below, 127); for that of the Thessalians, see Sordi 1–6; Lepore, *Ricerche* 47–48 and in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 74–75.

¹⁰⁰Justin 17.3.4; cf. H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* (Oxford 1967) 144.

¹⁰¹"Pyrrhus" ("Red-head") appears in the *Cypria* (fr. 11 Kinkel: Paus. 10.26.4) as a name given to the son of Achilles by Lycomedes of Scyros, his maternal grandfather, in whose house he was brought up. Both masculine and feminine forms of the name are connected with the house of Lycomedes, for Achilles himself is said to have taken the name "Pyrrha" when he hid there (Hygin. *Fab.* 96) and Deidameia, the daughter of Lycomedes and mother of Neoptolemus, is sometimes called "Pyrrha" (Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.2; *Anth. Pal.* 9.485). Probably it was a child's nickname (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 1.2). Cf. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 209. On all other occasions and in other early and classical sources the hero bears the name "Neoptolemus," which was given to him by Phoenix, according to the *Cypria*. Cf. Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2440–2442 and, for early texts in which allusions to "Pyrrhus" have been suspected, M. Delcourt, *Pyrrhos et Pyrrha*

pose that the hero who met his end at Apollo's oracle at Delphi was known to have visited, earlier in his travels, the ancient oracle of Zeus at Dodona,¹⁰² with which his father's name was connected.¹⁰³ If so, Pindar's choice of Dodona as the southern marker of the kingdom of Neoptolemus is intelligible in the mythical context.

It is probable, therefore, that in Pindar's imagination the kingdom of Neoptolemus of the Fourth Nemean comprises all of Epirus from Thesprotia to Acroceraunia and Illyria, and certain that it runs from the mountains round Dodona down to the sea.¹⁰⁴ It is consistent to believe that this is true also of the Molossian kingdom implied in the Seventh Nemean and the Molossian land of the Sixth Paean. If that is the case, Pindar cannot have in mind the contemporary Molossian kingdom, for, although it established itself on the shores of the Ambraciote gulf by 380–360, it never broke out of its highland fastness down to the Ionian sea and was quite land-locked round Pindus in the fifth century.¹⁰⁵ It is possible that at an earlier time Molossian power had been more widespread in Epirus, but we never hear of Molossians on the Ionian coast.¹⁰⁶

(Paris 1965) 31 ff. The earliest mention in verse of "Pyrrhus" as the proper name of the hero is by Theocr. *Id.* 15.140, and in prose by Theopompus (115 *FGrH* F355) on the genealogy of Olympias, the wife of Philip and mother of Alexander. Alternatively, Pyrrhus appears as a son of Neoptolemus in Strabo 7.7.8 (326) and Ps.-Scymnus 449. The name was accepted, from whatever source, by the royal house of Epirus in the fourth century and from that time, and particularly under that influence, came into common use there in the myth of the origin of the Molossian kingdom. This development seems part of a romantic Hellenisation that is revealed by an efflorescence of heroic names in the genealogy of the royal house of the time. There is, however, another version, by which the Molossian kings are made to descend from Molossus, the son of Neoptolemus and Andromache; it is attributed to Eratosthenes by Schol. Hom. *Od.* 3.188, and to others: cf. Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2453. See the genealogical table in *RE* 24 (1963) 114, by D. Kienast, and M. P. Nilsson, *Studien* (above, n. 99) 9 and *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund 1951) 108.

¹⁰²Sordi (68–69, 76–77) proposes that there was ca 500 an exploitation by Aleuas of Thessaly of the myth of Neoptolemus' connection with Dodona and the union of Aeacids with Heraclids.

¹⁰³Hom. *Il.* 16.231 ff. Cf. Hammond 371 and Parke (above, n.100) 1 ff.

¹⁰⁴The extension of Neoptolemus' kingdom to the sea seems to be signified by the late tradition that he had a son named "Anchialus:" see Sosiphanes and Asclepiades of Tragilos *ap.* Schol. Eur. *Andr.* 32 (12 *FGrH* F23). See also Apollod. *Ep.* 7.40 (2.306 Frazer), where Neoptolemus is "king of the islands off the mainland."

¹⁰⁵Ps.-Scylax 32; Ps.-Scymnus 447 and 453. Cf. Hammond 523–524. That the Athenians sought the help of Alcetas, king of Molossia, in an intervention in Corcyra mentioned by Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.2.10–11) proves nothing for the fifth century and little for the state's borders in the fourth. But cf. Lenk in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 20–21.

¹⁰⁶Cf. Strabo 7.7.5 (323–324) and 7.7.11 (328), and Hammond 479. Hammond argues (468) that Strabo used Hecataeus as a source for Epirus and that therefore the former's statements that "the Chaonians earlier, the Molossians later" once ruled over the whole of Epirus and that Dodona "came under the rule of Molossians" refer to the time of the

In conceiving of Neoptolemus as going to Mount Tomarus in the Paean and, probably, to Dodona in the Seventh Nemean, it may be that Pindar thinks of the place where the hero was installed as king, if not of his royal capital. Dodona is likely to have seemed to him an island of Hellenism amid a sea of barbarians, and so a fitting seat for Neoptolemus.¹⁰⁷ But if so, he thinks of a place that was Thesprotian, not Molossian, in his own time. The name that tradition gave to the kingdom of Neoptolemus was "Molossia," but the area to which tradition applied it was much greater than that which obeyed the power of the Molossian kings of the fifth century.¹⁰⁸

The discrepancy between the old myth and contemporary fact may be explained by another story.¹⁰⁹ According to Teucer of Cyzicus (274 *FGrH* F1) and Servius (*Aen.* 3.293),¹¹⁰ Helenus, the son of Priam, who is said by others to have accompanied Neoptolemus on his return journey, founded Buthrotum, where he and Aeneas are said to have settled with their followers.¹¹¹ Other late sources say that Neoptolemus, before his departure for Delphi, left his kingdom to Helenus, and that after the former was killed, Andromache was married to Helenus, and bore him a son, Cestrinus. When Helenus died, he left the crown to Pyrrhus's son, Molossus, but Cestrinus held the land across the Thyamis.¹¹² This was the origin of the royal house of Chaonia and of the independent existence of Cestrine, on

latter. But Strabo speaks of the coast's being occupied by Chaonians and Thesprotians, without mention of Molossians. Hammond himself provides ample evidence against his conclusion: he finds (471 and 473) that Bylliae was called by Hecataeus (1 *FGrH* F104) a "city of Chaonia," that (474) the territory inland from Buthrotum was called "Chaonian" (F105), that (477) Hecataeus *ap.* Strab. 7.7.8 (326) placed the Paroraii and the Atintanes west of the Molossians, that (478) Thucydides (1.46.4), following Hecataeus, had Thesprotia begin south of the Thyamis and the Acheron flow through Thesprotia, that (478) Hecataeus (F105) placed the Ciraean (?) plain near Buthrotum as "in Chaonian territory," that (479) "in the time of Hecataeus (F108) Dodona was certainly in the frontier area between the Thesproti of the upper valley of the Acheron and the Molossi of the plain of Ioannina." Hammond provides a map on page 464.

¹⁰⁷Dodona was one of τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μαντήια (Hdt. 1.46.3) and was consulted by envoys of Periander (5.92). In speaking of Dodona, Herodotus (2.56) says that Thesprotia, which was formerly part of Pelasgia, now belongs to Hellas. Cf. Hammond 422; Nilsson, *Studien* 8-9, 35-37. The scholiast on Pindar (3.129 Drachmann), after explaining that only Neoptolemus, or one of the Myrmidons who followed him to Epirus, is properly an "Achaean man" (*Nem.* 7.64), calls that person Δωδωναῖος. He appears to assume that an Achaean in Epirus must be at Dodona.

¹⁰⁸Hammond (491) doubts that Pindar refers in the Fourth Nemean to the Molossian kingdom. So also Nilsson (above, n.99) 21.

¹⁰⁹Hammond 384-385, 412.

¹¹⁰See Lepore, *Ricerche* 56.

¹¹¹Justin 17.3.6-8 and Virg. *Aen.* 3.291 ff. and 327 ff. Cf. Hammond 412-413.

¹¹²Paus. 1.11.1-2. The Thyamis is said by Thucydides (1.46.4) to mark the boundary between Thesprotia and Cestrine.

the mainland opposite Corcyra. The story assumes the existence of two separate kingdoms under the rule of eponymous kings, the one in the mountains of Molossia, the other in the coastal land of Cestrine. Chaonia was, in fact, separate from Molossia in the fifth century, as Thucydides shows (2.80.5–6), and kept Molossia from the sea.¹¹³ According to the myth, both kings held their thrones by rights derived from Neoptolemus,¹¹⁴ and it is, it appears, his undivided kingdom, extending from the mountains to the sea, that engages the imagination of Pindar.

This conclusion has implications for other difficult passages of the Seventh Nemean. The first comprises lines 64–67:

ἔων δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνὴρ
 Ἰωνίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰ-
 κέων, καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταις
 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν,
 βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις

It is usually thought that the Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνὴρ who dwells above the Ionian sea is the Molossian king of the time,¹¹⁵ for members of the royal house, by a tradition known to Euripides and later sources, claimed descent from Achilles and Neoptolemus, and so might style themselves “Achaean,” according to traditional usage.¹¹⁶ This interpretation must seem doubtful, if the Molossian kings of the time lived inland far from the sea, round the plain of Ioannina and the range of Pindus. It is not certain either that the kings of Molossia made this claim in Pindar’s time. It appears for us first in Euripides’ *Andromache* of ca 425. In 429, according to Thucydides (2.80.6), the Molossians and Atintanes were led in battle by Sabylinthus, the guardian of Tharyps, the boy-king;¹¹⁷ and, presumably not long afterward, Tharyps was sent to Athens to be educated, according to Justin (17.3.11), and was admitted to Athenian citizenship.¹¹⁸ It is attractive to

¹¹³Cf. the maps in Hammond 464 and 614.

¹¹⁴That the marriage of Helenus to Andromache, the relict of Neoptolemus, was known in the fifth century is shown by Eur. *Andr.* 1243 ff.

¹¹⁵Cf. Hammond 383–384; Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 135. But Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 79 and note 28 (80) argues, reasonably enough, that Ἀχαιοὺς . . . ἀνὴρ suits a Thessalian better than a Molossian, and goes on to maintain, with diminished plausibility, that Ἰωνίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων can refer to someone living in Thessaly “beyond (i.e., to the north of) the Ionian sea.” Kirkwood in *CSCP* 38 (1975) 85 appears to find the same sense in the phrase, but takes it as a reference to Epirus. See also Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7 (3.129 Drachmann). The old view of Dissen, that 64–65 refer to the *Achaeorum ultimi*, is revived by E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte* 1 (Heidelberg 1968) 97, as a part of the theme of “near and far.” ἔων δ' ἐγγὺς is an embarrassment for this interpretation.

¹¹⁶Cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.384, 5.803, and *passim*; Pind. *Paean*s 6.85 and *Nem.* 10.47.

¹¹⁷Hammond 500–501.

¹¹⁸M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* 2 (Oxford 1948) no. 173. Cf. the granting of citizenship about 431 to Sadocus, the son of the Odrysian king Sitalces (Thuc. 2.29.5

see in Euripides' claims of Achaean descent for the Molossian royal house a compliment to the young king, perhaps then in Athens, as well as an expression of interest in a region that was important for Athenian foreign policy. Plutarch records (*Pyrrhus* 1) that Tharyps is said to have been first to introduce Greek customs, institutions, and civilisation to the Molossians.¹¹⁹ Indeed, the names of king and guardian are not Greek, unlike the heroic names from the Aeacid line that fill the genealogy of the royal family in the next century, and Thucydides (2.80.5–6) bluntly calls the Molossians "barbarians." It is appropriate to notice the story that when Pericles sent invitations to his pan-Hellenic congress at Athens to all the Greeks of Europe and Asia, his envoys to the "mainland" travelled as far as Acarnania and Ambracia, but no farther (Plut. *Per.* 17; cf. Strabo 1.2.20[28]).¹²⁰ The mysterious gifts of the Hyperboreans, which were brought from the north to the Adriatic and thence southward, were first received in Greek hands at Dodona (Hdt. 4.33.1–2).¹²¹ None of this information encourages us to believe that Pindar would have called the king an "Achaean" or put confidence in his proxy.¹²² To be sure, it has been denied that we have here to do with linguistic, as well as with political and cultural, differences, and Thucydides (1.136–137) has a story, not free from suspicion, of a Molossian king with a Greek name, "Admetus," with whose wife Themistocles once took refuge in his exile ca 470, and Stesimbrotus also (107 *FGrH* F3) knows of Themistocles at

and 67.2). On Tharyps at Athens, see D. S. Robertson in *CR* 37 (1923) 59–60 and Hammond 506–507. Nilsson (above, n.99) 43 is sceptical about the testimony of Justin.

¹¹⁹For interpretations of the text, cf. Hammond 507.

¹²⁰Cf. Ps.-Scylax 33; Hdt. 8.47; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 1; Strabo 7.7.8 (326). The "Congress-Decree" is denounced as a forgery of the fourth century, reflecting contemporary conditions, by R. Seager and A. B. Bosworth in *Historia* 18 (1969) 129–141 and 20 (1971) 600–616 respectively.

¹²¹Cf. Strabo 7.7.1 (321) and Ps.-Scymnus 450–451.

¹²²Cf. Hammond (421–423), who argues that the Molossians were Greek-speaking. I cannot understand Hammond's argument that, because Thucydides can distinguish *βάρβαροι* *διγλωσσοι* (4.109.4; cf. 8.85.2), he means, when he calls the Amphilochians *βάρβαροι* (2.68.6), that "they spoke an uncouth form of Greek." It is possible, no doubt, to speak facetiously of an out-of-the-way accent or dialect as a *φωνή βάρβαρος*: cf. Plato *Prot.* 341e, where Socrates, in a richly comic passage, uses the phrase of Pittacus' Aeolic. But it seems more likely that Thucydides means that the Amphilochians, unlike the Chalcidians of Mount Athos, spoke no Greek at all. On general grounds it is likely that it was the bilinguals who spoke an uncouth, or broken, Greek. Cf., with Hammond, A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 2 (Oxford 1956) 202. Contrast the scepticism about Molossian Hellenism of Nilsson (above, n.99) 1 ff., Lenk in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 16–18, and J. Perret in *REA* 48 (1946) 5, note 2. The inscriptions, which are Greek, are not earlier than the fourth century. The earliest Olympic victory is apparently that of Arrybas of Epirus ca 344: L. Moretti, *Olimpionikai: I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici* (Rome 1957) 125. Strabo 1.2.20 (28) speaks of Homer's knowledge of Hellenes who extend as far as Thesprotia.

the court of "Admetus."¹²³ But "Admetus" has Thessalian connections, as we see especially in Euripides' *Alcestis* (510, 594), where it is the name of a Thessalian ruler whose power extends to Molossia. Whatever may be the value of Thucydides' story, it remains uncertain to what degree the Molossians or the members of their royal house spoke Greek, or claimed an Achaean descent, early in the fifth century. What seems certain is that these half-savage highlanders make strange company for the aristocratic and Apollinian poet.

It is preferable to follow the scholiast in believing that the 'Αχαιὸς ἀνὴρ, "the Achaean man of might" who dwells above the Ionian sea, is Neoptolemus himself. According to a later tradition, Neoptolemus had a son, Anchialus, whose name suggests that his father was known as the hero "beside the sea,"¹²⁶ and in another source Neoptolemus is said to have been "king of the islands off the mainland."¹²⁷ Pindar's combination of epithet and description constitutes an allusive and evocative form of address that seems particularly appropriate for a hero. It is not really an

¹²³The story, like others concerning Themistocles' exile, is open to doubt and the theatrical character of its suppliant-scene has been noticed and a connection with a similar scene in Eur. *Telephus* of 439 or 438 inferred. Scepticism is expressed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen* 1 (Berlin 1893) 151; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*² 3 (Stuttgart and Berlin 1915) 524; Nilsson (above, n.99) 7 and 38; Lenk in *RE* 16.1 (1933) 18. The story certainly testifies to Greek belief late in the century, and Hammond (492-493) and Gomme (above, n.122) 1.267 and 438 incline to accept the story, on the authority of Thucydides. See also Wilamowitz's later thoughts in *Pindaros* 167 and note 2 and Lepore, *Richerche* 150-151 and note 46. But note the comment of P. J. Rhodes in *Historia* 19 (1970) 393 on this point. For the most recent discussions see A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London 1975) 38-41 and R. J. Lenardon, *The Saga of Themistocles* (London 1978) 127-131.

¹²⁴A hero is ἀνὴρ rather than θεός, and the heroes are repeatedly called ἀνὴρ by Pindar, as by Homer; see, e.g., *Pyth.* 2.29 and 37 (Ixion), 4.79, 123, 132, 236 (Jason), 4.182 (Zetas and Calais), 12.18 (Perseus), *Nem.* 5.15 (Pelus and Telamon), *Isth.* 4.53 (Heraclides), 6.46 (Telamon), *Paeans* 8a.19 (Paris). Cf. Slater, *Lexicon* s.v. 1b.

¹²⁵At fr. 140b.6 Snell, the Epizephyrian Locrians are said to live ὑπὲρ Αὔσονια[s] ἀλός. The usage of ὑπὲρ in *Nem.* 7.65 was recognised by Dissen: "regiones mari adiacentes discurrunt ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης sitae, quoniam mari alteriores sunt," who quoted Strabo 7.7.5 (324) (ὑπερκείται ... τούτου ... τοῦ κόλπου Κίχυρος, ἢ πρότερον "Εφύρα κτλ.) and Thuc. 1.46.4 in connection with the coasts of Epirus and Illyria. Heyne's view that ὑπὲρ means "beyond" and that the reference is to Sicilians and Italians is excluded, if Pindar alludes to Neoptolemus (or indeed to the Molossian kings). Cf. Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 135, note 129 and note 115 above.

¹²⁶So Astyanax was named for Hector, who "alone keeps guard over Ilium" (*Il.* 6.403), Eurysakes for his father Ajax, the bearer of the great shield, Telemachus presumably for his father, who "fought afar off," and Teisamenus for Orestes, who "took vengeance." Cf. M. Sulzberger, "ONOMA ΕΠΩΝΤΜΟΝ," *REG* 39 (1926) 381-447, Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2441, and Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 209, note 21. On Anchialus, see above, note 104.

¹²⁷See above, note 104.

objection to this identification that Neoptolemus is said, some thirty lines earlier, to be buried in the ground of Pytho, whereas the Achaean dwells "above the Ionian sea." It cannot be a difficulty, for in the Fourth Nemean Pindar says that Neoptolemus "reigns" in Epirus. The hero, it is clear, is present and powerful in his old kingdom of the mainland, though his body receives veneration at Delphi far to the east.

A god might appear anywhere and be invoked to appear from some distant place, but a hero was in principle a local power, bound to his grave.¹²⁸ He was powerful to help or harm, but his power was generally limited to the regions where he was at home, though his home might be differently conceived in different places and heroes are known to have had more than one grave.¹²⁹ The Persian invasion was the occasion of a number of manifestations. Theseus, who had a shrine near Athens (Paus. 1.30.4), appeared, it was said, at Marathon, as did a strange hero, Echetaios or Echelos, who was represented by Polygnotus in the Painted Porch (Paus. 1.32.5 and 15.3). Kychreus, a local hero, appeared at Salamis in the form of a snake (Paus. 1.36.1), and at Plataea the seven Archegetai were invoked (Plut. *Arist.* 11.3-4), while Delphi was defended by a pair of heroes from that place (Hdt. 8.38-39). On another occasion (Hdt. 5.89) the Athenians thought it prudent to establish a precinct in honour of Aeacus in their market-place before making an attack on Aegina.¹³⁰

It was possible nevertheless to conceive of the hero's power as operating at a distance, as in the case just mentioned, and this was notably the case when a ship was sent, before Salamis, to fetch the Aeacids from Aegina (Hdt. 8.64; cf. 84). It may be that there was an actual transfer of the sacred images, as on an earlier occasion also, when the Aeacids were sent by Aegina to Thebes (Hdt. 5.80-81), though Herodotus does not say this explicitly in either case. Certainly, the Spartan kings took the Dioscuri with them into the field (Hdt. 5.75), and on one occasion sent them as far as Locri (Diod. Sic. 8.32).¹³¹ And the Epizephyrian Locrians, wherever they formed their array before battle, were able to leave a gap in the ranks that was to be filled by Ajax, fighting beside them.¹³² In any case, however the transfer of power was conceived at Salamis, it was held that it was successfully accomplished. The Aeginetans said that the first Greek ship

¹²⁸Cf. M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*³ (Munich 1967) 1.189, 715-716.

¹²⁹Cf. Nilsson 1.188; Eitrem in *RE* 8 (1913) 1119; Pfister, *Reliquienkult* in *RGVV* 5 (1909) 218-223. Four graves of Oedipus were known, at Sparta, on the Areopagus, at Colonus Hippias, and at Eteonus in Boeotia.

¹³⁰In general, see A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome 1958) 91-92; E. Rohde, *Psyche* Eng. trans. by W. B. Hillis (London 1925) 136-137.

¹³¹Cf. Wilamowitz (above, n.23) 2.342, note 2.

¹³²Conon 26 *FGH* Fl. 18 and Paus. 3.19.12 f.

to begin the action was that which had been sent to Aegina after the Aeacids (Hdt. 8.84).

It seems likely then that a hero's power, though limited by its relation to some material base, might possess a considerable variation of range, and that in particular it was not necessarily bound to a single grave.¹³³ It is of especial interest to anyone concerned to observe this flexibility that the Athenians were able to call upon Ajax and Telamon on Salamis, though Ajax could not have been buried there,¹³⁴ and to bring the Aeacids from Aegina, where they could not all have had graves, according to the myths told by the epic. Aegina, like Thebes, was a place where the Aeacids, including those not buried there, might be thought to be at home, very much as Neoptolemus was said by Pindar to "reign" in Epirus and Ajax to "possess" Salamis, though their bodies lay elsewhere.

A belief such as this may be used to explain the Pindaric phrase, ἐὼν ἐγγύς, which presents difficulties otherwise.¹³⁵ If the Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ is Neoptolemus, then the participial phrase that begins the sentence refers to the nearness of the hero and of his power, and the prominence given to it is understandable. "If, though he dwell above the Ionian sea, the Achaean man of might be near, he will find no fault with me." Neoptolemus was particularly to be met in Epirus or at Delphi, but he might, on a suitable occasion, be present with his mighty kinsmen, the Aeacids, on their island of Aegina.¹³⁶ If he came, he was a formidable presence, for all divinities were fearful when they approached and heroes were notoriously difficult. It therefore carries weight to say that the hero will find no fault.

Pindar continues (65-67), still engaged as before in establishing his status as poet in the community:

καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἐν τε δαμόταις
 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν,
 βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσais'

¹³³Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 199, note 4.

¹³⁴There was, however, a shrine (ναός) of Ajax on Salamis: Paus. 1.35.3.

¹³⁵On the Molossian interpretation, it is necessary to believe that a Molossian might have been thought to be present on Aegina on the day of the celebration: cf., e.g., Bury's note on 64. If so, one wonders what could have brought him there and why his presence is signified in so prominent, yet so indefinite, a manner. Gildersleeve, in *AYP* 31 (1910) 150, speaks of "the assuredly improbable case of the presence of an Epirote in the festal crowd." For a different explanation, see E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte* 1 (Heidelberg 1968) 97, note 82.

¹³⁶That Neoptolemus was not usually counted among the Aeacids who were at home on Aegina is suggested by the absence of his name from the great invocation at the end of *Pyth.* 8. ἐὼν ἐγγύς is appropriate to the presence, for good or for ill, of divinities: cf., e.g., Hom. *Il.* 14.417 and 21.285; Hes. *Op.* 249; Aesch. *Eum.* 65; Eur. *Alc.* 1011.

He appeals, as elsewhere,¹³⁷ to the standing given to him by the hospitality of his host, who is here Thearion, and then to the respect that he enjoys in the city. His position is secure, he means, in his relations with hero, host, and city, because he recognises the network of obligations that bind him to the *ἀγαθοί* and to his host, offers as poet the due word of praise to divinities and men, and refrains from all excess and offence to the citizens. He has no reason, he seems to say, to fear indignant censure from any side, no more from the hero's than from men's. All are witnesses to his own honour.¹³⁸

The myth of the return of Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles, is the story of a Thessalian hero whose journey home from Troy took him to Molossia, where he founded a kingdom, to Dodona (it appears), which was known to his father, and finally to Delphi, where he met a violent end but at last received honours. It is relevant to ask about the source of such a myth, and in this case the enquiry is more fruitful than such enquiries often are.

The Catalogue of the *Iliad* knows of a people called the "Enianes," who lived round "wintry Dodona" (*Il.* 2.749–750) and followed a king called Gouneus. Later in the poem, Achilles, praying to Zeus of Dodona (16.233–235), speaks of the Selloi, interpreters who do not wash their feet, sleep on the ground, and live nearby. The Selloi, or Helloi, are apparently the inhabitants of the plain of Hellopia, which was known to Hesiod (*Eoiai* fr. 240.1 Merkelbach-West) as near to Dodona. Their name seems to recur in the names of the Hellenes and of the river Selloeis, which is twice mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.659 and 15.531) in connection with Ephyra. That place in turn may be identical with Ephyra on the Acheron (Thuc. 1.46.4),¹³⁹ to which according to Pindar, Neoptolemus was carried

¹³⁷There are ready parallels at *Pyth.* 10.64 *πέποιθα ξενία προσανείϊ Θώρακος* and *Ol.* 9.83 *προξενία δ' ἀρετᾷ τ' ἦλθον*, where Pindar acknowledges that his status rests on his position as guest of the patron: cf. Slater, *Lexicon* s.v. *προξενία*; LSJ s.vv. *προξενέω* I. 2 and *πρόξενος* II.; also Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 77–78 and 80–81. More commonly he has been thought to appeal to his dignity as proxenus of the Molossian king: cf., e.g., Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 163, 167, the commentaries of Bury and Farnell, etc. Historians, on their side, are divided concerning the evidence of the text: contrast Hammond 384 and 490 and M. B. Wallace in *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 205–206 with F. Gschnitzer in *RE Suppl.* Bd. 13 (1973) 633; see also Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 77–78 and 80–81. The interpretation does not follow Pindar's usage and relies on the doubtful presence in the poem of a Molossian king. It is rejected by Lepore and by Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 135; the latter keeps, however, the Molossian allusion, and the former wishes to substitute a Thessalian proxeny. C. A. P. Ruck in *Hermes* 100 (1972) 151 and note 1 follows the scholiasts in believing that Pindar appeals here to the kinship of Thebans and Aeginetans.

¹³⁸Later Cichyrus: Strabo 7.7.5 (324); Paus. 1.17.4; Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7 (3.123 Drachmann), who mentions three other cities called "Ephyra;" for more, see Strabo 8.3.5 (338), *RE* 6 (1909) 20, and Hammond 478. Hammond 371–373 and Parke (above, n.100) 5–10 give alternative interpretations.

¹³⁹On the Selloi, or Helloi, see G. Restelli (above, n.99) especially chaps. 1 and 2.

by the storm. If this identification is right, the Selloeis in turn may be plausibly identified with the upper Acheron, which takes its rise under Mount Tomarus, near Dodona; or else it may be the Achelous farther to the east. By these means the Homeric association of the Enianes with Dodona and its priests may be caused to acquire topographical credibility as well. But it is a strange fact that the Catalogue associates the Enianes with the Perrhaebians and the lands watered by the Peneius, while the Aenianes, who are presumably the same people, were in historical times also Thessalian. In these circumstances, it is a conjecture worthy of respect that the original Hellenes were a group of tribes that extended from Dodona to the valley of the Spercheius, which flows down to the Malian gulf.¹⁴⁰ In any case, we must, it seems, see in the kingdom of Gouneus in the Catalogue a tribal memory in which were combined experiences both east and west of Pindus.¹⁴¹ Within this context, it is important to notice that Achilles knows the Zeus of Dodona, that his people in Phthiotis are said by Thucydides (1.3.3) to be among those who "were first Hellenes," and that Aristotle (*Meteor.* 1.14 [352a33 ff.]) identified "ancient Hellas" as the region round Dodona and the Achelous.¹⁴²

If there is a tribal memory at work here, the tribe most probably involved is that of the Aenianes, who are presumably the same as the Enianes of the Catalogue. By tradition, they were driven by force from the Dotian plain of eastern Thessaly by the Lapiths, up into Pindus and Molossia, where there was more fighting. Thence they moved into Cassopaea in southern Epirus, and thence to Cirrha near Delphi. In the end they found a home in the upper valley of the Spercheius, and became members of the ancient Amphictiony of Anthela.¹⁴³ In later times at least the Aenianes asserted that they were Hellenes through and through, that their land was Phthia, that Achilles was one of their own, and that all the Thessalians conceded that they were most closely related to Neoptolemus.¹⁴⁴ It is therefore the more compelling to notice that the story of their wanderings matches at almost every point the course of Neo-

¹⁴⁰Lepore, *Richerche* 3 and note 4. Cf. Hammond 382. The case for the identification of the Selloeis with the Achelous is made by Restelli (96 ff.), against Hammond's identification with the Acheron.

¹⁴¹T. W. Allen, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships* (Oxford 1921) 130–137. The parallel between the myth of the wanderings of Neoptolemus and the tribal legend narrated by Plutarch was noticed by Y. Béquignon, *La vallée du Spercheios* in *BEFAR* 144 (1937) 148–158, who thought that Plutarch accommodated the legend to the myth.

¹⁴²Achilles himself speaks of his own country as "Hellas and Phthia" (*Il.* 9.395) and the Catalogue calls his followers "Myrmidons and Hellenes" (2.684). Cf. Restelli (above, n.99) 179 ff.

¹⁴³On the wanderings of the Aenianes, see Strabo 9.5.22 (442) and Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 13 (293f–294a) and the commentary of W. R. Halliday (Oxford 1928) 74–76 and 130. Cf. Y. Béquignon, in *BEFAR* 144 (1937) 148–158, Hammond 382, Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 195–196 and Restelli (above, n.99) 152 ff.

¹⁴⁴Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.34.3. Cf. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 195–196.

ptolemus, the son of Achilles,¹⁴⁵ including what has been inferred concerning his visit to Dodona and the influence of the Amphictions on his cult at Delphi.¹⁴⁶ Given this preparation, it is reasonable to lend credence to the report, though we find it in a romance of the third Christian century, that the Aenianes visited Delphi every four years at the time of the Pythian festival in order to make offerings to Neoptolemus.¹⁴⁷ The author, Heliodorus, provides a colourful and ambitious description of the ceremonies, which are said to include the offering of a hecatomb. But, whatever time and fiction may have done to alter details, the fact of the cult should not be questioned. The Aenianes claimed Achilles and Neoptolemus as their own, and the myth of the latter at least must be the remembered oral history of the tribe.

Concerning the cult of Neoptolemus Pausanias (1.4.4; 10.23.2 and 24.6) tells a story. When the Gauls under Brennus invaded Greece in 279/8 B.C., they were driven back in rout from Delphi by Greek forces, aided by the apparition of the heroes, Hyperochus and Amadocus "the Hyperboreans," Phylacus, and Pyrrhus, son of Achilles.¹⁴⁸ Because of this signal service the Delphians offered heroic honours annually at the tomb of Pyrrhus, where before they made no offerings because he was their enemy.¹⁴⁹

Pausanias admits that the tomb was already there before the coming of the Gauls, and the story implies that Pyrrhus, like the other three, was already a hero of the place. Now modern archaeology has identified the site and discovered signs of Mycenaean occupation (above, 98). Further, as the hero's tomb is within the precinct of Apollo it would be extraordinary to suppose that it was tolerated there but never given appropriate honours by any one.¹⁵⁰ In fact, Pindar says (*Nem.* 7.44-47), it was

¹⁴⁵Except that Pindar, both in the Nemean and in the Paeon, brings Neoptolemus to the "mainland" by sea. Cf. above, note 99.

¹⁴⁶There are two more indications of a connection between the Aenianes and the "mainland" and Dodona. According to Plutarch (*Quaest. Gr.* 26 [297b, c]), the Aenianes sent an ox regularly to Cassopaea for sacrifice, with prayers that they might never return to their old fatherland. Ps.-Aristotle (*De mir.* 133 [843b15-844a5]) says that the Aenianes possessed an inscription which has been thought to refer to a visit to Dodona by Heracles: cf. G. L. Huxley, "A Poem of the Aenianes," *GRBS* 8 (1967) 88-92.

¹⁴⁷As credence is given, e.g., by Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2454-2457, 2459. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 131, note 1 is more tentative. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 195 gives enthusiastic acceptance.

¹⁴⁸Amadocus is replaced by Laodocus at 10.23.2.

¹⁴⁹Accepted as possible by Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 131, note 1; approved by Ziegler in *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2454-2457.

¹⁵⁰Note the protest of Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 192-193, who also gives (194) parallels, at Olympia, Didyma, Delos, Sparta, and Athens, for heroes who received veneration side by side with one of the great gods. Cf. Eitrem in *RE* 8.1 (1912) 1120 ff. and Pfister, *Reliquienkult* in *RGVV* 5 (1909) 450 ff.

fated that one of the royal line of the Aeacids should henceforth lie within the venerable precinct to supervise the right order of the heroes' processions with their numerous sacrifices. The mention of the heroes' processions and many sacrifices agrees with the fuller description by Heliodorus, and Pindar's statement that the burial within the precinct was fated may perhaps be combined with Strabo's assertion (9.3.9[421]) that the tomb was established by an oracle (*κατὰ χρησμόν γινόμενος*).¹⁵¹ Pindar's "supervisor of right order" (*θεμισκόπων*) also recalls the oversight (*ἐποπτεύει*) attributed by the romantic novelist to "Neoptolemus, the greatest of heroes."¹⁵² We recall the conjecture made earlier (above, 99), that Neoptolemus was believed to have the oversight of good order at the very festival where he met his end in disorder, and add now that this might have been at the Pythia.

The simplest summation of the evidence appears to be that the Aenianes made their quadrennial offerings at the tomb of the hero in the fifth century.¹⁵³ But the Delphians, who clung to the temple-myth concerning Neoptolemus' end, though permitting the foreign cult, themselves offered no honours.¹⁵⁴ This hypothesis has, in addition to its simplicity, the advantage of providing an explanation of the difference between Pindar's two versions of the myth. His account in the Paean of the vengeance of Apollo, which was written for the Delphians, is likely to come from a Delphic source and to represent the earlier Delphic myth.¹⁵⁵ The version of the Nemean, which is more favourable to Neoptolemus and therefore more acceptable to his Aeginetan patrons, presumably belongs to the Aenianes, but it conspicuously fails to assert that the Delphians venerated the hero. Pindar goes no further than to say that they were grieved by his fate, implying that it was a breach of their hospitality to strangers. What the poet says is consistent with the view that the attitude of the Delphians in the fifth century differed from that of those, such as the Aenianes, who conducted the processions and sacrifices.

That the Delphians themselves early conceded some formal recognition, even if they did not then establish their own rite, is suggested, not only by the implications of the place of burial, but also by several pieces of literary evidence. As has been noted, Pindar appeals to the sanction of fate for the burial and Strabo mentions an oracle in connection with the

¹⁵¹Cf. Parke and Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* 2. no. 188.

¹⁵²Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.10.1.

¹⁵³Strabo's account (9.3.9 [421]) combines the myth of the hostile Neoptolemus with the legitimization of his tomb by an oracle.

¹⁵⁴Defradas (above, n.5) 149.

¹⁵⁵But cf. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 223, who finds in the Seventh Nemean "the purely Delphic myth," in which the hero Pyrrhus has not been identified with Neoptolemus, the enemy of Apollo. It is a difficulty for this view that Pindar calls the hero "Neoptolemus."

tomb. In addition, Pherecydes (3 *FGrH* F64a) and Asclepiades of Tragilos (12 *FGrH* F15) state that Neoptolemus' body was first buried under the threshold of the temple, and adds that it was later removed to the tomb "by Menelaus." This legend suggests the memory of a time before the establishment of the tomb beside the temple, as if Neoptolemus had not always enjoyed at Delphi the recognition that he received in historical times. Pindar too speaks more positively than has been understood, for he says that God himself safeguards the honour of those who came to Delphi to be his Helpers.¹⁵⁶ The context implies that Neoptolemus was one of these and the effect of the passage is to signify that he owed to God the honour that he received at Delphi. If Pindar uses *Boalbos* of Neoptolemus and other Helpers, it is nevertheless true that the word is a cult-epithet of Apollo himself and indeed the name of a Delphic month. This may be thought to derive from a Delphic festival, that of the Helpers, as the Attic festival of Boedromion celebrated Apollo Boedromios. In that case, it is possible to imagine that Neoptolemus was among the heroes who were remembered by the Delphians at that season.¹⁵⁷ Finally, the Pindaric scholiast (3.125 Drachmann), on what authority we do not know, speaks of an entertainment to which the god invited the heroes (*ἥρωσι ξένια, ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ξένια καλεῖν τοὺς ἥρωας*). This is an unknown rite, and the statement might possibly be thought to conflict with Pausanias, if it were taken to mean that cult was offered by the Delphians. But the notice, like the other pieces of evidence, may instead give an indication of some recognition of Neoptolemus, short of the offering of cult, by a Delphic festival.¹⁵⁸ If so, the Delphians remembered their old enmity, as

¹⁵⁶Cf. above, 112.

¹⁵⁷Farnell, in his note on *Nem.* 7.46, appears to accept the identification by the scholiasts of the heroes' processions with the *ξένια*, which is in turn identified with the Theoxenia. He refers to his *Cult of the Greek States* 4 (Oxford 1907) 292 and 426–427, where however he speaks only of "the Theoxenia, in which the newly-arrived deity extends hospitality to the other gods, especially to Dionysus," without saying anything about the heroes; so A. D. Nock in *HTR* 37 (1944) 152–153 = *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* 2 (Oxford 1972) 585–586. But Nilsson, *Gesch.d.gr.Rel.*³ 1.135 and *Griechische Feste* (1906; repr. Darmstadt 1957) 160–161, speaks of the Theoxenia as an entertainment offered by men to gods and explicitly denies that Apollo invites the heroes to a banquet. Nilsson does not say what the *ἥρωσι ξένια* then were. Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 197 rejects a reference by Pindar to a Theoxenia; contrast Nock 153 = 586, note 46 and 154 = 587, note 50.

¹⁵⁸It may be that Pindar's own language gives an indication of this state of affairs, for in the very passage (*Nem.* 7.46–47) in which he mentions Neoptolemus' oversight of heroes' processions he speaks also of many sacrifices (*ἡρώταις . . . πομπαῖς . . . πολυθύτοις*). By a familiar distinction (cf. *Hdt.* 1.167.2 and 2.44.5; *Is.* 6.51 and 7.30) *ἐναγίσματα* are offered to heroes, and *θυσίαι* only to gods. If Pindar here observes this distinction, he puts the veneration of Neoptolemus in the context of a festival in honour of the god. However, the distinction is not always observed; cf. *Hdt.* 5.47.2 and Nock (above, n.157) 141–166 = 575–597; and at *Pyth.* 5.86 Pindar speaks of *θυσίαι* in connection with

indeed Pausanias implies, only by withholding cult from the hero's grave. This would then be the meaning conveyed in the fifth century by the old temple-myth, that Neoptolemus, in meeting his end at Delphi, was deprived of any share of the sacrificial offerings.¹⁵⁹

On this interpretation of the evidence, the Delphians were later to change their attitude, just as Pausanias says, after the repulse of the Gauls, and it was then that they began to make their own annual offerings to Neoptolemus.¹⁶⁰ Subsequently, if we may trust the description of Heliodorus, they came to take part also in the quadrennial festival of the Aenianes.¹⁶¹

It is possible now to see the meaning of another disputed passage, from the myth of Neoptolemus in the Seventh Nemean (36–40):

ὁ δ' ἀποπλέων
Σκύρου μὲν ἄμαρτε, πλαγχθέντες δ' εἰς Ἑφύραν ἵκοντο,
Μολοσσία δ' ἐμβασίλευεν ὀλίγον
χρόνον· ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρει
τοῦτό οἱ γέρας. ῥῆχτο δὲ πρὸς θεόν. . . .

The last sentence but one has usually been taken to be an interruption of the narrative, whereby the short-lived mythical kingdom of Neoptolemus was connected with the contemporary kingdom of Molossia by means of the long line of Aeacid kings descending from the hero: "and in his honour, this dignity was borne by his race for ever. Now the hero himself had gone to consult the God . . ." (Sandys).

The line seems to have been generally taken in this way until 1946, when J. Perret attacked the standard interpretation, as offered by the French version of Puech.¹⁶² In addition to other criticisms, he pointed to the violence that was done by the translation to the dative pronoun *οἱ*, which seems to be diminished in emphasis and to become a mere possessive.¹⁶³ It is a consequence of this interpretation that the translator has

the veneration of the local Trojan heroes of Cyrene. The scholiast says flatly: λέγεται γὰρ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ θῦσαι ἐναγισμοὺς ἐπέσπενδον. On ἐναγίζειν and θύειν, see Pfister, *Religienkult in RGVI* 5 (1909) 466 ff.

¹⁵⁹It is possible to imagine a similar situation represented in the myth of the defeat of Heracles' attempt on the Delphic tripod, on Defradas' hypothesis: cf. above, note 62.

¹⁶⁰Similarly, Defradas (above, n.5) 124 ff. posits a change in the Delphic attitude to Heracles, though at a much earlier date.

¹⁶¹Fontenrose, *Cult and Myth* 195–196, 198 ff. holds that Heliodorus is evidence for early Delphic participation in the rites of the Aenianes and that Pausanias' story of the Gauls' attack is a form of a much earlier Delphic story, so that Pyrrhus must have taken part also in the defence of Delphi against the Persians.

¹⁶²J. Perret, "Néoptolème et les Molosses," *REA* 48 (1946) 5–28. γέρας is here, as in 101, an honour rather than the actual power of kingship.

¹⁶³E. des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare* (Paris 1947) 31–32 prefers to class the dative as "attributive" rather than "ethico-possessive." In *Pyth.* 4.48, which is sometimes cited as a parallel instance of the latter usage, the position of *οἱ* is quite different.

to insert a subject (Sandys' "the hero himself") at the beginning of the following sentence in order to make a clear connection, after the digression, with Neoptolemus once more. It may be added that parallel passages, in which near-synonyms replace the noun *γέρας*, also point to a meaning different from that commonly found in the Pindaric passage.¹⁶⁴

Perret translated, "mais sa race lui fit toujours honneur de cette royauté," and this seems to be correct.¹⁶⁵ "The people pay to him ever the honours of that kingship." As Perret pointed out, the context presents in Pindaric fashion two pictures, in each of which a misfortune or disaster is balanced by everlasting honour. Neoptolemus missed Scyros, was carried off-course to Ephyra, and reigned as king in Molossia only briefly, but still (*ἀτὰρ . . . αἰεί*) the people honour him as king. Though he went to consult the god and to offer the first-fruits of his booty, he was killed in a quarrel, but it was fated that for all time to come (*ἀλλὰ . . . τὸ λοιπὸν*) he should have his place and his function amid the holy ceremonies. Understood in this way and in this context, the disputed sentence yields a sense that seems inevitable and Neoptolemus remains what he is immediately before and afterwards, the point of reference. The brevity of Neoptolemus' reign is matched perfectly, and Pindarically, by the never-fading freshness of his royal honours which, it was said, God makes to grow. The Fourth Nemean says, we remember, that he rules even now throughout the mainland of Epirus.

Perret assumed that it was the memory of the Aeginetans by which the royal dignity of Neoptolemus was sustained until the present, and he rejected, along with the old translation, any allusion to the kings of Molossia. This latter conclusion is a consequence of his compelling interpretation and demands acceptance on that ground alone. Still, it is fair to say that the conclusion is strengthened by the interpretations put forward in this paper. For if, in the Fourth Nemean, the realm of Neoptolemus is recognised as the mythical, and not the historical, kingdom, and if, in the Seventh Nemean, Pindar puts his confidence, not in his Molossian

¹⁶⁴Pindar uses *φέρειν* with objects such as *δόξα* (*Nem.* 9.34), *χάρις* (*Ol.* 10.17), *βαθύδοξος αἶσα* (*Paeans* 2.57), *τιμὰ* (*Pyth.* 4.278) in the sense of "bring," "offer." At *Pyth.* 2.43, *οὐτ' . . . γερασφόρον* is generally taken as "unhonoured," but the moral proclaimed by Ixion as his punishment is the need to requite the benefactor (24), as though his fall were an ungrateful failure to give honour. Doubtless Ixion, who was born *ἄνευ . . . χαρίτων* (42), is defective in regard to the whole honour-system of Pindaric society. Cf. above, 111. It is worth noting that, when Pindar wishes to convey the sense "possess a *γέρας*," he uses *ἔχειν*, as at *Nem.* 7.100–101. Contrast also *Isth.* 7.21–22 with *Ol.* 13.37.

¹⁶⁵Perret is now followed by Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 70–71 and *Ricerche* 47, note 82. Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* 93 (1973) 131 offers a similar translation, "but the race ever honours him for that royalty." Perret's version is rejected by Radt (above, n.2) 87, note 4 and by Hammond 384, note 1.

proxeny, but in the hospitable favour of Thearion, we have no external reason for believing that in the passage now under study the γένος should be the line of Molossian kings or the γέρας their royal power. These semi-civilised rulers may be dismissed altogether from Pindar's poetry.

On the other hand, it is now possible to be more precise concerning the memory of Neoptolemus' kingship. It is true, beyond doubt, that the Seventh Nemean was written for Aeginetans, and the theme of this poem makes plain, as is done also by the themes of other poems, how great was the dignity of the Aeacids in the eyes of Aeginetans. But it is not much less plain that the myth and the cult of Neoptolemus were conceded to belong to the Aenianes. It must be they, above all others, who, in Pindar's phrase, "ever pay to him the honour of that kingship."¹⁶⁶ In return for this identification we gain from Pindar's text a right to believe that the Aenianes gave him royal honours;¹⁶⁷ and these in turn are recognised as the historical basis in the fifth century of the myth, which is celebrated by Pindar, of the Molossian kingdom of Neoptolemus.

The interpretation of the myth offered here may be held to give support to those who, following the scholiasts, find in the Nemean evidence of the poet's awareness of the Aeginetan attitude towards the Delphic version that he had followed in the Paean. It does not, however, address itself directly to that matter and therefore leaves untouched a number of other passages that bear upon it.

An interesting result of the interpretation that is of general interest for our understanding of Pindar is the light cast by it upon his attitude to myth. He appears here as the interpreter of myths that are given rather than invented. His function is not primarily that of pure imaginative creation, nor that of providing imaginative clothing for an internally-consistent, intellectual doctrine. The truth is offered in concrete and symbolic form in the existing myths, which are ultimately authenticated, not by their imaginative validity, their mutual coherence, nor their correspondence with historical fact, but by their existence and the general veneration that accompanies them.¹⁶⁸ The power and the presence of Neoptolemus are implicit in both.

¹⁶⁶Lepore in *AFLB* 6 (1960) 75 argues that the γένος is Thessalian.

¹⁶⁷Achilles received divine honours in Epirus, according to Plut. *Pyrrh.* 1.

¹⁶⁸Cf. G. Huxley (above, note 2) 43.