PINDAR'S SEVENTH *NEMEAN*

CHARLES SEGAL

Brown University

—To John H. Finley on his sixty-fifth birthday.

Nemean 7[1] has traditionally been accounted Pindar's most difficult ode.

[1] I shall cite the following works by author's name or by the indicated abbreviation: August **Boeckh**, *Pindari Opera* (Leipzig 1811–21): Boeckh's Latin translation and L. Dissen's commentary on the *Nemean Odes* are in vol. 2, part 2 (1821; reprint, Hildesheim 1963), and all page numbers herein refer to this volume. C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964): henceforth, **Bowra, *Pindar***. Elroy L. **Bundy**, *Studia Pindarica* I and II = *Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Philol.*, vol. 18, nos. 1 and 2 (Berkeley 1962) 1–92. J. B. **Bury**, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London 1890). L. R. **Farnell**, *The Works of Pindar* (London 1930–32) 3 vols. John H. Finley, Jr., "The Date of *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7," *HSCP* 60 (1951) 61–80: henceforth, **Finley**, "**Date**." John H. Finley, Jr., *Pindar and Aeschylus* = "Martin Classical Lectures" 14 (Cambridge, Mass., 1955): henceforth, **Finley, *Pindar***. Edwin D. **Floyd**, "Pindar's Oath to Sogenes (*Nemean* 7.70–74)," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 139–51. Joseph **Fontenrose**, *The Cult and Myth of Pyrros at Delphi* = *Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Arch.*, vol. 4, no. 3 (Berkeley 1960) 191–266. Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*[2] (Munich 1962): henceforth, **Fränkel, *D. u. P.***. Hermann Fränkel, review of Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau* (see below), *Gnomon* 6 (1930) 1–20: henceforth, **Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6**. G. F. **Gianotti**, "La *Nemea* settima di Pindaro," *RFIC* 94 (1966) 385–406. Basil L. **Gildersleeve**, "The Seventh Nemean Revisited," *AJP* 31 (1910) 125–53. Giuliana **Lanata**, *Poetica Pre-Platonica* = "Biblioteca di Studi Superiori" 43 (Florence 1963). E. **Lepore**, "La saga di Neottolemo e la VII Nemea di Pindaro," *Ann. della Fac. di Lett. e Filos., Univ. di Bari* 6 (1960) 69–85. Georges **Méautis**, *Pindare le Dorien* (Neuchâtel 1962). Friedrich **Mezger**, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880). Gilbert **Norwood**, *Pindar* = "Sather Classical Lectures" 19 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1945). Aimé **Puech**, Pindare, III: *Néméennes* (Paris 1923). J. E. **Sandys**, ed. and transl., *The Odes of Pindar*[2], "Loeb Classical Library" (London and New York 1919). Wolfgang **Schadewaldt**, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle 1928). F. **Schwenn**, "Pindaros," *RE* 20.2 (1950) 1606–97. Charles P. Segal, "God and Man in Pindar's First and Third *Olympian* Odes," *HSCP* 68 (1964) 211–67: henceforth, **Segal, "*O.* 1 and 3."** Bruno **Snell**, *Pindari Carmina*: I, *Epinikia*[4]; II, *Fragmenta*[3] (Leipzig 1964). Karel **Svoboda**, "Les idées de Pindare sur la poésie," *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 108–20. Ernst **Tugendhat**, "Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. Nemeischen Gedicht," *Hermes* 88 (1960) 385–409. Alexander **Turyn**, *Pindari Carmina* (Krakow 1948; reprint, Cambridge, Mass., 1952). U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922): henceforth, **Wilamowitz, *Pindaros***. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht," *SB Berlin* (1908) 328–52: henceforth, **Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin***. David C. **Young**, "Pindaric Criticism,"

Its difficulty[2] has drawn to it the special attention of some of the century's most distinguished and astute Pindarists. Yet the attraction which the ode has exercised on interpreters lies, fortunately, not merely in its difficulty. *Nemean* 7 is also a great poem.

Wilamowitz, to be sure, found in it, as he wrote in 1908, "nicht viel von der wirklichen Poesie" and apparently took little pleasure in it: "eins der wenigst erfreulichen" was his final judgment a decade and a half later.[3] Yet Wilamowitz considered this unpoetic and joyless ode valuable enough to devote to it a detailed separate study. His important studies of the ode, however, though they contributed much of value, especially in linguistic and textual matters, stressed the "problems" over the questions of literary quality. As a result, in part, of his enormous influence, the amount of literature on the "Rechtfertigungsproblem," the poem's relation to *Paean* 6, and the chronology,[4] has

Minnesota Review, vol. 4, no. 4 (1964) 584–641. For a recent survey of the literature (1958–1966) see Erich Thummer, "Pindaros, 2. Bericht," *AnzAlt* 19 (1966) 289–322, especially 318 and 322. The text cited is generally that of C. M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina*[2] (Oxford 1947), with a few noted deviations. Fragments of Pindar are given according to the numeration of both Bowra and Snell.

[2] See *inter alios* Gildersleeve 126: "It is an ode from which commentator after commentator has retired baffled"; Puech 87: "L'ode a passé longtemps pour être à peu près inintelligible"; Mezger 361: "Das Gedicht ist eines der schwierigsten"; Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 160: "wohl das schwerste aller Gedichte"; Farnell 2.289: "the most difficult of the odes." See also Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 328; Schwenn 1627.

[3] Respectively Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 352 and *Pindaros* 160.

[4] The date of *N.* 7 is still a matter of dispute. Wilamowitz' date of 487 (see *SB Berlin* 344 ff. and *Pindaros* 160) has been rejected, rightly in my opinion, by Farnell 2.184, 289, 402; by Finley, "Date"; by S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958) 90–93; by W. Theiler, "Die zwei Zeitstufen in Pindars Stil und Vers," *Schriften d. Königsberger gel. Gesellsch.* 17, no. 4 (1941) 269–71; and most recently by Bowra, *Pindar* 411. Yet Wilamowitz' date continues to appear as authoritative in important scholarly works: Schwenn 1625; Turyn 172; Snell 1.144; A. Lesky, *Gesch. d. griechischen Literatur*[2] (Bern and Munich 1963) 218–19 = Eng. transl. (London 1966) 192–93; R. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962) 16; Floyd 145, note 13; A. Hoekstra, *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962) 13–14, and Lepore 82–85 (though their reasons differ from Wilamowitz'); and most recently Gianotti 385, note 1. Wilamowitz' date rests on the supposed stylistic parallels between the proems of *Pae.* 6 and *P.* 6 (the latter securely dated to 490). In view of the continuing influence of Wilamowitz' date, it is worth stressing once more how weak and inconclusive this parallel is. To the arguments adduced by the scholars cited above, I add the following minor points: (1) the association of the Charites and Aphrodite in *Pae.* 6 and *P.* 6 does, it is true, occur only here in Pindar's extant work; but such an association is so well established in early Greek poetry that it could easily occur to Pindar in two different poems decades apart: see *Il.* 5.338; Hes. *Theog.* 64, 910–11, *Op.* 73–75; *Hom. Hymn to Aphrodite* 61; *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 194–96; and also Pausan. 6.24.6–7.

far outweighed evaluative studies of the poem as poetry. The biographical approach (or, as it is called by its critics, the "biographical fallacy") may supply invaluable information about the background or circumstances of composition of the poem, but it says little about the poem *per se*.[5]

From the point of view of literary criticism, Schadewaldt's study of *Nemean* 7 in 1928 marked a notable advance over the biographical school. He saw the poem less as a "problem" in biographical reconstruction than as a logical structure with certain clearly defined, formal objectives.[6] The poem contains a progression of motifs (praise of the victor, the power of song to confer immortal *tima*, the victor's father and ancestry, the *philia*-motif, etc.), and these motifs are bound together by varied transitional formulas which can be paralleled in type from other *epinikia*.

There are obvious limitations in this method: excessive concern for the formalistic, an impression of a certain rigidity in the movement of an ode, an emphasis on the typical features that are paralleled in other odes rather than the uniqueness of the individual poem.[7] Schadewaldt seems to have been aware of some of these limitations, for he declares his concern with the question, "wie der objektive Programmpunkt in die subjektive Einheit des Hauptgedankens eingegangen ist und von der persönlichen Absicht seine besondere Gestalt erhalten hat."[8] On the whole, however, Schadewaldt's study of *Nemean* 7, though it elucidates its formal "Programm" and dispels the notion of its being a hopelessly dark, chaotic work, still does not succeed in distinguishing its peculiar poetic qualities or estimating its literary value. And by perpetuating Boeckh's artificial division between "subjective" and "objective," he failed to advance the question of the unity of the Pindaric ode as far as he might otherwise have done.[9]

---

(2) In *P.* 6.2 Pindar says "Aphrodite *or* the Graces"; in *Pae.* 6.4, "Aphrodite *and* the Graces." Since Wilamowitz' entire argument rests on the similarity between the two proems, this small detail is not so insignificant. There are also stylistic and thematic indications of a later date in lines 89, 67–68, 102–5, which are discussed in my notes below (respectively notes 78, 82, 93). I would favor a date between 476 and 460. Hermann's emendation of the Scholia's corrupt date to 467 is as likely an approximation as any.

[5] For the biographical and historical approach to Pindar and its limitations, see Young 587 ff.

[6] Schadewaldt 306–7.

[7] For the limitations of Schadewaldt's methods, see Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6.1–20; Young 610 ff.

[8] Schadewaldt 316.

[9] See Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6.2 ff., 16 ff.; Young 610–11, 623.

One can perhaps come closer to answering these questions by recognizing that, alongside the formal unity of the ode, there is a unity of another kind: a pervasive symbolic unity which consists in the interrelation of certain themes and images throughout the poem. This is not to say that the meaning of an ode can, as Norwood thought, be reduced to a single symbol. Such a view is both an exaggeration and an oversimplification. Pindar does not arbitrarily impose a single central symbol on a poem. There is, rather, a constellation of related images which, as they recur throughout the ode, delineate certain patterns, follow certain rhythms, suggest certain analogies. These, taken together, form the meaning of the ode. The meaning rests not in a specific gnomic utterance or a single passage or a neatly paraphrasable "Hauptgedanke,"[10] but in the total movement and the interweaving of narrative, imagery, factual utterance, and gnomic generalization into a single whole. Such meaning, as always in poetry, is sensuous and concrete rather than abstract. It inheres in the sounds of words, the beat of the verse, the sensuous texture of imagery, the involving vividness of narrative detail, rather than in moral generalization.

The great odes of Pindar (among which I place *Nemean* 7) leave with us the impression that these individual sensuous elements have a relation to one another, a relation that we can at first grasp only tentatively, as the shadow of a solid object. That relation between the sensuous parts of an ode I call, rather loosely, its symbolic meaning. Symbolic, because here the sensuous elements stand both for themselves and for something other than themselves. They have their individual and immediate sensuous impact, yet are also felt as components of some larger structure, as parts of some broader, more complex statement which is complete only when all the parts of the ode are seen together in their full range of interrelation.

Finley, Hermann Fraenkel, Schadewaldt, and others have rightly stressed the fact that Pindar's poetry is totally concrete and non-conceptual.[11] It is of the essence of poetry, however, to reach the universal through the concrete; and in this sense, too, Pindar's poetry, like all

[10] For the pernicious effects of the "Hauptgedanke" or "Grundgedanke" approach to Pindar, see Young, *passim*.

[11] On Pindaric "concreteness" and its symbolical possibilities, see Schadewaldt 306–8; Finley, *Pindar*, Chap. 1; Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 552–53, 564–65.

poetry, is symbolic. Such symbolic meanings are not explicitly stated, nor can they be. They dwell in the concrete objects themselves. Pindar need only bring to life the objects, the figures of his narrative, the settings in all their concreteness, and their symbolic meanings will exist as a part of that concreteness.

The fundamental fact of literature is that the connotative meaning of poetry is not the denotative meaning of prose. "Meaning" in Pindar is not the same as "meaning" in Euclid or Hippocrates. Poetic meaning is contextual, imagistic, associative. It lacks, not the precision, but the abstractness, the ideational "purity" of prosaic meaning. Poetic meaning, unlike prosaic, is not separable from concrete situations (real or imagined), from sensuous impressions created by sound or rhythm, from the influence of surrounding formal patterns. Prose holds us sternly to our specific task; poetry encourages, not revery, but an alert, directed excursion of mind joined with sense. In this way some prose-writers may also be "poetic" (Herodotus, Plato, Livy, Tacitus, Apuleius).

We may then expect meaning in Pindar to be multiple rather than unitary, suggestive and dynamic rather than closed, static, defined and delimited within precise boundaries.[12] Such meanings change, develop, become compounded as the ode gains momentum. Gradually past, present, and future, myth and reality, the metaphorical and the factual interpenetrate and become functions of the overall symbolic meaning of the poem, that highest level of meaning where concrete and universal are one and the same.

By its very nature, of course, the *epinikion* confronts immediate, present moment with past, universal myth. But Pindar makes of this confrontation something unique. He gives us neither charming narrative for its own sake, as does Bacchylides, nor merely encomiastic comparisons of the victor to a mythical hero. Nor does he see the "facts" surrounding the victory as so many prosaic details which he must incorporate into the "Programm." They are instead the scattered lineaments of a not-yet-existing order which are to be composed into a single compelling form; they are hints and aspects of more intense meaning to be discovered and made visible, palpable, like the

[12] See Thomas Hoey, S. J., "Fusion in Pindar," *HSCP* 70 (1965) 235–62, esp. 247–50.

solid temples of song (*P.* 6, *P.* 7, *O.* 6) or the honey or nectar which poetry brings (*N.* 3.77, *O.* 7.7). These "facts," then—the occasion of the victory and the celebration, the local setting, the victor's ancestry and circumstances—become the symbolic vehicles for "the sense . . . of something far more deeply interfused."

I

The immediate starting point of my essay is the interpretation of a single line, 74. This line and its context form an important node of related themes; and, in a sense, this essay is an attempt to elucidate the meaning and demonstrate the importance of lines 74–79 for the ode as a whole. Rather than proceed in terms of a line-by-line analysis, as has already been done in great detail by Wilamowitz, Gildersleeve, and Schadewaldt, I shall move freely between the various parts of the ode and stress their connections with one another through related images and symbols.

Such an approach grows out of the definition of symbolical meaning given above. The connections between the parts of an ode are of a symbolical rather than of a strictly logical or sequential nature. Rather than following a consecutive narrative order, Pindar selects significant details of a myth, highlighted bits of legend, or an unusually vivid concrete object (e.g. Ajax' *λευρὸν ξίφος*, *N.* 7.27), bold and sudden metaphors, all of which are related to one another through a rich network of analogies. Because of these analogies, the whole of the "meaning" of the ode is implicit at any one point. Once the ode is perceived as a whole, nearly any given passage is a potential center and focus of meanings, a point of reference from which one can look both forward and back within the poem's symbolic structure.

Line 74, *εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται*, has been variously interpreted and emended. The verb *πεδέρχεται* regularly means "go in quest of," "search for." In Homer it commonly has the meaning "go among" or "go between," but that meaning is obviously inappropriate here. If *to terpnon* is construed as the subject of *pederchetai*, the verb must mean "follow," "come after": "If there was toil, joy comes after the more." Liddell-Scott-Jones interpret the passage in this way, but cite no other parallel for this intransitive meaning of the verb. When the verb is used intransitively in Homer, it means not "come after," but, as noted above, "go among or between." Pindar

uses the verb in one other surviving passage, *Isthmian* 7.7. Here Zeus visits Alcmene: ἄλοχον μετῆλθεν Ἡρακλείοις γοναῖς. The verb is here transitive and means something like, "went in quest of," "searched out." If the verb, then, has its common meaning in the Seventh *Nemean*, *to terpnon* will be object, not subject; and the phrase will mean "goes in quest of pleasure the more."

The next question is what is the subject of *pederchetai*. One possibility is Sogenes. But after the second-person address to Sogenes in line 70, the change to the third person is impossibly harsh, especially with the second person following in the next sentence (ἔα με, 75). Though Pindar is often accused of abrupt transitions, even he cannot say, "I take this oath to you, Sogenes. If there was toil, he (Sogenes) seeks after the joy the more. Permit me, Sogenes, (to give that joy)."

Recently E. D. Floyd has suggested emending the third-person form to the second person: πεδέρχεαι.[13] This line of solution follows Wilamowitz, who suggested changing the verb to the first person.[14] Later he suggested repunctuating, but the result is an improbably awkward sentence which has met with little favor from editors, and is rightly dismissed by Floyd also.[15] Wilamowitz, however, clearly felt that the only possible meaning of the verb was the transitive "go in quest of."

In fact, the manuscript text (of which there are no variants) gives a satisfactory sense. One need only understand *ponos* as the subject of the verb, and, of course, *to terpnon* as the object. The sentence then reads, "If there was toil, it (the toil) seeks after joy the more. Permit me (to give that joy)." The transitive use of *pederchetai* has also the advantage of making it easier to supply the infinitive which is to be understood with ἔα με. There is perhaps a slight strain involved in having to understand *ponos*, the subject of the conditional clause, as the subject of the main clause also. But the brevity of the sentence compensates for this slight difficulty. Pindar often understands the subject of the main clause from the subordinate clause in the case of personal subjects, e.g. *P.* 8.73–75; *P.* 9.93–94; *N.* 7.11–12.

[13] Floyd 150–51.
[14] Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 340.
[15] See Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 163; Floyd 148–49, and especially note 20, p. 148.

The use of a non-personal noun as the subject of so concrete a verb of action as *pederchetai* is also common in Pindar. Parallels are *Paean* 2.20–22, where μόχθος is subject of φέρει, and *Nemean* 8.43–44, where τέρψις is subject of μαστεύει, a verb not dissimilar in meaning from *pederchetai* here.

In such cases, the noun so treated gains a special emphasis, verging toward, though not quite reaching, personification. In Pindar's mythopoeic mind, almost nothing is entirely abstract. The boundaries between the personal and the non-personal are extremely fluid. Hence Pindar can personify qualities like Hesychia (*P.* 8) or Hora (*N.* 8), cities (*P.* 10, *P.* 12, *I.* 7, etc.), or the tools of his art (the *phorminx* of *P.* 1).[16] The *ponos* of our passage, while far humbler than these examples, belongs here too, albeit at the lower end of this shifting spectrum between quasi-mythical beings and lifeless objects.

Line 74 states a familiar enough idea in Pindar: achievement and effort need the reward of song.[17] Lines 12–13 have already introduced this theme: "Great valor, lacking songs, holds much darkness." Since it is a regular feature of Pindaric imagery to identify song (or the *charis* which song brings) with what is "sweet" (γλυκύ) or "pleasant" (τερπνόν), the *terpnon* of line 74 may easily be understood as implying poetry. Again, one need not go beyond the Seventh *Nemean* to find this association between achievement (toil), song, sweetness, and pleasure: "If one in his deeds hits the mark, he has cast a reason (for song), of honeyed mood, upon the Muses' streams" (11–12). *O.* 1.30 and *O.* 14.5–7 also provide close parallels.

Line 74 appears at first, then, as one of Pindar's common *gnômai*. Yet the particular phrasing of this *gnômê* is a little unusual. Pindar does not say simply, as one might expect, "If there is toil, it (always) seeks after joy the more." Instead of a present general condition, he uses a mixed condition, imperfect in the protasis, present in the apodosis. The shift from imperfect to present may be related to the nature of Sogenes' victory. If lines 72–73 mean that Sogenes won the pentathlon

[16] For such powers and personifications in Pindar, see Franz Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1921) 50–54; also Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 331–32; Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 549 ff., esp. 552. Gildersleeve 145 nicely observes: "To the Greek anything that lives and moves is a person, is man or woman; and that is true of the poets everywhere."

[17] For this *topos*, see *inter alia* *O.* 7.15–16; *O.* 10.91–94; *N.* 4.1–8; *I.* 1.41–46; *I.* 3.7–8.

without having to participate in the wrestling, as many have thought,[18] then Pindar wants to reassure us in 74 that there actually was *ponos*, that the victor fully earned his prize, even though he escaped some of the heaviest of the contest's *ponoi*. The unusual circumstances of Sogenes' victory would then create a situation not quite covered by the usual generalization about effort needing the reward, the *terpnon*, of song; and the unusualness of the situation would be reflected in the slight strain of the language.

But, regardless of the precise meaning of 72–73, the strain in the shift of tenses points also to the transitional function of the whole passage, a point to which I shall return later. As Floyd has recently remarked, "These lines [70–74] thus form the conclusion to that section of the poem which is devoted to the Neoptolemus myth and to Pindar's statements concerning his handling of this story."[19] The tenses of line 74 reflect this transitional function of the lines: the imperfect (*ἦν*) points back to the past, to the recent efforts; the present (*πεδέρχεται*) points to the present achievement (both the victory and the poem) and to the future, the joy to come.

Line 74 has, then, a broader reference, which is related in turn to the importance given *ponos* in the view of the syntax for which I have argued. The *ponos* is not only Sogenes'. It is also Pindar's. Wilamowitz' emendation of *pederchetai* to the first person indicates that he felt the personal reference in *ponos* to be very strong. The clause, *εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεὶς ἀνέκραγον*, in the next line also indicates that Pindar is thinking much of himself in this context; for these words are a hint at the personal criticisms which it is part of the purpose of the ode to answer. Hence this *πέραν ἀερθεὶς ἀνέκραγον* in 75–76 should be read in connection with the *οὐχ ὑπερβαλών* of 66 and the *πὰρ μέλος* of 69. In any case, there is a continuity of personal reference, both before and after the *ponos* passage in 74, which strongly suggests that this *ponos* is the poet's as well as the victor's. The context, then, would support this

[18] For the interpretation of lines 70–73 and a review of previous scholarship, see Floyd; cf. also below, note 30. I no longer in fact believe that there is a reference here either to a foul or to the extraordinary circumstances of Sogenes' victory, as the scholia (followed by most modern scholars) suggest. But I plan to deal with this difficult passage in a separate essay. For my present view, see my forthcoming essay, "Two Agonistic Problems in Pindar: *Nemean* 7.70–74 and *Pythian* 1.42–45," in *GRBS* 9 (1968).

[19] Floyd 143.

interpretation of *ponos*, even if the view of the syntax argued for above were not accepted.

II

What the scope of this *ponos* may be will emerge as we explore the context of this passage more fully.

After speaking of the limitations of human life in 54–60, Pindar in 61–65 becomes personal and refers, in all likelihood, to earlier criticism of his handling of the myth of Neoptolemus in *Paean* 6. The language of lines 61–63 is of special interest:

> ξεῖνός εἰμι· σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον,
> ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων
> κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω.

Pindar here yokes together two of his most common metaphors for poetry: light and water.[20] The two metaphors pervade the poem and help articulate its underlying antithetical structure (see below, section IV). It is through Eleithyia, goddess of birth, that we see both light and dark (3), through her that we obtain "bright-limbed" (ἀγλαόγυιον) youth (4). Water (ῥοαῖσι) and sweetness (μελίφρονα) are connected with the Muse and poetry in 11–12. Immediately after, there is another contrast of light and dark in 13–15: the "darkness" (σκότον) of oblivion is opposed to the "mirror" (ἔσοπτρον) for noble deeds and "bright-veiled" (λιπαράμπυκος) Memory. The next strophe deepens these contrasts, setting the "blind heart" (23b–24) of the crowd that cannot "see the truth" (25) against the light of the ode's beginning. This blindness of the many caused the death of Ajax (25–30); hence the death of Ajax connects the light-dark and truth-falsehood contrasts with that of life and death.

These metaphors of light and water, to return to 61–63, center on poetry and inform this later passage (61–76) with some of the concerns of the opening of the poem. Direct reference to song and speech in 68–69 (πὰρ μέλος . . . ψάγιον ὄαρον ἐννέπων) thus follows the metaphorical talk of poetry in 61–63 and makes explicit what is implicit throughout, namely that a major subject of the ode is the struggle

[20] For "the power of song to illumine" and its connection with water, see Bury 116–17; also Schadewaldt 299, with note 2; Finley, *Pindar* 52–53.

between good and bad poetry, between the harm done by the lying tongue and the life-giving, refreshing boon of truth-speaking poetry.[21]

For Pindar, poetry stands between truth and falsehood. It mediates between the two final realities of human existence, life and death. When rightly used, it bestows immortal life; when wrongly used, it destroys good men (Ajax) and right relation to the gods (see *O.* 1.28 ff.).[22] This double possibility of poetry Pindar indicates in the two contexts in which he uses the word *logos*, here "the fame brought by poetry." In 21 it is used of Odysseus, who profits from false poetry and gets more than he deserves. In 32, to counterbalance the death of Ajax, he uses it of the immortal life of fame (*tima*) through poetry. This *logos* is thus sanctioned by the god (*θεὸς . . . αὔξει*).

Pindar is here developing, in his own personal vein, Hesiod's insight into the two sides of poetry (*Theogony* 27–28):

> *ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα·*
> *ἴδμεν δ', εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.*

For Pindar, as for Hesiod and Solon (frag. 21 Diehl), poets may deal in *pseudea*. Homer's sweetness in 21b (*ἁδυεπής*) is of the negative, cloying sort that appears in the second half of the poem as bringing glut and excess (*koros*) rather than true satisfaction (53–54).[23] Homer's verse has something *semnon* about it, an appearance of stature and dignity (*semnos* is also one of the terms which Aristophanes uses to describe Aeschylus in the *Frogs*, 1061). Yet his charm is hollow and treacherous, attained by "lies and winged device" (22). Against this negative poetry Pindar sets a positive art. To stress the different sides of poetry, he uses the same word for both, as he does with *logos* in 21 and 32. Homer's poetry which "deceives men, misleading them with its tales," (23) is

[21] Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 351, well stresses the ode's concern with "die Verteidigung seiner [Pindar's] komplizierteren Poesie (V. 78) gegen das Geschmacksurteil des äginetischen Publikums."

[22] On Pindar's sense of the two-sided potential of poetry, see the discussion and examples cited in Bowra, *Pindar* 27–30; Svoboda 117–18; Bundy 86 ff.; Norwood 166–67, with notes 8–9, p. 264; Hermann Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt a. M. 1935) 50–51; Segal, "*O.* 1 and 3," 224–25. Tugendhat 394 aptly frames the dichotomy: "Das Wort aber steht wesensmässig immer in der Möglichkeit des Offenbarens *und* des Verstellens, der Wahrheit *und* der Lüge."

[23] For the pejorative connotation of this "sweet-speaking," see Gildersleeve 129 and Lanata 89. Commentators generally cite *O.* 1.28–29: so Dissen *apud* Boeckh, *ad loc.*; Schadewaldt 304, note 1.

called, as poetry often is in Pindar, *sophia*, "skill," "craft." A few lines earlier, however, Pindar speaks of the *sophoi* (17) who know of coming storm and "are not harmed by gain" (οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν, 18). The language is obviously metaphorical. Elsewhere Pindar speaks of poetry in terms of metaphors of winds, storm, voyage.[24] These *sophoi*, these "craftsmen," then, are not only sailors, but also poets.[25] *Kerdos* means not only "profit," in a neutral or (in a capitalistic society) even positive sense; in Greek literature and elsewhere in Pindar (e.g. *P.* 2.78) it is associated with trickery and deceit, with the *pseudos*, *machana*, *kleptein*, and *paragein* of lines 22–23.[26] We have, then, in these lines two kinds of *sophia*, as we have two kinds of *logos*: one which is "not harmed" by trickery, deceit, profit, and one which uses them for its own advantage.

The language of lines 21–24 closely associates Homer and Odysseus. *Pseudea*, *machana*, *sophia*, *kleptein*, *paragein*, *mythoi* are equally applicable to Odysseus and to the poet. Some scholars have even suggested that the οἱ of 22 refers to Odysseus, not Homer,[27] and hence that the trickery described in 22–23 refers to Odysseus also. *Semnon*, which is more appropriate to Homer than to Odysseus, makes this view unlikely, as does the fact that Pindar's theme is poetry here and not Odysseus. But this very possibility in the language suggests an affinity between the hero and the poet who has made him famous.[28]

[24] For storm or voyage as metaphors for poetry, see *P.* 4.3; *P.* 11.39–40; *N.* 3.26–27; frag. 84.10–15 Bowra (=94b.13–20 Snell). See also Bowra, *Pindar* 11.

[25] Some interpreters have felt that the *sophoi* of line 17 are not poets (so Bury 132 and Farnell 1.207). But this view, given the context of the passage, is unlikely. Favoring a connection with poets are Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 334 and *Pindaros* 165; Gildersleeve 129, 134, 146; Finley, "Date," 76; Gianotti 389–90; D. E. Gerber, "Pindar, *Nemean*, 7, 31," *AJP* 84 (1963) 183–85. For the meaning of the term *sophia* in Pindar, see Bowra, *Pindar* 4–7; Svoboda 108.

[26] For the negative significance of *kerdos* in Pindar, see *P.* 1.92; *N.* 5.16–17; *I.* 2.6–10; further examples in Lanata 88–89 and Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6.11. Instructive in the context of *N.* 7.20–24 is *P.* 3.54: ἀλλὰ κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδεται. See also Gianotti 391–92.

[27] So Mezger 366; Fränkel, *Gnomon* 6.12. Puech 97, note 2, admits that "le texte est ambigu," but he also decides in favor of Odysseus. See *contra*, Boeckh's Latin translation, p. 81, and Dissen *ad loc.*, pp. 421–22; also Méautis 51, note 1; Gianotti 392, note 1; E. Des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare* (Paris 1947) 31. The fact that Pindar means Homer and not Odysseus here is made all the more likely by the phrase ποτανᾷ . . . μαχανᾷ in line 22. This expression is very close to one which Pindar explicitly uses in connection with poetry (his own poetry) in *P.* 8.33–34: χρέος . . . ἐμᾷ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾷ.

[28] Gianotti, 393–94 and 400, seems to miss the edge of Pindar's criticism of Homer and

This affinity is developed in the ensuing myth of Ajax and gives a deeper and more serious meaning to the theme of poetry. The wrong use of poetry has definite, concrete effects on the world; and those effects are suggested in the fate of Ajax, who dies because men are misled by false *mythoi*. As often in Pindar, then, the aesthetic and the moral spheres overlap; and Ajax and Odysseus become exemplars and symbols of the tangible wrong which the false poetry creates.

The mythical language of 20 ff. has also an important meaning for lines 70–76, to which we may now return. The story of Ajax, coming in a context where Pindar is talking about good and bad poetry, is relevant to Pindar himself.[29] Ajax, victim of Odyssean guile, was slandered and committed suicide because "the largest portion of men have a blind heart" and cannot "see the truth" (23b–25). Pindar, in his turn, has been slandered; he must, therefore, vindicate his claim to the positive sort of poetry (which he does explicitly in 61–63 and 69), and maintain his freedom from "blame" (*Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεταί μ' ἀνήρ*, 64). His work is on the side of "fair-named justice" (48), for which "three words suffice." "Three words" contrast with the elaborate *mythoi* of "sweet-tongued Homer" or the *δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις . . . μῦθοι* of *Olympian* 1.29, in a similar context. The "witness" for the deeds with which Pindar deals is "not false" (*οὐ ψεῦδις*, 49), a patent contrast with the *pseudea* of 22; and this witness, as I shall argue later, is probably Pindar himself, the true poet who opposes falsehood and upholds justice (*dika*, 48).

This contrast between the two kinds of poetry is resumed in 70–76. What the exact nature of Sogenes' victory was, and how literally the athletic language of 71–73 is to be taken, does not concern us here. But given the fusion between aesthetic and moral realms, the defensive character of the whole context, and the return to first-person language in 61 ff., lines 70–73 must be more than mere assurance that Pindar will

Odysseus. *I.* 4.35–43 does not necessarily prove that Pindar's judgment on Homer in *N.* 7 is favorable. Though Homer is praised for his treatment of Ajax in *I.* 4, the context is quite different from the Homer passage of *N.* 7. The antithetical estimates of the two passages are a reminder of the dangers of demanding total consistency between different odes.

[29] Schadewaldt 304 rightly sees Ajax and his fate as "Paradeigma für die falsche Beurteilung Pindars durch die aiginetische Gesellschaft," though to limit the meaning of the myth to the biographical issue only is too narrow a view, as Schadewaldt himself realizes (p. 323).

not end his poem too soon, as Floyd has recently argued.[30] Sogenes' victory is an opportunity for Pindar to enter the lists against the glozing tongue of Homer and the "dark slander" of the envious, to vindicate Ajax and the simple, traditional *aretê* which Ajax stands for, and to free himself from undeserved criticism.

The *ponos* in 74, then, is part of the same personal struggle which the whole poem manifests; and the use of an athletic simile in the lines immediately preceding confirms the association of the victor's *ponos* with the poet's. The two levels of meaning, athletic and aesthetic-moral, are inextricably woven together by the whole framework of analogies which makes up a Pindaric ode. And as we travel further back on the paths of these analogies, we find that this *ponos* is the suffering of all those who would create anything great and noble; for nothing great is without risk: ὁ μέγας δὲ κίνδυνος ἄναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει (O. 1.81). Hence this *ponos* is, in a sense, Ajax' and Neoptolemus' too.

Two verbal parallels link the *ponos* of 74 with the earlier part of the ode. First, this toil seeks "joy in greater degree." The word πλέον echoes the phrase used of Odysseus in 20–21, πλέονα λόγον. Through the deceptive art of Homer, Odysseus gets "more" than he deserves. But the "joy" which this *ponos* seeks will be well earned and lasting. Second, Pindar has used the verb πονεῖν to describe the sufferings of the Greeks at Troy, τᾷ καὶ Δαναοὶ πόνησαν (36). The collective noun *Danaoi* here unites and includes both Ajax and Neoptolemus. Both are Greeks whose sufferings begin at Troy.[31] Ajax is carried across the sea to "the city of Ilus" (πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν, 30). Neoptolemus, having sacked "Priam's city" (Πριάμου πόλιν, 35) "misses" his homeland on

[30] The question of whether lines 70–73 are only metaphorical or not is extremely difficult: see above, note 18. Elsewhere Pindar uses such metaphors solely to refer to his own artistic-moral position: see *O.* 13.93–95; *P.* 1.42–45; *P.* 11.38–40; *N.* 6.26–28. Floyd has argued strongly for the biographical view that the reference is to Sogenes' victory; but see, *contra*, Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 340 and *Pindaros* 163, with note 4; Schadewaldt, 318–19. On the danger of taking such conventional and transitional passages literally, see Bundy's remarks on these lines, pp. 39–41. One must not rule out the possibility (strong in this case) that Pindar, with his characteristic "fusion," is doing two things at once: justifying himself and alluding to the victory.

[31] For the Greeks' efforts at Troy as *ponoi*, see also *Pae.* 6.89–91. Norwood 85 thinks that the *ponoi* of *N.* 7.36 are an oblique reference to the difficulties and disasters of the *nostoi*, the calamities that overtook the Greeks on their return from Troy.

his return and comes to the Molossians. When he sets sail on his fatal Delphic voyage, he comes "with gifts from the spoils of Troy" *κτέατ' ἄγων Τροΐαθεν ἀκροθινίων* (41). That *ponos* can mean, not just "toil," but intense suffering, both physical and spiritual, appears from Pindar's use of the word elsewhere (*O.* 2.34, *P.* 5.54, *P.* 10.42, *N.* 8.42, *N.* 10.78). In the Eighth *Isthmian* the word has a personal reference too (8–9): "Having ceased from unmasterable evils (*ἀπράκτων κακῶν*), we shall make public something sweet even after suffering" (*ponos*). The word here refers to the concern, danger, and shame which Pindar feels for Thebes during the Persian War. The multiple reference of the *ponos* of *N.* 7.74, then, is part of the recurrent identification which Pindar makes between hero, victor, and poet; or, temporally understood between past, present, and eternal, timeless moment.[32] He thus raises not only the victory, but also the poetic act, to a significance and a validity comparable to what the myths of the gods and heroes possess.

III

This multiple reference to poet, mythical hero, and athletic victor in the *ponos* of 74 bears also on the difficult lines 31b–36, where the *ponos* of the heroes is explicitly mentioned:

> *τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται*
> *ὧν θεὸς ἁβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων.*
> *βοαθοῶν τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου*
> *μόλον χθονός. ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις*
> *κεῖται, Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πράθεν,*
> *τᾷ καὶ Δαναοὶ πόνησαν.*

The text which I give here is essentially that of Bowra, Farnell, and Snell, but with two important modifications: *μόλον* for *μόλεν*, and a period after *χθονός* instead of a dash (Bowra, Snell) or a comma (Farnell). Interpretation depends on whether one reads *βοαθοῶν*, *βοαθόων*, or *βοαθόον*; and whether one reads *μόλον* or *μόλεν*. Farnell,[33] whose commentary on the passage is probably the most lucid of modern attempts at solution, has made the following points clear: (1) *μόλον* and

[32] For Pindar's tendency "to assimilate the poetic to the athletic process," see Hoey (above, note 12) 251; and for the implications of this identification, Segal, "*O.* 1 and 3," 224–25, 241–42. For this identification in *N.* 7, see Bowra, *Pindar* 334–35.

[33] Farnell 2.291–95.

μόλεν have equal authority in the textual tradition. (2) The reading βοαθόων (genitive plural, "helpers") with τοί as the relative pronoun—the view strongly maintained by Gildersleeve and followed by Sandys and Turyn[34]—gives puzzling and unsatisfactory sense ("heller Unsinn," said Wilamowitz).[35] It seems odd that heroes "who have come to the earth's great navel" at Delphi should be singled out from other heroes as deserving of special fame. (3) Wilamowitz' ἀβρὸν . . . λόγον . . . βοαθόον is an "awkward and suspicious complex" and should be rejected as improbable.

One is then left with the reading printed above, or with that of Farnell, Bowra, and Snell, which has μόλεν in 34. Reading μόλον and following the punctuation given above, one may translate this text as follows:

> There is honor for those for whom the god increases a rich account though they are dead. Helping, I came to the great navel of the broad-bosomed earth. And he lies (here) in the soil of Delphi, Neoptolemus, after he sacked the city of Priam where the Greeks also toiled.

Among modern scholars, Wilamowitz and Fraccaroli have defended μόλον as the first person singular, "I, Pindar, came to Delphi. . . ." I believe that they are right, though my interpretation differs from theirs on other points. First, let me indicate some of the difficulties of the third person singular form.

If μόλεν is read, the subject does not appear until long after the verb. In itself, such a construction is not impossible, but at the beginning of the myth it is harsh. It creates an abrupt, somewhat confusing introduction to the central myth of the poem. The dashes with which Bowra and Snell surround ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις κεῖται seem a somewhat arbitrary expedient wherein the editors confess their feeling of the looseness and uncertainty of the narrative movement.

A second and more serious objection to the third-person form, μόλεν, is the meaning of βοαθοῶν. Whom is Neoptolemus "helping"? Farnell assumes that Pindar uses the word to redeem his earlier unflattering picture of Neoptolemus in *Paean* 6. Neoptolemus' "helping" at Delphi would then refute the legend of his coming to Delphi to sack

[34] Gildersleeve 148; Sandys *ad loc.*; Turyn *ad loc.*

[35] Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 163, note 2. His fullest discussion of the passage is in *SB Berlin* 335–37. Also G. Norwood, "Pindar, *Nemean*, VII, 31–35," *AJP* 64 (1943) 325–26.

the temple. Against this view there are two objections. First, as Farnell himself admits, Pindar "nowhere mentions or alludes to the story of his [Neoptolemus'] intended sacrilege."[36] *Paean* 6 speaks only of Apollo's anger at the hero's killing of "old Priam at the altar of his courtyard" (113–15). And this tale of murder, of which Neoptolemus' devotees might well have preferred not to be reminded, is in itself enough to have provoked their angry criticism of Pindar. The second objection is more general. Both Tugendhat and Méautis,[37] in their excellent recent studies of the ode, have convincingly argued that Pindar does not recant on Neoptolemus as fully as some scholars (including Farnell) have thought. Pindar will admit that Neoptolemus has a positive side too, but he does not necessarily take back the criticism of the hero offered in the *Paean* (see also below, section VIII). Such an interpretation would also undercut Farnell's reading of *βοαθοῶν . . . μόλεν*.

I come, then, to the first-person reading, *μόλον*. This gives a smooth introduction to the myth. Pindar has come, figuratively, to Delphi to aid the hero who suffered there. In saying, "I came to Delphi helping Neoptolemus," he is making use of a transitional device very closely paralleled in *O.* 6.22–28. There Pindar, speaking both in the first person singular and first person plural, gives orders to yoke up the victorious mules "that I may come to the ancestry of the victors" (*ἵκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν καὶ γένος*). "One must fling open for the mules the gates of song, and today *I* must go at the timely moment to Pitana, by Eurotas' ford." Pitana, Iamus' grandmother, brings him

[36] For a useful survey of the diverse legends of Neoptolemus' death, ancient sources, and recent bibliography, see Fontenrose 212 ff., with his notes; also Lepore 72–76. Farnell's view of Neoptolemus' "helping" the god has been defended recently by Gerber (above, note 25) 187, with note 18. But this view is open to the same objections outlined above (though Gerber's point against Norwood's criticism of Farnell [above, note 35, p. 326] is well taken). The parallel which Gerber draws between Neoptolemus and Socrates' "helping the god" in Plato, *Apol.* 23B7, is interesting, but of little real bearing on the case, especially since it is precisely a phrase like *τῷ θεῷ* which is lacking in Pindar. And, of course, Plato is himself using both "god" and "help" in a very special way, and means a very different kind of "help" from that which a Pindaric hero would bring. Nor would Plato be entirely happy with the identification of his *theos* with Pindar's, and, one may hazard, vice versa.

[37] Méautis 55–56; Tugendhat 404 ff.; further discussion below, section VIII. A similar view of Pindar's attitude to Neoptolemus is apparently taken in a forthcoming study of *N.* 7 by E. L. Bundy, referred to by Fontenrose 223, note 14.

into the myth, which begins forthwith in the next line (30); and the Eurotas is the geographical point of entrance to the myth of Iamus, which occupies the center of the ode (30–70). In both *N.* 7 and *O.* 6, then, there is a figurative journey from the actual place of celebration to the setting of the myth. In both odes this metaphorical movement introduces the detailed narrative of the myth itself.

This notion of the poet's coming to help with song is also a fairly common motif in other odes: *O.* 13.96–97, *O.* 14.17–20, *I.* 5.21–22 (cf. also the poet's journey to Delphi, real or imagined, in *P.* 8.58–60). But even more to the point is a passage very closely associated with that of *Nemean* 7 and verbally reminiscent of it, namely the proem of the Sixth *Paean.* This passage contains a participial clause closely analogous to the meaning and the construction which I have claimed for *βοαθοῶν . . . μόλον* in *N.* 7.33–34. The relevant lines are as follows (*Paean* 6.9–11):

> . . . ἦλθον
> ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀλέξων
> τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμαῖς.[38]

And immediately thereafter Pindar speaks, still in the first person (*κατέβαν*, 13) of coming "to the grove of Apollo," where the Delphian maidens dance "by the earth's shaded navel," *χθονὸς ὀμφαλὸν πάρα σκιάεντα* (*Pae.* 6.17). One may compare the expression in our passage (*N.* 7.33–34): *παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου . . . χθονός.*

If *N.* 7.33–34 are understood as here suggested, it is possible that the participle *βοαθοῶν* may have as its understood object not only Neoptolemus, but also the *ἁβρὸν λόγον* of the preceding line (here of course to be supplied in the dative case). Pindar himself then becomes the "helper" who champions the "rich account" which the god increases for heroes. He appears, then, in his full moral dignity as poet, aiding the god's purposes and advocating the right mode of speech, as opposed to the hollow, undeserved *logos*, the *pseudea* and *mythoi* of 20–24. And simultaneously he also champions Neoptolemus, who has suffered, as has Pindar himself, from misunderstood *mythoi* and from slander. And we may here return once more to that association and suggestion

[38] Gianotti, 396–99, who also reads the first person (though for the rest he follows Wilamowitz), has called attention to the parallel with *Pae.* 6.9, but has not used the entire passage as fully as he might have.

of sympathy between poet and hero implied in the echo, *πόνησαν* (36) and *πόνος* (74).

The participle *βοαθοῶν*, if understood as modifying Pindar, forms a proud and definite first-person declaration. It confers upon the poet an active, heroic role. He sees himself as a protector, a champion. In using the participial expression, he shows himself to us in the midst of action, "helping." He is defending himself, the hero, and his poetry; but this triple defense is ultimately unitary, for in all three cases he is defending truth, nobility, and justice (see *dika*, 48) against falsehood, meanness, and treachery.

Lines 31–36, so understood, have implications for another difficult passage in the poem, lines 48–50:

> *εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει·*
> *οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ,*
> *Αἴγινα, τεῶν Διός τ' ἐκγόνων.*

"For fair-named justice three words shall suffice; not false is the witness who stands by the deeds, Aegina, of your and Zeus' descendants."

The verb *ἐπιστατεῖ* has a meaning closely analogous to that of *βοαθοῶν* in 33, "to stand by," "aid."[39] If Pindar is the "helper" in line 33, then, he may be the witness who "stands by" in 49. The poet who "went to Delphi" to aid the hero is naturally the "witness" to his fame, as well as the preserver of it in song. Wilamowitz, for different reasons, felt that Pindar was the "witness."[40] Most interpreters (Farnell, Bowra, Schadewaldt, Puech) have argued for Neoptolemus.[41] But, as Finley has pointed out, "it seems illogical that an Aeacid should attest the deeds of Aeacids."[42] Also, Neoptolemus is himself too controversial a figure to be adduced with such confidence as the witness to Aegina's fame. In such a context one would expect Pindar to invoke a "witness" about whom there could be not the slightest trace of doubt,

[39] See Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1248.

[40] See Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 162, with note 2, who also points briefly to the connection between lines 33–34 and 49.

[41] Farnell 2.296–97; Bowra, *Pindar* 73, with note 2; Schadewaldt 313; Puech 99, with note 1. Mezger 368 suggests a compromise: "Man hat dabei nicht an eine einzelne bestimmte Person zu denken, sondern an die Bedeutung, welche die Zeugschaft im Gerichtsverfahren der Dorier überhaupt hatte"; but this is not very convincing. That the "witness" is Pindar has recently been strongly reargued by Tugendhat 395, with note 1.

[42] Finley, "Date," 80, note 43.

one of whom he can speak with the fullest assurance. From this point of view Finley's suggestion of Apollo is possible.[43] Yet Pindar has been remarkably reticent about Apollo in this ode: it is Eleithyia, Zeus, and Heracles whom he invokes by name; Apollo is only the vague θεός of 40 and 46. There is good reason for this reticence, for if one is going to praise Neoptolemus, it is better not to emphasize associations with the god who destroyed him to avenge his brutal slaughter of Priam (*Pae.* 6.109–20).

There is another point in favor of Pindar as the "witness," namely that falsehood or truth (cf. *pseudis*) is a standard more fittingly applicable to the poet than the hero. And since the word echoes the earlier discussion of poetry in 20–24 (cf. *pseudea*, 22), it is the more easily understood as reflecting Pindar's concern in the ode with his art and his conception of poetic truth. In *O.* 4.2–5 Pindar explicitly calls himself (in the first person) the "witness" of the victor's "loftiest prizes" (Ὧραι . . . μ' ἔπεμψαν ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων).[44] In naming himself here in 49 as "witness," Pindar vindicates his own name, Aegina's glories, and the truth of his poetry at one stroke.

IV

These problems of the interpretation of specific passages will, I hope, have broached some of the issues of the poem and cleared the ground for a fuller consideration of the literary qualities of the ode. Of these I turn first to structure.

Thematically, the ode may be divided into four main sections: lines 1–16, 17–43, 44–79, and 80–105. Both within these sections and between them there swings a pendulum-like antithetical movement. This antithetical structure in Pindar is familiar enough from passages like *P.* 3.86–103 or *N.* 6.1–7 (the movement of the latter Hermann Fränkel describes as the "archaischen Pendelschlag des Gedankens von Gegensatz zu Gegensatz").[45] But it is not often enough stressed that such antitheses may fill and organize an entire ode.

[43] Finley, "Date," 77. Later Finley inclined to accept Pindar as the "witness," but he added, "The point is minor, because he [Pindar] remains in any case the seer and spokesman of the god's purpose" (*Pindar* 101–2).

[44] In a Parthenion the leader of the maiden-chorus also describes herself in the first person as a "trustworthy witness" (πιστὰ μάρτυς): frag. 84.29 Bowra (=94b.29–30 Snell).

[45] Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 540; see also *Gnomon* 6.8, with note 2.

Some of the antitheses in the first main division, the first sixteen lines, have already appeared from the foregoing discussion. The poem's major symbolic dichotomies—darkness and light, death and life—are created in this first section. Eleithyia, goddess of birth, begins the poem; and in the train of this life-filled beginning come the themes of light (*φάος*, 3; *ἀγλαόγυιον*, 4; *ἔσοπτρον*, 14; *λιπαράμπυκος*, 15) and song (*ἀείδεται*, 8; *φιλόμολπον*, 9; *ῥοαῖσι Μοισᾶν*, 12; *ὕμνων*, 13; *Μναμοσύνας*, 15; *ἀοιδαῖς*, 16). Against these positive elements there are also negative ones: the "black night" (3) which we also see through Eleithyia along with "light" or "day" (*φάος*); the "abundant darkness" (*σκότον πολύν*, 13) which the Muses' streams dispel through "bright-veiled Memory" (12–15); and the uncertainty and adversity of human destinies (5–6). In the generally luminous atmosphere of this proem these passages hint at something darker and foreshadow the gloomier tone of the following section. The proem thus in itself suggests those antitheses which become more deeply marked as the ode proceeds.

The second section (17–43) contains the myths of Ajax and Neoptolemus. I mark the end of this section at line 43 for a number of reasons: the obvious climax at Neoptolemus' death, the continuity of mood, and the change that comes with the contrasting sentence, line 44.

The contrast with the first section is clearly marked. Many details have been discussed above and need not be repeated. The passage emphasizes death (Ajax and Neoptolemus) and deceptive, false poetry, over against the themes of birth, fame, and poetry well used in lines 1–16. In the center of this second section and forming the transition between the myths of Ajax and Neoptolemus, comes a gnomic reflection which again poses the two sides of the ode's main antitheses: on the one hand, the inescapable power of death which comes on all alike, the one who expects it and the one who does not (30–31b); on the other hand, the glory (*tima*) that comes through poetry, the "rich account" (*ἁβρὸς λόγος*) which the god causes to flourish even for the dead (31b–32). Lines 33–34, then, show Pindar facing this dichotomy and taking his stance on the side of life and fame: "I came to Delphi helping. . . ." But this section of the ode turns back into death with the ensuing story of Neoptolemus (34–43). The penultimate detail of the passage is the sordid violence, vividly and succinctly conveyed, of a man lunging at the hero with a knife (*ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὕπερ μάχας ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ'*

ἀνὴρ μαχαίρᾳ, 42). The fact that the second strophic system ends at this point isolates and highlights this lurid bit of narrative. The section ends, therefore, on à note of death, meanness, violence.

The third movement (44–79) is perhaps the most complex in the poem. Here the antitheses developed in the first two parts of the ode confront one another and begin to be resolved. This section begins hesitantly, still under the mood of the preceding movement, but it gradually gains confidence as the positive side of the ode's dichotomies prevails. That confidence culminates in the first-person statement of 70–76 and the following brilliant lines on the Muse (76–79).

This section, then, is crucial for the complex mood of the ode and requires attention in detail. It opens with a reply to the ominous βάρυνθεν of 43, a word which carries over into the third strophic system the gloomy mood of the preceding myth, related almost entirely in the second strophe. This reply is contained in the phrase ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον, which recalls the more balanced tone of the ode's first line, where the birth-goddess is invoked in the company of the "deep-thoughted Fates" (*Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων*). Past suffering, then, while not denied, is seen as part of a larger scheme, the meaning of human destinies over which the Moirai preside.

Not only does the *morsimon* of 44 echo the *Moirai* of line 1, but the ἡροΐαις . . . πομπαῖς of 46 echo the πομπαί of 29. The *pompai* which brought Ajax to his death in the gloomy second section of the poem are here a mark of the honor which Neoptolemus is to have as the "overseer" (θεμισκόπον) of the "processions of heroes graced by many sacrifices" in the place where he met his death. These *pompai* provide a significant link between Ajax and Neoptolemus. The death of Ajax is, within this poem, left bleak and unmitigated. For Neoptolemus, however, there is ultimately glory out of pain. In the final condition of both heroes the idea of seeing is involved: Ajax perished because the blind crowd could not "see the truth" (τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, 25); Neoptolemus will himself discern[46] (-σκόπον, in θεμισκόπον, 47) what is right. The hero killed in an unruly quarrel over sacrificial meats (42) will in the future see to the orderly performance of those very sacrifices (46–47). Thus the antithetical structure of the ode (cf. ἀλλά, 44)

[46] For the idea of seeing in *skopos*, see *P.* 3.27; also Homer, *Il.* 2.792, 24.799, *Od.* 16.365, etc; *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 62. See also Burton (above, note 4) 84.

emerges as itself the expression of the moral structure of the world; and that structure is itself *to morsimon* for mortals.[47] Part of this moral structure is also the contrast between the falsehood (*pseudea*, 22) which destroyed Ajax and honored Odysseus (20–30), and the assurance that there stands "no false (*pseudis*, 49) witness" for Neoptolemus' deeds (49). The explicit reference to *dika* in 48 also forms part of the moral framing of the poem's antitheses.

The first strophe of this third section, then, modulates from despair back to confidence; and its first line (44), with the strong antithesis marked in the ἀλλά, is in itself another statement of the poem's pervasive antithetical structure. The strophe ends, therefore, with a declaration of confidence about boldness of speech: θρασύ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν (50). The opening word of the antistrophe is correspondingly "bright," φαεννα῀ς (51), a return to the positive tonality of the proem which the *morsimon-Moirai* echo has already prefigured.

The note of hesitancy returns, however, in the reference to the limitations of human happiness in 54–58, a passage which recalls the lines on the uncertainty of *potmos* in the proem (5–6). Here too Moira recurs (57), now for the third time in the ode. Thearion, the victor's father, is the subject of these reflections. They too have a positive side. Though Thearion has not the "firm fulfilment" (τέλος ἔμπεδον, 57) of happiness, he has the "fitting measure of wealth" (ἐοικότα καιρὸν ὄλβου, 58) and sound understanding (σύνεσιν οὐκ ἀποβλάπτει φρενῶν, 60). He is, then, rather like the *sophoi* of 17 who are not "harmed by gain" (βλάβεν, 18).

There is here also a certain parallel between Pindar and Thearion: both are *sophoi* after their fashion, both have come to know the harder side of life, and both have a moral sense of due limits (cf. Pindar's οὐχ ὑπερβαλών, 66). This association explains in part the rapid shift from the address to Thearion in 58–60 to the first-person statement of 61 ff.: ξεῖνός εἰμι. And more deeply behind this association lies the Pindaric equation of the moral and aesthetic realms. Thearion's knowledge of the *kairos*[48] has its aesthetic analogue in Pindar's avoidance of the

[47] See Méautis 53; Tugendhat 408–9, who finds such a moral structure in *Pae.* 6 also.

[48] For the moral connotation of *eoikos* also, see *O.* 1.35; *P.* 3.59; cf. Segal, "*O.*1 and 3," 217–18.

wrong sort of poetry (66–69). Behind both stands the fate of Neoptolemus, shifting from disgrace and death to honor. The risks, then, of Neoptolemus, Pindar, and Thearion (and of Sogenes and Ajax too) are all ultimately akin, though lying in different planes of action. All have to confront and solve the problem of right action amid the shifting movements of human *potmos* (5–6, 54–57).

The difficulties of human happiness described in 54–57, then, are answered by the moral ideas of limits and understanding. This moral understanding is exercised by Thearion in the realm of affairs and wealth (58–60) and by Pindar in the realm of art (61 ff.). As noted earlier, Pindar returns to the light-dark antithesis of the proem in 61–62 and to the life-giving qualities of poetry in the ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοάς of 62, a clear echo of the ῥοαῖσι Μοισᾶν of 12.

The confidence and directness of this passage (61–63) carry over into the next strophe. Pindar is here willing to face even Neoptolemus' onetime subjects, the Molossians, who dwell over the Ionian sea (64–65). His language in 65, προξενίᾳ πέποιθ(α), has the same simplicity and forthrightness as line 61: ξεῖνός εἰμι. In both cases, he states his trust in a personal relationship with religious overtones, *xenia* and *proxenia* respectively. And not only may he rely on his friendships abroad: he can speak with confidence also of his relations with his fellow-citizens: ἔν τε δαμόταις ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν (66). The light-imagery (λαμπρόν) resumes once more the positive side of the poem's antitheses which was touched on also in φαεννᾶις (51) and, negatively, in the "dark blame" (σκοτεινὸν . . . ψόγον) of 61 (cf. also σκότον, 13).

The sea in 65 is part of an important sequence of imagery in the ode. Associated here with the distant Molossians, it has sinister connotations. In the second section of the poem, Pindar connects it with risk and death (cf. τριταῖον ἄνεμον, 17; κῦμ' Ἀΐδα, 31). Later he will speak of a jewel which the Muse takes from the sea (76–79). The victor himself was "unwetted" in the contest (ἀδίαντον, 73), but the poet is the giver of the "streams" of song (13, 62).

The oath of 70–76 emerges as the confidence which Pindar has been working toward in the earlier part of this section. Here too there are reflections of the difficulties which he had to overcome. Not only does he speak of *ponos* in 74 (see above), but he also glances back at the previous struggles in the promise of 76: "If uplifted too far I shouted

out anything, I am not harsh at repaying my debt of poetic grace (*charis*) to the victor" (75–76). The words πέραν ἀερθείς recall the dangers of excess touched on earlier (cf. *koros*, 52b, and in general 58–60, 66–69). The verb καταθέμεν, however, has an importance which is not generally noted. It is a metaphor taken from the language of business.[49] It thus takes up the mercantile imagery of 17 ff., with the hint there of commercial ventures over the sea and the talk of profit (*kerdos*) and rich and poor (ἀφνεὸς πενιχρός τε, 19). That passage was the introduction to the negative second section of the ode. There the language of business is correspondingly pejorative: *kerdos* is something to escape; *sophia*, cleverness, skill (in sailing or in commerce as well as in poetry) can deceive by falsehoods (cf. 22 ff.). Profits can be wrongful, for an Odysseus can get "more" than he deserves. In lines 75–76, however, Pindar's promise to "pay his debt" has behind it the solid honesty of the true poet, the true *sophos* who is not harmed by profit (17–18). His words stand at the farthest remove from the dishonesty implied throughout 17–25. The imagery contained in καταθέμεν, then, combines with the sea-imagery of 65 and 76–79 to reinforce the contrast between the third and second sections of the ode.

With the fourth and last major thematic section of the ode (80–105), I shall deal more briefly, both because it is simpler and because some of its aspects are treated in a different connection later. Here Pindar returns from the heavily mythical and metaphorical style of the third section to the present setting and the formal requirements of the *epinikion*: the victor, his home, the local cults surrounding it, hopes for his and his family's future happiness. As in the first section of the poem, a positive tone predominates, though with a delicate admixture of uncertainty. The final utterance of the ode is actually a sort of "coda," a highly personal statement, reaffirming the poet's belief that he has not injured Neoptolemus. The mocking tone of the very last line (on which more below, section VIII) is the final confirmation of confidence and certainty of his position; and this certainty is given with a sunny flippancy, which is, to say the least, surprising in so generally somber a poem. Yet it is a mark of the completeness of the victory which Pindar feels he has won.

[49] The verb is almost a *terminus technicus*: see Schadewaldt 320, with note 1; *LSJ* s.v., I.3.

To summarize, then, the poem is divided thematically as follows:

1. 1–16: Introduction: life and poetry.
2. 17–43: Death and deception.
3. 44–79: Hope and confidence arising out of death and slander.
4. 80–105: The present and the future: hope, but uncertainty; final victory. (102–105b: Coda: Pindar's personal victory.)

The main antithesis of the poem comes at the ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον of 44, the division between sections 2 and 3. It gains emphasis from the fact that thematic and strophic divisions nearly coincide between these two sections. This point, then, is the crucial juncture between life and death, light and dark, truth and falsehood, the positive and negative sides of the Neoptolemus-myth. It is also roughly the mid-point of the ode.

V

It may at first seem strange that Eleithyia, goddess of birth, should begin an ode concerned with the right uses of poetry, an ode addressed to a pentathlic victor and involved with the unhappy myths of Ajax and Neoptolemus. One of the more plausible scholiasts' explanations, given on good Hellenistic authority, is that Sogenes, still a boy, was born to Thearion late in life. There may be some truth in this explanation; but, even if so, it would not be the whole truth. One must not confuse origins with final meaning. Eleithyia's importance rests not in Sogenes' youth or Thearion's age, but in what Pindar has made of this biographical *donnée* (if such it is) in the structure of his poem.[50]

Eleithyia is, in fact, more than a birth-goddess. As Farnell points out, she was "recognized by many states as a great power in the divine world."[51] In the ode, then, she may stand for what is vital and fruitful for man in the world. She connects human striving and success with

[50] The scholiasts' biographical explanation is followed, with various minor modifications, by Bury 116; Gildersleeve 144–45; Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 329–32; Puech 87. Doubts as to the validity of this view were expressed as early as Dissen (*apud* Boeckh 417), and these have now been elaborated by H. Fränkel, "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 385–97, especially 391–94. Some of the recent work on the ode has also tended to break away from the narrowly biographical view of Eleithyia: see Méautis 50–51 and Tugendhat 407–8. Gianotti 386, however, returns to the biographical view, albeit in a modified form.

[51] Farnell 1.203.

the life-energies of nature and the gods. Hence she is not invoked alone, but carries in her train a host of kindred deities: the Moirai, Hera, Hebe. Hermann Fränkel comments, "Die Wesenheiten lassen sich nicht vereinzeln, denn sie haben ihre Bedeutung nur in dem Gefüge des grossen Ganzen das wir 'das Leben' nennen."[52] It is this coherence of life as a whole, life inclusive of, but extending beyond, man, that Eleithyia brings to the poem. For the victor, she has more than biographical significance, for she leads the favoring powers which have presided over his growth to this point of success and she assures him, as Finley remarks, that his life "is lapped in divine forces."[53] And in an ode where the symbolical attributes of poetry are water and light, the goddess of birth has a very proper place (one may be reminded of Lucretius' metaphor, *in luminis oras*, for birth and his not un-Pindaric association of physical and spiritual creativity).[54]

From the very beginning, then, Eleithyia gives the ode its roots in expansive, hopeful possibilities eventually to be fulfilled. In her the antinomy of light and darkness comes to rest, for she stands in a larger, calmer realm, where the oppositions of envy and honor, blame and praise, have no place. It is through her that all mortals see *both* the light of day and the darkness of night (2b–3). She presents, then, that higher vantage-point from which men may, at times, discern the grand unity of life through the murky particulars of their individual and divided circumstances. This unity—a sense of the interrelatedness of the visible and the invisible, of nature, god, and man—is one of Pindar's most deeply held convictions and most constant aims. It finds expression in the memorable proem of *Nemean* 6:

> *Ἓν ἀνδρῶν*
> *ἓν θεῶν γένος· ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ πνέομεν*
> *ματρὸς ἀμφότεροι.*

Eleithyia, like the "one mother" of these lines, is an expression of that unity. Her connection with the goddesses of destiny, the Moirai, is asserted in the first line. Like them, she contains the larger pattern of

[52] Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 551.

[53] Finley, *Pindar* 153.

[54] See J. P. Elder, "Lucretius 1.1–49," *TAPA* 85 (1954) 88–120, esp. 91–93, 102 ff., 107–13. For light and birth in Pindar, see *O.* 6.43–44, *N.* 1.35–36.

the meaning of life (*to morsimon* in 44), subsuming the oscillations between the poles of joy and suffering which mortals experience.

The primeval associations between water and birth also give Eleithyia special relevance to poetry, for the poet sprinkles fresh water from the "Muses' streams" to preserve great deeds from death. It is "with her aid" that Sogenes is sung (*σὺν δὲ τὶν . . . εὔδοξος ἀείδεται*, 6–8). She stands, then, on the life-giving side of the poet's task. In terms of the antithetical gnomic statement of 30–32, she belongs with the "rich account" which the god "increases" (*αὔξει*, a word suggesting growth and life: see below, note 69), over against "the wave of Hades common to all."

The hope for life symbolized by the birth-goddess, however, is realized only after the death of Ajax and the darkness of falsehood and slander which surrounds Neoptolemus. Life and birth are confirmed, late in the poem, shortly after the confident Sogenes-passage (70–79), in the story of the siring of Aeacus (84):

λέγοντι γὰρ Αἰακόν
νιν ὑπὸ ματροδόκοις γοναῖς φυτεῦσαι.

Here too the theme of birth is coupled with that of poetry or song; for in the previous sentence, the opening of the fourth and last thematic section of the poem, Pindar gives orders to "whirl about in peaceful mood the much-sounding shout of songs" (*πολύφατον θρόον ὕμνων δόνει ἡσυχᾷ*, 81–82). The word *ὕμνων* takes us back to the theme of song broached in the proem (*ὕμνων*, 13). The oxymoron, "whirl . . . peacefully" (*δόνει ἡσυχᾷ*) points to the resolution, under the large order of Zeus (cf. *Διὸς δὲ μεμναμένος*, 80), of the poem's tension between praise and slander, the positive and the negative sides of poetry. This resolution is amplified in the tale of Aeacus' birth in the next lines, for it is to be told *ἀμέρᾳ ὀπί*, "with tame or gentle voice."[55] These two words of gentleness, *ἡσυχᾷ* and *ἀμέρᾳ*, recall also the adjective *ἁβρός* used of the right poetry's gift in 32 (cf. also *προπράονα*, 86). They contrast with the violence from which Pindar has had to defend himself in the past (cf. *πὰρ μέλος*, 69; *ἀνέκραγον*, 76), just as the gentle

[55] The attempt of Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 341, note 1, to keep the reading of D, *θεμερᾶ* (= *θεμέρᾳ*), "sedate," "solemn," is implausible and difficult metrically. All recent editors read *ἀμέρᾳ*. But see now Douglas Young, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 21.

tale of Aeacus' birth contrasts with the violent stories of death connected with Ajax and Neoptolemus.

The birth of Aeacus, then, counterbalances the death of Neoptolemus; the compromised hero is redeemed by his solidly respected ancestor. The story of Aeacus' birth in 82–86 is in fact the culmination of a subtle pairing of these two heroes throughout the poem, another aspect of the poem's antitheses. In 44–45, where Pindar is explicitly concerned with the compensations for Neoptolemus' death, the name of Aeacus is present in *Αἰακιδᾶν*: it is fated that in recompense "some one of the Aeacids" be buried in the sacred precinct. And to strengthen the connection with 82 ff., Pindar used the same adjective, *εὐώνυμος*, to praise the Aeacids in both cases (*εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν*, 48; *εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ*, 85). And in both passages Zeus is mentioned as the ultimate founder of the line (50, 80).[56] Still further back in the ode, Aeacus has another prominent appearance: the proem speaks of Sogenes inhabiting "the song-loving city of the spear-clashing Aeacids" (9–10). Here too the phrase *πόλιν φιλόμολπον* is echoed in the *πολίαρχον* used of Aeacus himself in 85.

Aeacus brings assurances of harmony in other ways also. As brother and guest (*ξεῖνον ἀδελφεόν τ'*) of Theban Heracles (86), he asserts in mythological terms that relationship of guest-friendship which Pindar has claimed directly in 61: *ξεῖνός εἰμι*. In this way too he soothes the outrage of *xenia* caused by Neoptolemus (cf. *βάρυνθεν δὲ περισσὰ . . . ξεναγέται*, 43). Pindar's relationship of *xenia* with Aegina has been threatened (cf. also Pindar's reference to his Molossian *proxenia*, 65), but it is cemented by the mythological friendship between the Theban and the Aeginetan hero.

Aeacus, then, recurs throughout the poem as a reassuring presence, a reminder of happier possibilities in the face of the suffering associated with his wayward descendant. It is fitting, therefore, that he should serve to make the transition from the third to the final section of the poem. The kindliness (cf. *προπράονα*, 86) of his bond with Heracles prepares for the gentle and personal tone of the closing section of the ode, where Pindar invokes Heracles to pray for the victor's family. If, as 5–6 and 54–60 suggest, Thearion has had his share of suffering, then Aeacus' line is proof that unhappiness does not persist always in a family,

[56] Schadewaldt 321.

that the unhappiness of the father may be followed by the success of the son, or vice versa. Pindar feels such alternation between generations strongly, and elsewhere compares them to the rhythms of natural growth (*N.* 6.8–11; *N.* 11.37–39).

There is another aspect to the transitional function of the Aeacus-Heracles passage of 82–89: it continues the interweaving of the mythological and the personal which occurs at the end of the ode's third section, lines 70–79. Within 70–79 the direct, first-person statement of 70–76 is followed by the mythological language of 77–79; in 86 ff. the mythical ties of Aeacus and Heracles point transparently to Pindar's personal ties of *xenia* and *philia* with Aegina. It is to the mythological and metaphorical language of 77–79 that I shall now turn, for these lines cap the slow upward progress from death to life in the ode and thus immediately precede the birth of Aeacus at the beginning of the following section.

VI

εἴρειν στεφάνους ἐλαφρόν· ἀναβάλεο· Μοῖσά τοι
κολλᾷ χρυσὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἁμᾷ
καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας ὑφελοῖσ' ἐέρσας.

"To weave garlands is easy. Strike up the tune. The Muse welds gold and white ivory together and the lily flower [of coral] taking it from the sea's dew."

These lines (77–79) are set apart from the preceding and given special emphasis by the strong pause created by *ἀναβάλεο*, 77. As the scholiast notes, the verb means "strike up the prelude." It thus marks a new start. After the generalized review of past *ponos* in 74, it confirms the victory of the positive side of the poem's antitheses.

It is clear from the "weaving of garlands," a conventional metaphor for poetry,[57] which introduces the passage, and from the Muse, who begins the main statement, that Pindar is speaking here of the special qualities of his own art. Most poets "weave garlands," but Pindar's work is not of the ordinary sort. "Any journeyman," paraphrases Norwood, "... will produce for you, without effort or inspiration, a string or so of poetical flowers; but the genuine Muse toils at her task,

[57] The weaving of garlands as a metaphor for poetry is familiar enough in early Greek lyric poetry and can be traced back probably as far as Sappho (frag. 188 Lobel-Page = 125 Bergk): see Bowra, *Pindar* 16; Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 369, with note 38.

welding three elements into a solid and enduring crown."[58] Precisely because Pindar is trying to convey something of the wonder, mystery, and uniqueness of his artistic creativity, he has need of symbolic language. Gold, ivory, the sea, and dew are evocative substances whose combination can have many resonances of meaning and exceed with the unconvertible "plus" of great poetry any attempt to translate them into single-dimensional, conceptual equivalents. Since Homer and Hesiod, poets have invoked the Muse as an acknowledgment of the mysterious, foreign realm from which the immortal work of art has its life. A great modern poet's attempt to explain the "mysterious existence" which he feels in works of art might serve as a prose paraphrase of our passage:

> Die Dinge sind alle nicht so fassbar und sagbar, als man uns meistens glauben machen möchte; die meisten Ereignisse sind unsagbar, vollziehen sich in einem Raume, den nie ein Wort betreten hat, und unsagbarer als alle sind die Kunst-Werke, geheimnisvolle Existenzen, deren Leben neben dem unseren, das vergeht, dauert. (Rilke, *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*, Letter I.)

The Muse, then, welds together three precious substances into a jewel. It is significant that Pindar does not actually name this jewel. To call it a "jewel," or, with some interpreters, a "diadem," goes beyond what Pindar actually says. I shall continue to speak of a "jewel" for the sake of convenient reference. Yet it is important to recognize that "jewel" translates nothing in the Greek. Pindar gives us no word for the finished thing. What he describes is only the *process* of creation: the precious substances themselves, ornately rendered, and the Muse's "welding." Pindar sees his art, then, not so much as a finite, completed object, but as an activity, a state of vibrant energy or life-filled being.

Gold is generally mysterious and wonderful in Pindar, associated often with permanence and divinity.[59] Ivory is redolent of exotic Eastern luxury and wealth. It may, as Norwood has suggested, have some connection with the ivory gate of false dreams in the *Odyssey*. This ivory is also λευκόν, "white." One is reminded of the "stele whiter than Parian marble" which, along with gold, represents the

[58] Norwood 107.

[59] For gold and its significance here in *N.* 7, see Finley, *Pindar* 53–54, 102; "Date," 78.

perdurable brilliance of poetry in *N.* 4.81–85.[60] In any case, the white ivory resumes the light-dark imagery introduced in the poem's first section, where the Muse is also first named (12); and it gives a positive touch to the light-dark antithesis developed in the third section (51, 61, 66).

These associations make the jewel an appropriate symbol for Pindar's art and for the "true" poetry in general. The Muse conjoins living with imperishable substances: the hard metal and the delicate coral which appears in Pindar's periphrasis as the "lily flower" taken from the sea.[61] If coral appears as a flower, then the jewel contains elements from the major states of physical existence: inanimate, outside of growth or death (gold); and animate (ivory, "flower"). The animate side comprises both animal and plant realms (ivory and "flower" respectively). The Muse's art thus spans and brings together the basic elements of our world.

Though these lines are set off from the preceding part of the poem by the new "striking up" of the lyre (77), they follow naturally from earlier hints in the poem. The lushness of language in the lines is prepared for by the *terpnon pleon* of 74. This extraordinary creation of the Muse is itself the "joy," the more than usual reward for the unusually difficult *ponos*. The lines, then, following upon the *ponos* of 74,

[60] For the significance of the adjective *leukos* and the *Odyssey*, see Norwood 108. With *leukos* in *N.* 7.78, cf. also the "honey mixed with white milk" (*leukon gala*) that forms part of the "drink of song" in *N.* 3.76–80.

[61] "Lily flower," it should be noted, is not a certain translation of the phrase λείριον ἄνθεμον, since the adjective, at this date, may have associations of brightness and delicacy rather than a reference to a specific flower. The ideas of delicacy and brightness may perhaps be present together here, as they seem to be also in Bacchylides 17.95, λειρίων . . . ὀμμάτων. On the meaning of *leirios*, see R. C. Jebb, *Bacchylides* (Cambridge 1905) 385–86; F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Halle 1914) 213; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, fasc. 12 (1961) pp. 100–1; J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemosyne* 31 (1903) 114–16; and most recently J. Stern, *RBPhil* 45 (1967) 42, note 1. The identification of this "flower" with coral is not absolutely certain either, but is extremely likely. The scholion *ad loc.* gives two apparently traditional explanations: coral, or purple dye obtained from the *murex*; but the former is surely the more appropriate to the context and to the notion of "welding." The idea of coral as an underwater plant which hardens as it emerges from the sea (the explanation given by the scholiast) is not uncommon in ancient authors: see *RE* 11 (1922) 1373–77, s.v. "Koralle." Ovid, *Met.* 15.416–17, is especially to the point: "sic et curalium, quo primum contigit auras / tempore, durescit; mollis fuit herba sub undis."

constitute one source of that promised *terpnon*, ultimately the conquest of death by art.

Stylistically, the passage is also an example of the "luxuriant speech" (*habros logos*) which provides lasting fame to heroes (31–32). The adjective *habros* might well describe lines 77–79. It is worth noting here that *habros* itself in 32 is an unusual epithet for *logos*. Pindar usually applies the adjective to material objects or persons: girls, parts of the body or the body itself, luxurious dwellings.[62] The sensual Hippolyta of *Nemean* 5, for example, is *habra*. The closest parallel to the *habros logos* of our passage is the κῦδος ἁβρόν of *Isthmian* 1.50.[63] Even here, however, the context makes clear the emphasis on the tangible and physical which *habros* has: this *kydos habron* is juxtaposed with the material reward (*misthos*, *I.* 1.47) of labor; and it constitutes, in fact, a "gain" of a special and higher sort (κέρδος ὕψιστον, *I.* 1.51). The adjective *habros*, then, when used of *logos* in *N.* 7.32, implies the rich concreteness and solidity of what poetry confers. That implication of *habros* in 32 is made manifest in the rich, solid creation of the Muse in 77–79.

The verbs of 77 and 78, εἴρειν and κολλᾷ, both suggest craftsmanship, care, delicacy of touch, intense concentration on detail. Yet they also form part of the confident note which these lines strike. They seal the ode's progress out of death and violence to the quiet, civilized and civilizing work of the Muse. They contrast, thus, with earlier verbs of violent action: "strong" Ajax "fixed" his sword in his breast (ἔπαξε, 26); Neoptolemus "sacked" Troy (πράθεν, 35); a nameless man "drove" at Neoptolemus with a knife (ἔλασεν, 42b). The Muse's work is not only gentle, but also implies joining and union, ideas strong in both εἴρειν and κολλᾷ. Thus as gentleness and refinement oppose savage violence, so bringing together opposes war's dissolution (the sack of Priam's city, 35) and forcible separation of a man from his home (Ajax in 29–30, Neoptolemus in 36–37).

These victories of civilization over violence are subsumed in the general struggle of life against death throughout the ode. In so far as

[62] For such associations of *habros*, see for instance *O.* 6.55–56; *P.* 3.110; *P.* 8.88–89; *P.* 11.34. Also W. J. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962) 392–93.

[63] The same phrase occurs also in *O.* 5.7, but *O.* 5 is probably spurious: see Bowra, *Pindar*, Appendix III, 414–20.

the Muse confers immortality, she stands firmly on the side of life. Elsewhere Pindar closely associates the Muse with immortal life.[64] In *Pythian* 3.88–95, "hearing the Muses singing on the mountains" is part of the extraordinary happiness which Peleus and Cadmus enjoy. That favor accompanies their marriage to goddesses and their vision of "the gods on their golden thrones," all images of a success which transcends mortal limits. In *Isthmian* 8.62–66 Pindar draws on *Odyssey* 24.60 ff. and has the Muses sing at Achilles' grave as a sign of his immortal fame:

> τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντ' ἀοιδαί τι λίπον,
> ἀλλά οἱ παρά τε πυρὰν τάφον θ' Ἑλικώνιαι παρθένοι
> στάν, ἐπὶ θρῆνόν τε πολύφαμον ἔχεαν.
> ἔδοξ' ἆρα καὶ ἀθανάτοις,
> ἐσλόν γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοις θεᾶν διδόμεν.

The first line (62) of this passage recalls the *habros logos* sentence of our ode (*N.* 7.31b–32). Though Pindar does not speak explicitly of immortality in 77–79, the "welding" of hard substances contrasts with the fragile, perishable crowns, which are "easy to weave" (77).[65] The verb κολλᾶν is generally used of large, solid objects: gates, chariots, houses, and the like.[66] Hence it provides a further suggestion of permanence. The "flower" metaphor for coral also suggests growth, like the αὔξει of 32.

The "lily flower" of which this firm, welded jewel consists is simultaneously something of delicate beauty and something which endures. It contrasts, therefore, with the "pleasant flowers of Aphrodite" (τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια, 53) which are named in the context of perishable, unstable gifts (cf. 54–58) and belong among things which bring satiety (*koros*, 52b). Such sweetness is cloying and ungenuine, unlike the sweetness which lies in restraint and limits (see 52, ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργῳ). And as these fleeting *anthea* contrast with the coral *anthemon* which the Muse welds into a durable creation, so their

[64] For the Muses and immortality, see Finley, *Pindar* 48, 131 ff.; Young 620, with note 172, p. 638.

[65] For this implicit contrast between fragile garland and solid jewel, see Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 560. His point was anticipated by Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 340, note 1, and see also *Pindaros* 163, note 4.

[66] E.g. Homer, *Il.* 4.366, 15.678, 19.395; *Od.* 21.164, 23.194; Herodotus 1.25; Aristophanes, *Equ.* 463.

sating "pleasure" (cf. *τέρπν' ἄνθεα*, 53) contrasts with the true *terpnon* (74) which will, after suffering, emerge from the *ponos* of the past.

The closing phrase of this passage is one of the most suggestive and difficult utterances in the poem: the Muse is described as "taking it [the coral flower] from the sea's dew," *ποντίας ὑφελοῖσ' ἐέρσας* (79). These mysterious words, of importance, if for no other reason, because of their position closing a main section of the ode, continue several major strands in the imagery of the ode and carry the pervasive life-death antithesis further toward resolution.

The "sea's dews" take us back indirectly to Eleithyia. Mysterious emergence from the waters is an old and familiar symbol for birth (cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 188–200), and one which Pindar himself uses explicitly (see *O.* 1.25–27). Water, light, life (birth) are thus all present here together in a context describing the Muse and poetry, exactly as in the proem (see especially 11–16).

The phrase *ποντίας . . . ἐέρσας* is a bold oxymoron. It juxtaposes opposite qualities: the freshness of dew and the salt sea.[67] The dew, mild liquid, belongs with the poet's life-giving "streams of song" (cf. 12, 62). In the two other places where *ἔερσα* occurs in the *Epinikia*, it is also connected with poetry. In *N.* 3.76–79, the poet sends a "drink of song" (*πόμ' ἀοίδιμον*)[68] which contains honey, milk, and dew: *κιρναμένα δ' ἔερσ' ἀμφέπει*. In *N.* 8.40–42, the growth of *areta* through poetry (*<ἐν> σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν*) is compared to a vine flourishing and reaching up to "the liquid air":

> *αὔξεται δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις*
> *ὡς ὅτε δένδρεον οἶνας,*
> *<ἐν> σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖσ' ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὑγρὸν*
> *αἰθέρα.*

In this passage, the life-giving associations of the dew are clear both from *χλωραῖς* and from the simile of growth itself. Like the *δένδρεον οἶνας* of *Nemean* 8.40b, the coral "flower" of our passage implies an analogy between organic growth and poetry, which in turn rests on poetry's gift of immortal life. Hence the *αὔξεται* of *N.* 8.40 helps show that this same image of growth and life is probably present in the *αὔξει* of

[67] Compare Lucretius' phrase, *rorem salis*, 4.438.

[68] For the meaning of this expression see Bowra, *Pindar* 3.

N. 7.32.[69] One further passage is relevant here, *I.* 6.62–64. Speaking here of the "brilliant" (*aglaoi*) family of the victor, Phylakidas, Pindar says that they brought a noble "share of songs into the light," and "water" their clan with "the loveliest dew of the Graces":

> ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἵαν μοῖραν ὕμνων·
> τὰν Ψαλυχιδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων
> ἄρδοντι καλλίστᾳ δρόσῳ.

He uses *drosos* here instead of *eersa*, but the imagery is closely akin to the passages discussed above: water and light are connected with poetry and with the capacity of men to reach what is life-giving and creative in their world.

Yet in line 79 of our passage dew is paired with sea, and sea is no gentle force in Pindar or other Greek poets.[70] In *Nemean* 7, especially, it is connected with the negative side of the ode's antitheses: the "storm" which the *sophoi* know about and escape (17–18) and the "wave of Hades common to all" which "falls on the unsuspecting and the knowing man alike" (30–31). The reference to a "storm" in 17 is followed by a generalization about the power of death (19–20) which anticipates the bleak saying of 30–31. Sea also unites the unhappy fates of the two main mythical figures of the ode. Ajax traverses the sea to meet his death at Troy, "Ajax whom the blasts of the straight-blowing West Wind carried to Ilus' city" (29–30). Neoptolemus, having sacked Troy, "missed Scirus in sailing back" (36). The sea has some sinister associations too in line 65, where Pindar says that the Molossian who dwells "beyond the Ionian sea" will not blame him; for sea here points back to the unfamiliar, remote kingdom of Neoptolemus and to the savage background of that ambiguous hero.[71]

[69] For this verb and the idea of organic, biological growth, see also *O.* 7.62; *N.* 9.48; frag. 140 Bowra (=153 Snell); cf. also *O.* 6.105 and Ibycus, frag. 6.5 Diehl (=286.5 Page). For "dew" and poetry see also *P.* 5.98–100. The possible association of *habros* in *N.* 7.32 with *hêbê*, maintained by Verdenius (above, note 62) and others (see Frisk [above, note 61] vol. 1 [1960] s.v.), and hence its association with the idea of growth or "ripeness," would strengthen this connotation of αὔξει in *N.* 7.32.

[70] For the sinister force of the sea in Pindar, see *O.* 1.71; *O.* 6.100–5; *P.* 2.79–80; *N.* 6.55–57; *I.* 4.21–22; also Segal, "*O.* 1 and 3," 226, with note 38; Albin Lesky, *Thalatta* (Vienna 1947) 209–11 and also 227–29.

[71] The Molossians must have seemed remote, perhaps even uncouth, to Pindar and his audience. Note his description of the βουβόται πρῶνες of Neoptolemus' Molossian realm, *N.* 4.52–53; cf. also Aeschylus, *Prom.* 829–32. Thucydides names the Molossians

Sea, then, is a trial both for poet and hero, symbolizing the primal violence from which gentler creations are born. But just as Eleithyia, at life's mysterious, calm center, can hold both light and darkness (2b–3), so the Muse who fashions the jewel of art draws it both from the mild, gentle element and the dangerous, destructive one: both from the "dew" which confers life and the "sea" which points back to death and suffering.

The Muse as giver of immortal life in art is thus related to the physical life bestowed by Eleithyia. And as water is traditionally connected with birth, so the Muse in Pindar is often named in close association with water (e.g. *N.* 4.1–5, *I.* 8.64);[72] and this association appears elsewhere in ancient literature as well (e.g. Hesiod, *Theogony* 5–8 and 39–40; Plato, *Phraedrus* 235C–D, 278B–C; Horace, *Odes* 1.26 and the "Pindaric" ode, 4.2).[73]

In Homer, Euripides, and Plato, the fresh water of streams and fountains symbolizes the positive possibilities of safety, peace, and creation, whereas the salt water of the sea symbolizes potential chaos, disorder, passion, and death.[74] Pindar is fond of repeating that he draws poetic inspiration from the fresh water of Thebes' sacred fountains.[75] He does not here elaborate this antithesis between fresh

among other *barbaroi*: 2.68.1, 80.6, 81.3. See, in general, Lenk, "Molossi," *RE* 16.1 (1933) 15 ff., esp. 16–19. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 168, remarks of a hymn of Pindar to Dodonean Zeus, "So etwas wird den Dodonaeern nicht oft geboten sein." See now N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 419–24. For a different view of lines 64–65, see Lepore 78–81.

[72] See also *O.* 7.7 and, in general, Bowra, *Pindar* 25.

[73] For the Muses and water, see Lanata 87; also Sittig, "Hippokrene," *RE* 8.2 (1913) 1853–56, esp. 1854. The Graces are also frequently associated with water (e.g. *O.* 14.1–2; *P.* 12.26–27; *N.* 4.1–5); and the close affinity between the Graces and the Muses is well known: see Svoboda 111; M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford 1966) on line 64 (p. 177).

[74] For this symbolic antithesis between sea and fresh water, see Homer, *Od.* 5.322–23, 420, 441, 451–53; Euripides, *Hippol.*, *passim*, and my analysis of this theme there, *HSCP* 70 (1965) 117–69; Plato, *Phaedrus* 243D. For similar sea-symbolism in Lucretius, see W. S. Anderson, *TAPA* 91 (1960) 21–22. In Sophocles, *Trach.* 112–22 and 144–50, escape from the sea is connected with innocence and freedom from passion and elemental violence. In a tantalizingly fragmentary passage Pindar speaks of his poetry as a "siren voice" which "silences the sudden blasts of the West Wind" and brings calm when the sea is raging: frag. 84.10–15 Bowra (=94b.13–20 Snell). On the interpretation of this fragment see Bowra, *Pindar* 26, who rightly cites *I.* 7.38–39, where "calm out of storm" is the metaphorical equivalent of peace after life's troubles.

[75] See e.g. *O.* 6.83–86; *P.* 9.88; *I.* 6.74.

and salt water, but it is perhaps implicit in the contrast throughout the poem between dangerous sea and the "streams" of song. The "sea's dew" of 79 resolves the antithesis on the side of life and order, for it treats the sea's salt liquid as refreshing dew and answers the threat of "Hades' wave" (31) with the restorative power of artistic creation.

Yet the verb *ὑφελοῖσα* in 79 is a small and subtle touch which does not deny entirely the continuing force of destruction connected with the unruly sea. The verb suggests something of poetry's risk. The Muse "secretly snatches" her "lily flower" out of death's element. Deeds have much darkness (13–14). Death is common (19–20, 30–31). Even the Muse acts with knowledge of and respect for the powers of death and darkness. Poetry is a struggle for light and life in the face of the world's resistance. The poet sprinkles fresh water to dispel death, as he brings light to "keep away dark blame" (61). The power of death and the blindness of men are stern realities (30–31, 23–25). Yet despite human greed (*kerdos*, 18), mendacity (22), ignorance (23–25), the poet has the help of birth-goddess and life-giving Muse in asserting truth (cf. *οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς*, 49; *ἐτήτυμον*, 63) and reaching light (*λαμπρόν*, 66) and life (*Αἰακόν . . . φυτεῦσαι*, 84).

With the Muse and the civilized refinements of poetic crowns and jewelry, Pindar reaches a new plane of confidence and enlarged vision. The potential held out by Eleithyia in line 1 begins to be realized in the other life-goddess, the Muse. Yet there is also a significant progression here. Eleithyia belongs to the dim and mysterious company of nature-goddesses, doubtless inherited from Minoan or perhaps earlier times.[76] She is companion of the Moirai, who have equally remote origins and are divinities of death as well as of life. In proceeding from the pre-Hellenic and chthonic Eleithyia to the jewel-fashioning Muse in 77–79, and later to Heracles who "conquered the Giants" (90), Pindar moves from the world of primeval nature-cult to Olympian lucidity. He never loses contact, however, with those elemental forces of nature to which Eleithyia belongs (so the imagery of water and birth throughout). Yet the presence of the Muse in 77 confirms the bright influence of "shiny-veiled Memory" in 15, which has been dimmed through the

[76] See Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 331; more recently B. C. Dietrich, *Death, Fate and the Gods* = "Univ. of London Classical Studies" 3 (London 1965) 80 ff.

intervening pessimism and gloomy narrative. The Muse in 77, then, suggests the imposition of form and clarity on darker realms.

And along with this mythological progression from Eleithyia to the Muse go two related movements in the ode. The first is geographical: from Troy "where the Greeks also suffered" (36) to Delphi (44–47) and Aegina (82 ff.). The second is temporal: from the grim past of Ajax and Neoptolemus to a present and future governed by a moral order which assures that an Aeacid will remain in the holy sanctuary for all time (44–47).

VII

The life-giving qualities of the Muse, then, lead naturally to the birth of Aeacus and the emphasis on gentleness and friendship at the opening of the poem's fourth section (80–89). Here, as throughout the ode, the fusion of mythical and personal is very close, because of the associations of Aeacus and Heracles with Aegina and Thebes (see above, section v). Hence after a gnomic generalization on the joys of friendship (86b–89), Pindar turns to a personal prayer for the victor. This prayer is itself the concrete, active manifestation of the friendship and good will presented mythologically in 86 and gnomically in 86b–89.

This prayer is also connected with lines 77–79. Pindar asks Heracles to "weave a happy life" for the victor (98–100):

> *εἰ γάρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοτον ἁρμόσαις*
> *ἥβᾳ λιπαρῷ τε γήραϊ διαπλέκοις*
> *εὐδαίμον' ἐόντα.*

"Having fit to them a life of firm strength, may you weave it through in happiness for shining youth and old age."[77]

[77] I keep Triclinius' *σφισιν* (instead of the unmetrical *σφιν* of the mss.), which was accepted without comment by Boeckh and is printed also by Bury, Sandys, Puech, Turyn, and Farnell, among more recent editors. Snell and Bowra read *σύ ἵν*, the emendation of Paul Maas which was accepted also by Schadewaldt 322, note 1. Triclinius' reading is palaeographically the more plausible. It makes the prayer refer both to Thearion and Sogenes, which seems to me preferable for several reasons: (1) Thearion has an important place in the ode and is in Pindar's thoughts as much as the son; (2) the prayer for family continuity in 100–1 would be more appropriate if the older generation were also included; (3) the reference to "youth and old age" in 99 naturally (though not necessarily) suggests father and son.

The verbs ἁρμόσαις and διαπλέκοις are words of "joining." They therefore belong to the atmosphere of creative work and civilization implied in the verbs (εἴρειν, κολλᾷ) of 77 and 78. Yet there is a more hesitant note in 98 ff. In 77, Pindar has said that "weaving crowns is easy." But the "weaving" of 100 is less certain and more difficult. In coming from the Muse and art to mortals and human life, Pindar is dealing with more fragile, less permanent substances than gold, ivory, coral. Hence the prayer of 98 ff. is immediately preceded by a statement of the "helplessness" (*amachaniai*) of mortal life (96–97). And the entire prayer is qualified by the hesitant εἰ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ θεὸς ἀνέχοι in 89. This qualification is very similar to the εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχὺ λίποι in *O.* 1.108, where θεός is also subject. This unnamed *theos* has a certain ambiguity and sinister quality in the ode, for while the *theos* of 32 gives immortal fame, the *theos* of 40 and 46 is Apollo, the god who destroyed Neoptolemus, the dangerous, vengeful god of *Paean* 6.[78]

The *theos* of 89, then, unlike the familiar Heracles addressed in these lines, is mysterious and unpredictable. Pindar cannot, therefore, promise happiness. Earlier he has stressed the uncertainties of human life (5–6, 54–58). His language here in 98 recalls the second of these passages: here he prays for an ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοτον for Thearion and Sogenes; in 56–58, addressing Thearion, he said that he knew of no one to whom the Moira gave complete happiness as a "firm fulfilment" (τέλος ἔμπεδον, 57).[79] At the very beginning of the poem, "great strength" (μεγαλοσθενέος), epithet of Eleithyia's mother, Hera, was a certain possession of the gods. Here in 98 ff., among mortals, this "strength" (ἐμπεδοσθενέα) can only be prayed for. And the return to the precariousness of human destinies in this prayer takes us back once more to Eleithyia, who makes mortals see both light and dark and is the companion of the "deep-thoughted Moirai" who give men their unsteady fates (cf. *Moira*, 57).

The Eleithyia passage is also recalled in the language of this prayer of

[78] On Pindar's presentation of this dangerous side of Apollo, see Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 351–52. For the awe and power which Pindar generally feels in Apollo, see *P.* 3.27–46; *P.* 5.63–69; *P.* 9.42–49. The parallel between *N.* 7.89 and *O.* 1.108 is another suggestion of the late date of the ode (see above, note 4). Line 89 expresses that somber sense of human uncertainty over against divine power which is characteristic of Pindar's mature thought. For thought and expression cf. *O.* 13.105 (dated to 464).

[79] The parallel is noted without comment by Bury 143.

89 ff. The only two deities in the poem who are invoked for prayer in the second person are Eleithyia and Heracles (the address to Aegina in 50 is obviously not on the same level, nor in prayer). To the former Pindar says (6–8), "With you (*σὺν δὲ τίν*) the son of Thearion too . . . is sung in fame." To the latter he prays in lines 90–92, "In you (*ἐν τίν*) who conquered the giants may Sogenes wish to dwell, holding a tender feeling for his father" (cf. also 95, *τὶν δ' ἐπέοικεν Ἥρας πόσιν . . . πειθέμεν*). Both prayers are also preceded by strong qualifications. In 5–6, immediately before the reference to Sogenes, Pindar reflects on the inequality of human fortunes. In 89 occurs the conditional clause cited above, "If the god should maintain this. . . ."

In this closing section of the poem, however, Pindar touches more lightly on this sense of uncertainty than he did earlier. Yet he does not dispel it entirely. Mortals need a god like Heracles for "defence against unpassable helplessness" (*ἀλκὰν ἀμαχανιᾶν δυσβάτων*, 96–97). With this phrase, Pindar is once more for a moment immersed in the gloomier tone of the second section (19–20, 30 ff.). But only for a moment. He does not deny the negative possibilities of existence. Yet he has done all he can to resist them. With Aeacus in 84 he has taken his stand in the victor's familiar homeland (cf. *δάπεδον ἂν τόδε*, 83, and contrast the fateful *Πύθια δάπεδα* of Neoptolemus in 34). Now secure in the friendly surroundings of Sogenes' home, Heracles' Aeginetan shrines (92–94), he prays generously for his family's happiness.

These geographical and topographical details thus become part of the poem's symbolic scheme, and help express the development of its themes and the rhythms of its moods. In a great work of art even ostensibly minor or trivial details are relevant and meaningful. Thearion may have requested Pindar to mention the setting of his house, or Pindar may have found this setting appealing because of the Theban associations of Heracles. But whatever the reasons, the local setting is itself expressive of safe enclosure. It narrows down the world's openness from the dangerous sea and the foreign shores of Troy (30, 36, 41) and Molossia (64–65) to the snug limits of the well known street (*ἄγυιαν*, 92) in the victor's home-city. The street itself stands under divine protection: *ζαθέαν* (92). After the mysterious and awesome presence of Apollo, the unnamed *theos* of 40 and 46, we return to the unquestioned protection of a simpler divinity and a local cult.

The simile which describes the location of the house, while appropriate to an athletic victory, is expressive of benign enclosure (93–94b):

> ἐπεὶ τετραόροισιν ὥθ' ἁρμάτων ζυγοῖς
> ἐν τεμένεσσι δόμον ἔχει τεοῖς, ἀμφο-
> τέρας ἰὼν χειρός.

"Sogenes has his home amid your shrines, like the pole of a four-horsed chariot between the double yoke."

This mood of safety and enclosedness is perhaps reminiscent too of the protectiveness of the birth-goddess who watches over our entrance into life and gives us the gifts of Hebe and Hera (1–4). There is a more tangible connection, however; for immediately after the lines on Eleithyia in the proem there comes a "yoking" metaphor: "Different circumstances keep apart different men, each yoked to his lot" (εἴργει δὲ πότμῳ ζυγένθ' ἕτερον ἕτερα, 6). Here at the beginning, the "yoking," rather than implying union and safety, points to the diversifying, dangerous forces of existence (cf. διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα δύναμις, *N.* 6.2–3). The powers of disunion, randomness, discord are stressed by the fact that the "yoking" stands in a tense contrast with the verb of separation, εἴργει, which begins line 6. At the end of the poem, however, when Pindar has led us "home," ensconced us between the reassuring shrines on either hand after the journey across dangerous seas, the "yokes" (ζυγοῖς, 93) signify security in the embrace of the local god and continuity amid the warmth of family association.

It is in the context of this mood of safe arrival and protected, familiar settings that Pindar utters his final prayer—another instance, one could say, of an *habros logos*, another utterance spoken ἡσυχᾷ and with ἀμέρᾳ ὀπί (82–84).

The language of the prayer also continues the pervasive association of poetry, life, and light. The verb διαπλέκοις (99), as noted earlier, recalls the poetic weaving of 77. The "bright old age" (λιπαρῷ τε γήραϊ, 99) for which the poet prays recalls the "bright-veiled Memory" of the proem (Μναμοσύνας . . . λιπαράμπυκος, 15). Even more pronounced is the echo in 99 and 100 of the invocation to Eleithyia, "genetrix of children" (γενέτειρα τέκνων, 2), giver of "bright-limbed Hebe" (4).[80] The meaning of that opening invocation, then, becomes

[80] See Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 343.

progressively clearer and more profound as the ode unfolds. The emphasis given to *αἰεί* (100) by its position at the end of the antistrophe, and the strong confidence in family continuity in the solemn repetition of *παίδων δὲ παῖδες*, with its heavy *d*-sounds, contrast too with the power of death stressed in the second section of the poem.

This concluding prayer also provides a final strand in the thread which binds together victor, poet, and mythical hero. The last part of the prayer in 100–1 (*παίδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ / γέρας τό περ νῦν . . .*) recalls the prayer for the continuity of Neoptolemus' race in 39–40:[81]

ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρει
τοῦτό οἱ γέρας.

But at the end of the poem the context is more favorable to hope and the stress on *αἰεί* more confident.

The wish that Sogenes "may happily dwell in his ancestors' holy street, rich in possessions, cherishing a kindly spirit toward his father" (*πατρὶ . . . ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων θυμόν*, 91–92) is another reference back to the ode's beginning: Sogenes "dwells in the song-loving city of the Aeacids of clashing spear, and they zealously wish to cherish a spirit that takes its share in the risks of contests" (*σύμπειρον ἀγωνίᾳ θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν*, 10). The echo underlines the movement from violence and risk (*δορικτύπων, σύμπειρον ἀγωνίᾳ*) to tenderness (*ἀταλόν*). And the movement itself forms another analogy concurrent with the general symbolic progression from the death of Neoptolemus to the birth of Aeacus, from death to life, war to peace.

Beside these prayers for the victor and his father one may set Pindar's prayer for himself in 67–68: *ὁ δὲ λοιπὸς εὔφρων ποτὶ χρόνος ἔρποι*. For himself, however, Pindar asks not for outward but for inward wealth. His prayer comes in the context of his statement on due limits (66–67, 70–71). He requests not total *eudaimonia*, which he thinks impossible (55–57), nor even limited good fortune (cf. *εὐδαίμον' ἐόντα*, 100; also *εὐτυχῶς*, 90; *ἐϋκτήμονα*, 92), but rather happiness of spirit. He wants to be *euphrôn*, not *eudaimôn*.[82]

[81] The echo is noted by Bury 143–44.

[82] Pindar's prayer for himself in lines 67–68 is another piece of evidence for a late dating of the ode (see above, note 4). The prayer may be set among a group of personal statements of this character which tend to occur in the later, indeed in the latest, of the odes. Cf. especially *I.* 7.37–42; *N.* 8.35–39; *P.* 8.67–69. Very close is *N.* 4.41–43; and,

Both the prayer at the end and the personal statement in 61–79 are pervaded by the sense of life's uncertainties. Hence the echo of τέλος ἔμπεδον (57) in ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοτον (98), of εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν (56) in εὐδαίμον' ἐόντα (100), and of εἶρειν (77) in διαπλέκοις (99). In both passages, concern for the victor and his father (55–60, 89–101) is followed by the poet's explicit defense of himself (61–76, 102–5). Thus the poet's suffering and his hopes for better things are intertwined with those of the victor; and through the gnomic generalizations and the universal implications of the myths, they are extended to comprise also the suffering that is inherent in all mortal existence, the *amachaniai dysbatoi* of 97. Pindar's art, then, like the life-giving, fresh waters of streams—which are the waters of birth also—brings balm not merely for the recent *ponos*, the passing exhaustion of the victor, as in the proem to *Nemean* 4. Its restorative effects go much deeper, for this "true" poetry is itself a symbol of the richness and possibility of life. Thus it reaches back into the past to lighten the "dark blame" of ugly myths (61–62), and forward into the future to search out what happiness uncertain Moira may hold out for old and young alike.

VIII

In the mood of confidence which the closing prayer creates, Pindar can face his detractors at the very end of the poem (102–4):

> τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὔ ποτε φάσει κέαρ
> ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἑλκύσαι
> ἔπεσι.

Having explored the uses of poetry, both creative and destructive, he can assert with simple sincerity that his words have not been of the destructive, slanderous type. He has not played Odysseus to the Aeginetans' Neoptolemus.

Interpreters have found this passage abrupt, even irrelevant: "the unnecessary postscript," Farnell says, "to an anxious letter where the writer feels that he can never say enough and so repeats himself at the end."[83] Yet the repetition is justified, for it is a reaffirmation of one

though *N.* 4 cannot be dated with certainty, it is universally placed among the later odes estimates vary from 473 to ca. 460). Also *O.* 4.16–17, *O.* 6.97, *O.* 8.28–29.

[83] Farnell 1.209. See Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 343 ("ein für unser Gefühl störender Nachtrag") and also *Pindaros* 164; Puech 93.

of his central themes in the ode, poetry and its dangers. To this theme Neoptolemus is indeed relevant. This hero has become a symbol of the dangers of envy and meanness which surround the poet's striving for what is noble and enduring. To say, as Puech does, that Pindar's thought is "still obsessed with the phantom of Neoptolemus"[84] is perhaps not so far from the truth, save that instead of "obsession" one should speak of a symbolic identification, an identification confirmed by the concluding utterance in the first person (τὸ δ' ἐμὸν . . . κέαρ, 102).

To sense the confident tone of these lines, it is important to grasp the precise meaning of ἀτρόποισι (103). Recently, Ernst Tugendhat in an important study has shown that this adjective should not be translated with Farnell "unfitting" "improper" "insulting" (a meaning which it nowhere else has).[85] Rather *atropos* should have its regular meaning, "not turning," i.e. "inflexible," "unwilling to adapt to circumstances." Lines 103–4 should, therefore, be rendered, "But my heart will never declare that it has dragged about Neoptolemus with inflexible words." As Tugendhat convincingly argues, this sentence does not mean that Pindar retracts, that he takes back the tale of Neoptolemus' punishment which he told in *Paean* 6.[86] What Pindar means is that Neoptolemus' life, like all mortal life, has both good and bad. Such is the law of τὸ μόρσιμον illustrated in 43–47 and elsewhere (e.g. *P.* 3.81–102; *O.* 2.30–56). Hence, when praising Apollo as upholder of justice and avenger of cruelty and impiety in *Paean* 6, he can be critical of Neoptolemus. But Neoptolemus' life has another side too. When looking toward his achievements, his place in the line of the Aeacids and Aegina's glories, he can see this positive side. He can stand by the truth of his judgment of *Paean* 6, yet admit that the deservedly censured hero is not all black. To make this admission is to avoid *epea atropa* and to recognize the complex, unstable quality of human life which has no *telos empedon* (57) of happiness, no certainty that a day begun in peace will end well (*O.* 2.30b–34, *N.* 6.6–7).

This view of the passage is also confirmed by the style. The language

[84] Puech 93.

[85] Tugendhat 404 ff.; Farnell 2.301. This interpretation of *atropos*, however, goes back to the scholia, who explain, οὐκ ἀτρόπως οὐδ' ἀπεοικότως. See Dissen *apud* Boeckh, *ad loc.* (p. 439).

[86] Méautis 55–56 takes a rather similar view of the passage. See also above, p. 447, with note 37. For the older view, see Lepore 76–77, 80–85.

of these lines is of a simplicity that comes upon us with a bracing suddenness that is almost a shock. Such simplicity of expression is the more moving following as it does upon the poem's complex, pessimistic probing of the evil, hostility, and darkness of life, the transience and uncertainty of happiness. This conclusion, then, is the final fulfilment of the gradual upward movement which began in the third section of the ode (44 ff.) and became more definite in the talk of "joy" and the Muse's "jewel" in 74–79. The joy sought by *ponos* now touches Sogenes, his father, and Pindar himself, and for the last time reaches back to soothe the *ponos* (cf. 36) of the displaced Neoptolemus and, perhaps, by implication, of the maligned Ajax.

In these austere, unadorned closing lines, Pindar rises to the full height of his Aegeid dignity. He speaks as if among friends, certain of the *xenia* and *philia* which he has affirmed earlier (61, 65, 86b–89).[87] He feels the aristocratic assurance that he will be taken at his word. He couches the lines in a tone worthy of an Ajax, and by his very language implies the restoration of the heroic values wherein trust and honor prevail, not the trickery and deceit of an Odysseus.

Now, having vindicated his own dignity and that of his poetry and his heroes, Pindar can end with a glance at the meaner spirit of his slanderers, a glance of sovereign disdain (104–5b):

> ταὐτὰ δὲ τρὶς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν
> ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοι-
> σιν ἅτε μαψυλάκας "Διὸς Κόρινθος."

In line 48 Pindar said that "for fair-named justice three words (*τρία ἔπεα*) will suffice." Here he will refuse "to go over the same thing three and four times." The numerical figure and the disdainful arithmetic link the two passages. In 48, in the still threatened world of Ajax and Neoptolemus, Pindar must take his detractors seriously, though he is far from being cowed by them. At the end of the ode, those slanderers appear silly rather than dangerous.

Bowra is right to see here not the "uneasy conscience" which Farnell detected, but a note "almost of defiance,"[88] or, as Puech calls it, "une

[87] For the affirmation of the ties of *philia* and *xenia* between the poet and his client, see Schadewaldt 314–15; Gundert (above, note 22) 32 ff.

[88] Respectively, Farnell 2.302 and Bowra, *Pindar* 73.

sorte de cri rageur."[89] The closing lines are a deliberate *reductio ad absurdum*. The exaggerated *t*-alliteration adds a mocking note, an imitation, perhaps, of infantile stuttering. Such a device, rare in the somber Theban poet, reinforces the effect of the nonsense words, *Διὸς Κόρινθος*, with which Pindar has deliberately chosen to conclude.

This last utterance, then, contains a remarkably sudden shift of tone which has caught critics off their guard. Norwood, for example, comments on the passage, "Most surprisingly of all, the massive Seventh Nemean dwindles down to a brisk conversational remark about poverty of thought and senseless babble."[90] Puech finds this final declaration framed "en termes dont la familiarité peut étonner."[91] But the surprise is intentional. Pindar ends not so much "with a smile," as Finley suggests,[92] as with a full, mocking laugh. A bit like Beethoven in the closing phrase of his last quartet, the "Es muss sein" movement of Opus 135, Pindar flashes out suddenly in impatient triumph after a slow, labored struggle. He bursts the bonds of the irksomely felt constraints in the near-irreverence of his closing utterance.

One can discern here a trace of a proud, somewhat saturnine humor which Pindar does not always allow himself. The mood is unusual in the *Epinikia*, but not unexampled. One thinks of *O.* 2.83–88. But the closest parallel is the ugly, angrily hissed retort that suddenly (lines 89–90) bites into the dreamy luxuriance of *Olympian* 6:

> . . . γνῶναί τ' ἔπειτ', ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλαθέσιν
> λόγοις εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ὗν.

Taking lines 102–5b as a whole, then, we see Pindar juxtaposing two sharply contrasting tones: the impregnable dignity and aristocratic simplicity of the first half of the statement (102–4) and the contemptuous half-nonsense of 104–5b, which makes his opponents seem hardly deserving of serious refutation. In this opposition of tones Pindar implies his power to rise above the ominous fears which have dimmed his confidence throughout the poem. He is once more in full command of his world and has found the style, the disdainful hauteur, with which

[89] Puech 93.
[90] Norwood 79.
[91] Puech 93.
[92] Finley, *Pindar* 103.

to deal with slanderous enemies. His command is a verbal one; as poet, he holds the keys to different modes of speech. Here he balances proud simplicity over against childish nonsense, the status to which he finally reduces wrongfully used speech. His lofty contempt is itself a victory of the right uses of language over the false; of just, honest speech over the crowd's confusion and blindness (24–25).[93]

This confident language, then, is also a penetration through Odyssean deceit and vindictiveness and the transience they bring, to what is orderly, honorable, lasting. It accompanies the movement from dangerous seas and remote Troy to the safe shrine of Heracles in Sogenes' homeland. It seals the victory for the generative waters of life and poetry over darkness and death, the god's *habros logos* over mortal "helplessness" (97), Eleithyia over "the wave of Hades common to all."

CONCLUSION

We have come far from the *ponos* of line 74 with which we began. Yet what has been phrased as a conflict between life and death could also have been expressed as a conflict between joy and suffering, *terpnon* and *ponos*. Ajax and Neoptolemus occupy one side of the division, Aeacus and Heracles the other. In between stand the mortal figures, actual persons, but also symbolical characters in the drama of the ode: Sogenes, Thearion, Pindar himself. As men, all three stand between life and death, the "wave of Hades" and the recreative fresh streams of poetry. Above all these characters, both real and mythical, stands Eleithyia, symbol of life and renewal, inexhaustible in her energies and hence able to embrace the opposites of light and darkness in a vast unity: ἄνευ σέθεν οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὐφρόναν (2b–3).

Eleithyia is the goddess of birth, physical birth. But the ode does not separate physical and spiritual life. Youth, success in action, family continuity, poetic creation, the hope for permanence through fame, the durable quality of right speaking and honorable acting are all analogs

[93] The general tone of lines 102–5 and the parallels of mood and theme with O. 2 and O. 6 (and perhaps one should add also *P.* 2.77–88) suggest once more a later date (see above, note 4). Lines like these would seem most natural as the utterance of the mature and established artist. See also Puech 94, with note 1.

of and metaphors for one another. They are artificially separable for the purposes of analysis, though in the poetic fabric they are one. It is not Pindar's manner nor his task as poet to articulate the relations explicitly. "Pindar ist kein Systematiker."[94] The precise outlines of symbolic clusters like those of *Nemean* 7 (water-life-light-poetry-fame; sea-death-darkness-envy) are blurred. They shift and gain accretions in a rhythm which obeys, not logical economy, but rather the flux of mood and feeling, expansiveness or hesitation, confidence or uncertainty. The structure of a Pindaric ode is organic rather than crystalline, "woven" rather than "built" (despite the metaphors of *P.* 6, *P.* 7, *O.* 6, frag. 184 Bowra [194 Snell]). In this connection too can be understood Pindar's fondness for metaphors of growth and for words like ἄνθος or ἄωτος to describe his poetry, and his tendency to expressions denoting "fusion" or blending.[95]

We may, then, enter a poem like *Nemean* 7 through the *ponos* of Sogenes, Pindar, Neoptolemus, Ajax, as has been done here; or through the imagery of birth, water, light; or through the structural design of the work, with its pendulum-like oscillation between contrasting moods. But whichever approach we take, we are inevitably led back to the life-rhythms of birth, youth, and death, over which Eleithyia presides.

The jewel of lines 77–79 may be seen as a symbol of the whole poem and of all poetry—something rich and beautiful, fastened together mysteriously from precious materials and having origins from waters which are both fresh and salt. Yet Eleithyia is perhaps after all the more important and more inclusive symbol for the poem's unity. Thus Pindar returns from the symbolical manifestations of her creative powers (poetry and the immortal life which its ἁβρὸς λόγος confers) to her more tangible, less metaphorical significance at the end of the ode: the physical continuity of a family graced by a son of splendid achievements who will continue the race (100). Hence the prayer for the victor's happiness at the end echoes the ode's beginning: Hera in 95 and *hêbê* in 99 are the mother and sister respectively of Eleithyia in the proem (2b, 4).

[94] Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 553.

[95] For such expressions of "fusion," see Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 565–66 and, in greater detail, Hoey (above, note 12), esp. 239–42.

The poet who makes possible the conquest of darkness and death through the life-filled "streams" of song shares in Eleithyia's creative powers at a level deeper than the physical, and he conveys to men a sense of the connectedness of her several realms. His work appears as a continual vindication and freeing of the birth-goddess' resilient energies. In *Nemean* 7, where he finds himself and his art under attack from the opposed forces of death and darkness, he feels with special intensity and self-consciousness that his craft stands in the service of life.[96]

By invoking Eleithyia and allowing her influence to pervade the ode through his imagery of light, water, and birth, Pindar raises his personal struggles with his detractors to universal significance.[97] His sense of the negative, limiting forces of life is strong: the death of Ajax, the grim fate of Neoptolemus, the frailty of human happiness, the "impassable helplessness" from which only a god can free a man (96–97). The threat of nothingness and the struggle against it stay with Pindar to the end of his life (*P.* 8.95–97):

> ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ
> ἄνθρωπος. ἀλλ' ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ,
> λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.

"Beings of a day: what is any one? What is any one not? A shadow's dream is man. But when the Zeus-given brightness comes, there rests on men a bright light and a gentle time of life."

So *Nemean* 7, after plunging through the "shadow," emerges finally into the "Zeus-given brightness": joy, light, birth. Feeling the protection of the birth-goddess from his first line, he can end his hard and somber meditation on envy, treachery, and mortality with a flippant irrelevancy that in Pindar is almost gay. From Eleithyia to the babbling children, the ode verifies what poetry (as all art) essentially is: life's triumphant awareness and assertion of its power over the void of non-life.

[96] See Fränkel, *D. u. P.* 560: "Pindars Dichtung ist ein Stück Leben; sie dient dem Leben und zehrt von gegenwärtigem und vergangenem Leben."

[97] This lifting of the personal to the universal is, of course, only an expression of the harmony between individual and tradition which is made available to the classical poet through his sense of form. See Schadewaldt's excellent remark, 323: "Es gehört zum Wesen griechischer Kunst, dass die künstlerische Individualität nicht im Zerbrechen, sondern im Erfüllen der überkommenen Form ihren stärksten Ausdruck findet."