PINDAR'S CREATION OF EPINICIAN SYMBOLS: *OLYMPIANS* 7 AND 6

Pindar devotes a substantial portion of his epinician odes to the telling of myths.[1] The manners in which he revitalizes these tales and reshapes their symbols is the subject of this paper. In it I shall present and illustrate a methodology for examining a poet's alterations of either symbols themselves[2] or the narrative and semantic contexts in which they appear. Section I outlines the method. In Section II the methodology is applied to two Pindaric odes, each containing a myth depicting birth. Section III is a summary.

Section I: Methodological Introduction

Whereas details concerning the victor and poet are firmly grounded in fact, myth is intrinsically free from literal constraints. In "victor-praise" and "poetic programme"[3] the poet cannot alter facts, describe the future as fact, or expect miracles to occur; in the mythic sections he can, since myth is inherently fantastic.[4] In victor-praise and poetic programme laws of natural causality bind every human while the miraculous and magical are virtually absent, whereas in myth natural or logical causality need not be operative and miracles or magic are frequently present. Appropriate to victor-praise and poetic programme are wishes, prayers, and statements of intent—but not foreknowledge, answered prayers, or even future indicatives. In myth, however, wishes, intentions, and prophecies are often fulfilled, and prayers regularly answered. In myth the whole

[1] For Pindar's treatment of myth see especially C.M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1971); Karl Fehr, *Die Mythen bei Pindar* (Zurich 1936); Leonhard Illig, *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung* (Kiel 1931); Adolf Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971); and M.C. Van der Kolf, *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractaverit quidque in eis mutaverit* (Rotterdam 1928).

[2] I define symbols as concrete elements (objects, events, characters) having multiple significance in their traditional contexts.

[3] Several theoretically discrete though textually interwoven sections characterize most of Pindar's forty-five epinicia: a mythic section (in all but eight odes), victor-praise (including mention of the victor's city, catalogue of prior victories, announcement of present victory, and mention of relatives' victories and the victor's lineage); poetic programme (statements about poetry and the poet's task); and maxims. In my view, victor-praise and poetic programme form one narrative chain and should, therefore, be taken as a unit. (I indicate this in the text by using a slash between them.)

For a review of the literature (until 1973) on the epinician genre, see Richard Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (Paris 1974) 3-13.

[4] On "inconsequential fantasy" as one characteristic of myth see G.S. Kirk, "Greek Mythology: Some New Perspectives," *JHS* 92 (1972), esp. 81ff.

temporal gamut (past, present, and future) of a hero's or divinity's experience is presented, whereas in victor-praise and poetic programme verisimilitude demands that events be anchored in the present or in the recent past.

Because the actual deeds of the victor and poet are literal and bounded by reality, there are limits to the amount of acclaim which the poet can muster for these deeds, and there are limits to the amount of meaning which the poems confined to victor-praise and poetic programme can convey. In order to circumvent both of these limitations, the poet uses myth to enhance the stature of victor and poet and to make substantive the poetic work itself. Thus, there is a complementary relationship between the more restricted victor-praise and poetic programme sections and the less constrained mythic sections.

Though myth is not subject to the same constraints as victor-praise and poetic programme, it does impose constraints of its own, specifically because versions of most of the myths the poet uses—their motifs, sequences of events and significations—were the common property of his fifth century audience. Pindar eludes some of the impact of these constraints by adding whole sequences to traditional myths while keeping the main line of the myths intact.

In general, myth and victor-praise/poetic programme are subject to different but complementary constraints, and Pindar takes advantage of their interdependence. But how does he achieve this? How does he remold familiar symbols encased in traditional narratives and already possessing multiple meanings? How aware of these meanings would Pindar's audience have been? Can a poet detach such traditional meanings from a symbol and introduce new meanings that are epinician?

The Odes themselves attest to a degree of audience awareness of Pindar's infidelity or fidelity to earlier versions of the same myth or myth-type—sufficient awareness that Pindar feels obliged to introduce alterations with an apologia or explanation. For some he asserts, "I want to set upright a common tale" (*Ol.* 7.20-21) or "I shall celebrate you, son of Tantalus, differently from my predecessors" (*Ol.* 1.36).[5] Sometimes he begins a tale and suddenly draws back in silence, as in *Ol.* 1.52 (*aphistamai*) and *Nem.* 5.14 and 16 (*aideomai* and *stasomai*).[6] While these intrusions may indicate religious scruples or simply tact,[7] they im-

[5] Giovanni Pini, "Correzioni di miti in Pindaro," *Vichiana* 4 (1967) 339, assembles Pindaric insertions of this type.

[6] By refusing to tell a previously accepted version of a tale, Pindar indicates a high degree of currency for the version dismissed; otherwise he probably would not have bothered to dismiss it (unless he wanted absolutely to use it for foil). However, the dismissed version(s) need not have a single prior source of authority or a single codified form. For examples of Pindar's correcting hand see Bowra (note 1, above) esp. 67ff. and ch. 7, "The Treatment of Myth."

[7] Tact is the most common motivation offered to explain Pindar's alterations; see Bowra (note 1, above) 68, who quotes R. Schultz, *Aidos* (Rostock 1910) 38-43, in asserting that it is out of tact more than of conscience that Pindar avoids unseemly details. Gilbert Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley 1945) 80-81 and 235-36, sees Pindar's aposiopesis as a literary device, not sincere piety. So too Timothy Gantz, "Pindar's First Olympian: The Masters of Darkness," *Riv.St.Cl.* 26 (1978) 33.

ply as well consciousness of the prior accounts of the myths he is using.

Since in this investigation I am considering how Pindar remolds traditional symbols, i.e., concrete elements (objects, events, characters) having multiple significance in their traditional contexts, it is necessary to ascertain as well as possible the original significations of these symbols. It is important to select as examples myths which we know from alternative (and when possible prior) sources. Kirk is correct when he notes the poverty of Greek myths in an unadulterated (i.e., unliterary) form is such that, with the exception of the Dionysus and Demeter narratives, we have little material other than the births and matings of the Greek gods.[8] Since this is the case, I have chosen to illustrate my method by applying it to epinicia in which the mythic sections contain birth accounts. In order to specify the motivations and functions of Pindar's alterations, I shall consider, whenever possible, other versions of the same myth or other examples of the same abstract myth-type. I shall then treat the Pindaric and other versions as "couples" in the Lévi-Straussian sense,[9] paying close attention to the differences between them. Finally, I shall examine ways in which Pindar transforms mythic symbols to suggest new meanings for intrinsically "impoverished" epinician characters and events.

Section II: Application

Olympian 7

This ode to Diagoras of Rhodes commemorates his victory in a boxing contest in 464 B.C.[10] It consists of a proem (1-12), victor-praise (13-19 and 80-87), mythic material (20-80) and a conclusion (88-95). In the simile which introduces the ode, Pindar sends epinicia, the "fruit of my mind," to prizewinning victors as a father-in-law hands a goblet to his new son-in-law in a toast.[11] By singing a hymn to Rhodes (13-14) Pindar

[8] Kirk (note 4, above) 78. For another view of this distinction between Greek myths and those of oral-traditional societies see Marcel Detienne, *Dionysus Slain*, trans. M. and L. Muellner (Baltimore and London 1979) 5, where Detienne attacks Kirk's assumption that "Greek mythology is condemned to appear to us only and ever in a state of incessant agitation and deceptive, secondary elaboration."

[9] C. Lévi-Strauss, *The Raw and the Cooked*, trans. J. and D. Weightman (New York 1969) 307: ". . .Two syntagmatic sequences, or fragments of the same sequence, which, considered in isolation, contain no definite meaning, acquire a meaning from the fact that they are polar opposites. And. . .the meaning becomes clear at the precise moment when the couple is constituted. . .". For our purposes, not polar opposition but presence within the same text or treatment of the same theme motivates the consideration of two narrative sequences as a couple.

[10] The text I have used is that of C.M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford 1947[2]).

[11] The relevance of the opening simile and of the initial statement of the poet's task to the totality of the ode has been a source of continued dispute. See esp. David Young, *Three Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1968) 69ff; Ole Smith, "An Interpretation of Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode," *Cl.Med.* 28 (1969) 173ff; W.J. Verdenius, *Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode. A Commentary* (Amsterdam 1972) notes 3 and 4 (in which he contends that the correspondences in the simile are "not to be pressed"); and Gilbert Lawall, "The Cup, the

will praise Diagoras and his father Damagetus, for whom, as part of his poetic gift, he desires to "set upright a common tale, from the beginning, from the time of Tlepolemus" (20-21). This tale—which begins (27) with Tlepolemus' murder of his uncle and concludes (80) with the absolved murderer's attainment of god-like honor as the founder of Rhodes—frames two mythic digressions.

Both digressions contain accounts of births. In the myth of the Heliadae (38-54) Athena is born miraculously, through Hephaestus' skills, from the head of Zeus. In response to the miraculous birth, Helius charges his sons to build an altar and warm the hearts of Zeus and Athena. The Helius myth (54-77), too, contains a birth, the emergence from the sea of the island/nymph Rhodes. Helius witnesses this event and bids Lachesis and Zeus swear that he will possess the island as his *geras*.

A detailed study of these two birth myths in light of both traditional and epinician contexts reveals that Pindar (1) has reshaped the mythic narratives in which each birth occurs so that they parallel a portion of the epinician narrative in the ode, (2) uses repetition and metaphor to indicate and strengthen interrelations between parallel narrative segments, and (3) posits (on the basis of these strong parallels or analogies) substantive meanings for the victor, poet, and victory ode.

In Rhodes, where Tlepolemus had sailed, Zeus once rained with golden snow. "That was when," Pindar continues, "Athena, through Hephaestus' art and brazen ax, leapt from her father's head and, leaping, shouted loud enough to terrify the Sky and Mother Earth."[12]

Many have compared this sketch of Athena's birth to other versions of the same myth, though without taking full stock of its epinician context and the epinician demands.[13] The earliest literary record of Athena's birth (aside from a one-line mention at *Il.* 5.880) appears in Hes. *Th.*886-900 and 924-929. Zeus has tricked and swallowed Metis at the advice of

Rose, and the Winds in Pindar's Seventh Olympian," *Riv. Fil.* 39 (1961) 33-47.

In my view, the common ground between the two terms of the comparison is so carefully delineated that the details are indeed to be pressed. For an elucidation of such correspondences see Young, 73-75, Bowra (note 1, above) 25 and Smith, 173-74.

[12] In the discussion that follows, unless stated otherwise I have employed the following translations: Arthur Swanson, *Pindar's Odes* (Indianapolis/New York 1974); Norman O. Brown, *Hesiod. Theogony* (Indianapolis/New York 1953); Charles Boer, *The Homeric Hymns* (Chicago 1972); and E.V. Rieu, *Apollonius of Rhodes. The Voyage of Argo* (Baltimore 1959). For Pindaric passages where increased precision was required for my analysis, I have provided my own prose translations.

[13] The extensive bibliography on Athena's birth in art and literature includes: Norman O. Brown, "The Birth of Athena," *TAPhA* 83 (1953) 130-43; A.B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study In Ancient Religion* I-III (Cambridge 1940); H. Jeanmaire, "La Naissance d'Athene," *Rev.Arch.* 48 (1956) 12-39; S. Kauer, *Die Geburt der Athene im altgriechischen Epos* (Wurzburg 1959); G.S. Kirk, *The Nature of Greek Myths* (Baltimore 1974); A.H. Krappe, *La genèse des mythes* (Paris 1952), esp. ch. 15; and Jacques Laager, *Geburt und Kindheit des Gottes in der griechischen Mythologie* (Winterthur 1957). Also useful are Paula Philippson, "Genealogie als mythische Form," *Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. Supplet. 6 (1936) 20-21 and Walter Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaïschen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977) 220-25.

Earth and Sky, so that the kingship would not pass from Zeus to another of the gods:

> Zeus himself produced out of his own head the bright-eyed Tritonian goddess, the terrible queen who loves the clash of wars and battles, who stirs up the fury and leads the armies and never retreats. Hera, in turn, in resentment and jealousy, without union with her husband, produced famous Hephaestus, the master craftsman in the line descended from Father Sky. (*Th.* 924-929)

Central here is the familiar motif of a future offspring threatening to supersede his father, the current king—a danger already realized in the *Theogony* in the action of Cronus against Uranus and of Zeus against Cronus. Zeus, unlike his two predecessors, outwits destiny; he swallows his pregnant wife, Metis, who thereafter imparts wisdom to him from within.[14] At the same time that Zeus prevents the dangerous male offspring from ever coming into being, he usurps and tames the potentially dangerous power of procreation; Hera retaliates with the parthenogenetic birth of Hephaestus.[15] Hesiod does not elaborate the moment of Athena's emergence. He mentions no armor, nor any "midwife." (Hephaestus, younger than Athena, cannot have been present at his half-sister's birth.)

A more extensive account of Athena's birth appears in the *Homeric Hymn to Athena* (*Hom. h.* 23). While Stesichorus was first to mention the panoply of the goddess at her birth,[16] the *Hymn to Athena* develops this weaponry theme. Athena is born "clad with golden and resplendent warlike arms." She emerges from Zeus' head "brandishing a sharp-pointed spear." The resultant cosmic upheaval, and particularly the heaving motion of the waves, recedes only when "the splendid son of Hyperion stopped his fleet-footed horses long enough for Athena to remove the divine weapons from her immortal shoulders." Helius' halting of his chariot implies stopping time, and contrasts with and perhaps even counterbalances the motion of the sea. Athena's panoply, when worn, signifies her terrible power—power which causes Olympus to quake, the earth to resound and the sea to heave. The birth of armed Athena represents a threat to cosmic order, neutralized only when she has removed

[14] On Metis and the *type* of wisdom she imparts see: Cook (note 13, above) III, 745, who describes her, as well as Thetis, as a sea-power and shapeshifter loved by Zeus and destined to bear a son that would oust his father; Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Les ruses de l'intelligence. La Mètis des Grecs* (Paris 1974), esp. ch. 4 ("L'union avec Mètis"); Jean-Pierre Vernant, "Thétis et le poème cosmogonique d'Alcman" in *Hommage à Marie Delcourt* (Brussels 1970) 38-69; Brown (note 13, above) who argues cogently for the centrality of the swallowing of Metis to the thematic developments in the *Theogony;* and Jeanmaire (note, 13 above).

[15] Procreation is a dangerous power. It may produce excessively large or numerous or hubristic offspring. When Zeus swallows Metis pregnant with Athena, it is not only the power of the immediate and actual offspring that he neutralizes but also the potential production of future such offspring—like the unruly son, not yet even conceived, but predicted to overthrow him.

[16] Schol. to Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4. 1310.

her armor. Such removal would then symbolize control over a power intrinsic to her nature and present at her birth. The implication is that the goddess Athena embodies not only a threat to cosmic order but also the potential of containing or neutralizing that threat. In restraining herself by removing her own armor Athena re-enacts and reduplicates Zeus' display of control over chaos when (*Th.* 888ff) he swallows the "polymorphous magician" Metis. In most cosmogonies such defeat over chaotic forces involves two adversaries, a hero and an antagonist, and is not, as here, an internal battle.[17]

Though Pindar's four-line account in *Ol.*7.35-38 makes no mention of Zeus tricking and swallowing Metis, Athena's delivery from Zeus' head may imply such prior incorporation.[18] Pindar eliminates, along with any motive for swallowing the pregnant mother, the notion of a potentially dangerous offspring. The themes of a male usurping female procreative powers and of a female retaliating through parthenogenesis (an extreme form of asserting power over procreation) recede into the background in the Pindaric account. Only the shivering of the primal couple, Uranus and Gaia, recalls any cosmic implications of Athena's birth. Unlike Hesiod, who mentions no midwife, Pindar has Hephaestus deliver Athena from Zeus' head.[19]

By weakening, omitting and expanding these varied details of the birth Pindar probably would not have startled his ancient audience very much. He does, however, effect a bold revision in adding a sequel to the basic tale. The birth of Athena, he relates, prompts Helius' injunctions upon his sons. Even though they fulfill this order imperfectly by forgetting the sacrificial fire, Athena and Zeus bestow gifts on them: creative talent (which they utilize to produce works of art[20]) and golden rain.[21]

[17] The power of metamorphosis represents a particular form of intelligence which is threatening to cosmic order; see Vernant, "Alcman" (note 14, above) and Brown (note 13, above). On cosmogonies and threats to cosmic order see esp. Francis M. Cornford, *Principium Sapientiae. Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought* (Cambridge 1952) 187-256; Joseph Fontenrose, *Python* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1959) esp. chs. 4 ("Zeus and Typhon"), 5 ("Typhon and Python"), and 10 ("Chaos and Cosmos"); and W.K.C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning. Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man* (Ithaca 1957).

[18] Burkert (note 13, above) 224, remarks that "Nach anderer Version hat Zeus Athena ganz allein, ohne Mutter, hervorgebracht." Thus, even though in *Ol.*7 Athena emerges from Zeus' head, impregnation and incorporation of Metis would not be a necessary antecedent. However, with Hesiod's version so familiar to an ancient audience, Metis' role in these events might well be taken for granted.

[19] The oldest artistic source of Hephaestus as a midwife at Athena's birth is mid-sixth century B.C.: see Cook, I, 661 and Brown, 135ff (both in note 13, above). Pindar affords the earliest literary example.

[20] On a likely reference here to the magical Telchines, legendary Rhodian sculptors, see C.A.P. Ruck, "Marginalia Pindarica I," *Hermes* 96.2 (1968) 129-32; cf. also Jeanmaire (note 13, above) 30-31, n. 2 and Roscher, s.v. Telchines (Friedländer). Since the Telchines reputedly invoked envy, they would make a clever parallel for the prizewinning victor who so often stirred envy in his competitors.

On the nature of the *sophia* which the Telchines possessed and which resembles that of a creatrix like Metis, see Vernant, "Alcman" (note 13, above) esp. 51ff. For a discussion of the Telchines as sea-demons and primordial beings, as well as forgers of metal, see Detienne and Vernant (note 14, above) ch. 9 ("Les pieds d'Hephaistos").

Pindar introduces this effect of Athena's birth *for epinician purposes*. He sets the forgetfulness of the Heliadae in discharging their obligation to Helius in opposition to Pindar's own faithfulness in remembering to perform his epinician obligation. The key word *chreos*[22] marks the subtle contrast between the forgetful Heliadae and the mindful, muse-guided poet: in their execution of analogous tasks they differ dramatically. A maxim introduces the account of their lapse and emphasizes the implicit contrast: "Men prone to prudence find true excellence and satisfaction: strangely, though, the mist of forgetfulness crowds the proper path of action and beclouds men's minds." The cloud of forgetfulness draws *their* minds from the right path (i.e., they can no longer perceive and hence follow it), but *he* habitually remembers.[23]

Appending such a sequel to his retelling of Athena's birth strengthens Pindar's prayer for the future at the ode's conclusion. He implies without boasting that *he* is fulfilling his obligation to prize-winning athletes such as Diagoras, and that *he* perceives and follows a straight path towards his goal. His praise of Diagoras, when viewed as a primary and dominating structure of the ode, enfolds Athena's birth and its impact on the Heliadae as a secondary narrative and establishes an oblique argument; specifically, that if the sons of Helius are blessed and have received divine favors even after their oversight and error and even without praying for such favors, then the poet Pindar and the celebrated victor Diagoras deserve divine blessedness (*olbia*) and grace (*charis*) all the more.[24] By altering the narrative context of Athena's birth (minimizing

[21] Van der Kolf (note 1, above) 107, suggests that the golden rain owed its origin to the great wealth of Rhodes. On the meaning of gold in Pindar see Jacqueline Duchemin, *Pindar, poète et prophète* (Paris 1955) 193ff, and Gantz (note 7, above) 28; and on gold in myth, H.L. Lorimer, "Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology," in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Oxford 1936) 33ff.

[22] On the *chreos* motif in Pindar see Wolfgang Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle 1928) 278, note 1, and Elroy Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* I and II (*CPCP* 18, 1962).

[23] On the connection between poetry and memory see esp. Marcel Detienne, *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque* (Paris, Maspero 1967; 2e ed. 1973). Cf. also Jacqueline Duchemin, (note 21, above), esp. 42, 253, 258; and Pietro Pucci, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore/London 1977) esp. 22-25. For the image of the way or the path in Greek poetry see Ottfried Becker, "Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken," *Hermes*, Einzelschriften 4 (1936) 1-323.

[24] I postulate, as a working hypothesis, that the primary "narrative" of any epinician ode consists of the fundamentally factual interaction between the poet and victory. The mythic sections can then be viewed as embedded, secondary narratives. From empirical study I have found that the primary epinician narrative often has an abstract sequence or pattern, all or part of which appears in the embedded myth—either as a direct parallel from past to present or as a striking contrast, frequently contained within such a parallel. See my "Narrative Structure of Pindar's Ninth *Pythian* Ode," *CW* 71 (1978) 353-67 (esp. diagram, 364) for a description of such an abstract epinician sequence.

My assertion that the epinician occasion and material "frames" or "embeds" the mythic material and that the embedded myth provides exempla for epinician characters is consistent with Illig's view (note 1, above) of Pindaric myth as *paradeigma*. This view seems to underlie most recent "unitarian" approaches to Pindaric odes. The dominance of encomiastic over "paideutic" purposes has been a recent source of misunderstanding: see Hugh Lee's sensible treatment, "The Historical Bundy and Encomiastic Relevance in

or eliminating some of its traditional significations), Pindar pleads for his own and the victor's future.

There is a more subtle deviation in the tale of Athena's birth which effects the epinician content. The clue to this change is the presence of two golden precipitations, one in 33-34 (*entha pote breche theôn basileus ho megas chruseais niphadessi polin*), the other in 49-50 (*keinoisi men xanthan agagôn nephalan polun huse chruson*). From one point of view (or reading hypothesis) [25] the first shower anticipates the climax of the Athena tale. In this reading, the more consonant of the two with tradition, the initial shower is a purely literary device, not an authentic event in the narration.[26] Read in a different context, however, this first shower clearly (and necessarily) evokes the presence of Zeus in the form of impregnating rain as the male generative principle familiar from traditional hierogamies.[27] In this second reading, distinct from and logically incompatible with the first, the early shower does indeed "exist" and gives rise to subsequent events. Such a reading, subordinate to the first, is suggested only by the anomalous double shower,[28] which calls attention to the latent hierogamy motif. Nevertheless, acknowledging hierogamy as a latent frame of reference enhances our understanding of *Olympian* 7.

For example, the second reading illuminates several details in the sequel to Athena's birth. If we construct a narrative chain in which Zeus by the first shower fertilizes and impregnates the land of Rhodes (a usual effect of showers in hierogamies), then we anticipate a birth. That Athena's birth immediately follows in the text argues for *it* as fulfilling our expectation. That, however, would contradict the dominant reading

Pindar," *CW* 72 (1978) 65-70. P. Rose's earlier argument for a paideutic rather than a narrowly encomiastic intent ("The Myth of Pindar's First Nemean: Sportsman, Poetry, Paideia," *HSCP* 78 [1974] 146) is based on a reading of Bundy that is too literal, as Lee's article makes clear.

[25] The terminology I use here, though intelligible at a common sense level, comes from Menakhem Perry, who stated (in a talk entitled "Alternative Patterning: Mutually Exclusive Sign-Sets in Literary Texts" delivered at the International Association for Semiotic Studies meeting in Vienna, July 1979):

> The semantic integration of a text is a process of providing motivations for the appearance and order of textual elements. This is done, among other things, by relating the text to familiar "models." In the process of reading, the reader constructs a system of frames or hypotheses which can create maximal relevancy among the various data of the text—which can motivate their order or at least "co-presence" in the text according to models derived from "reality," from literary or cultural conventions, and the like.

[26] On the intricate question of authenticity in a literary text L. Doležel remarks that "statements are designated as true or false *in* or *of* a possible world," i.e. and a world constructed in the literary context (as distinct from the world of everyday life). See his "Extensional and Intensional Narrative Worlds," *Poetics* 8 (1979) 205—an issue devoted to the theme of "possible worlds" in literary semantics.

[27] On the *hieros gamos* see Andre Motte, *Prairies et jardins de la Grèce antique de la religion à la philosophie*, Academie Royale de Belgique Memoires de la Classe des Lettres (Bruxelles 1973) esp. 192-232. Cornford (note 17, above) 94, assembles and discusses ancient descriptions of the union between earth and sky (e.g. Eur. frag. 898; Eur. *Chrysippus*, 839; Aesch., *Danaïdes*, frag. 44).

[28] For the view that there is but one golden shower cf. Ruck (note 20, above) 131, who

in which she emerges from Zeus' head and not from the impregnated land, i.e. not autochthonously.[29] The sequel ends with another "birth," namely of works of art supported on the ground that resemble living and crawling things (52: *erga de zôoisin herpontessi th'homoia keleuthoi pheron*). Both their physical contact with the earth and their reptilian character suggest autochthony and are traditional ways of signifying dangerous potency and vitality.[30] These particular creatures have come into being even though the Heliadae had forgotten the seed of fire (48: *sperm'. . .phlogos ou*), i.e., the seed of life. Hence it is possible to attribute to Zeus' first golden shower the existence of the new works of art, even though it was through the skill (50: *technan*) of the Heliadae that they must logically have come into being. In a somewhat analogous fashion Athena emerged from Zeus' head through the skills (35: *technaisin*) of Hephaestus, though he did not cause (i.e., sow the seed for) her birth.

Another spontaneous burst of life may, by a similar logic, be linked to the first (and/or second) golden rain. Although it would be difficult to argue that the emergence itself of the island Rhodes results from a latent hierogamy,[31] at the very end of the poem the city of Rhodes "blossoms in festival" (93: *Eratidan toi sun charitessin echei thalias kai polis*). It was on this very *polis* that Zeus rained in 34, and again in 49-50, though this time without verbal repetition of *polis*; thus the blossoming of Rhodes fulfills yet a third time our anticipation of a birth at Rhodes.

The second and latent interpretation holds epinician implications. Since Pindar sometimes uses *erga* to describe his poem,[32] it is natural to compare his completed odes to the finished sculpture of the Heliadae. If their sculpture is viewed as potent and vital and lifelike, then Pindar's odes may be viewed in the same way. His poetry (cf. 8: *glukun karpon*) is also a gift from the gods (7: *Moisan dosin*), like the second golden shower on Rhodes and the *technai* of the Heliadae. Perhaps it will earn him "deep glory," as their sculpture did the Heliadae (52). Indeed, he calls his completed odes "nectar" (8)—a term for divine food which, like ambrosia, brings immortality to the one who consumes it. Both its liquid quality ("poured") and its immortalizing power suggest a fertilizing

sees the ring-composition as allowing attention to focus on Athena's birth. However, Verdenius (note 11, above) 113, argues against taking the two showers as identical. Neither position is unassailable.

[29] Of course, the presence of the male impregnating element would not in itself exclude autochthony, since birth-from-the-earth seldom results from pure parthenogenesis.

[30] An especially compelling example of the earth's ability to energize is the account of Antaeus' wrestling match with Heracles (Apoll. 2.5.11; Pi. *Isthm.* 4.52-55).

[31] That Helius' rays affect the growth of Rhodes (as a land and flower) is plausible (see Young [note 11, above] 86); but to view the chronologically later shower as actually *causing* the island to emerge seems unwarranted, especially since male insemination (through rain) would be anomalous for the emergence of dry land from the already wet and hence fertile sea.

[32] Cf. for example *Ol.*13.17 and *Py.*8.74; more frequently, this general term refers to athletic rather than artistic deeds.

energy for Pindar's poem comparable to the power of Zeus as rain god.[33] Although Zeus generates his own power while Pindar receives his as a divine gift, Pindar as poet uses the parallels between them to suggest that he, like Zeus, can transform the recipient of his verse.

Pindar leads directly from the Heliadae myth into the myth of Helius:

> Tradition has it that, when Zeus and the immortals parcelled out the earth, the island Rhodes had not yet risen on the open sea but lay concealed in salty depths below. . . .

And later:

> In salt-sea garden the island bloomed, held by the father of swift sunrays, the driver of fire-breathing horses.

No known account of Rhodes' emergence predates this one.[34] Hence a comparison with other nesogonies remains the only way of constructing a "couple" in the structuralist sense.

Most nesogonies, like the cosmogonies which they resemble, are aetiological, working backward from the present existence of an island to a time when it did not exist.[35] The sudden emergence, a change from non-being to being, traditionally results not from sexual intermingling (no language of sexual reproduction, and particularly of male insemination, appears), but from some inner impulse. There is often a hint that the dry land already existed in an unadulterated state beneath the sea, ready to emerge at an appropriate moment.

The best example of such a nesogony appears in an inverted form. In the *Hymn to Apollo* (70-73) the island/nymph Delos fears submergence at the hands of the newborn Apollo:

> I dreadfully fear. . .lest. . .scorning an island whose ground is rocky, he overturn me with his feet and push me into the deep sea. . . . Then polyps will settle on me and black seals on me will make their carefree abodes where there are no people.

Such a submergence would be a "devolution" to a prior formless state, as the mention of polyps and seals and the absence of people make clear.[36] Delos' fear resembles the fear of an inglorious death at sea as

[33] Cf. *Isthm.*7.5ff where blissful Thebe greets "in a mid-night snow of gold the greatest god, who stood within Amphitryon's door, then went into Amphitryon's wife with seed of Heracles." Cook (note 13, above) III.1, 455-78 ("The myth of Danaë and analogous myths") esp. 477, cites *Isthm.*7 and *Ol.*7 as two Pindaric accounts of epiphanies of the sky-god for amorous purposes, adding (in the case of the latter) that "Pindar does not expressly assert that Zeus was in this wondrous shower. But that such was the original concept is almost certain; for another Rhodian tale made Zeus consort with the earth-born Himalia 'by means of rain.' "

[34] None of the sources on early Rhodian history disputes Fehr's assertion (note 1, above) 132, that "uns keine andere Kunde von früheren rhodischen Sagen bekannt ist." So also van der Kolf (note 1, above) 106.

[35] This formulation is from A. Julien Greimas, "The Interpretation of Myth: Theory and Practice," in P. Maranda and E. Kongas, eds., *Structural Analysis of Oral Tradition* (Philadelphia 1971).

[36] See Detienne and Vernant (note 14, above) 163, n. 134 and 246ff. for the view that seals, as amphibians (Arist., *Hist.anim.* 566b 28ff), who combine equally the marine and

voiced formulaically by many characters in Greek literature, particularly in the *Odyssey*. Such a death is virtually equated with non-being.[37] It is from a similar state that many islands are pictured to have evolved.

Pontus, from which such islands emerge, shares certain traits with Chaos and with ancient Near Eastern primordial waters from which dry lands emerge (e.g., Tiamat, Tehōm, etc.).[38] One such characteristic of "marine space" is that it offers no point from which to navigate; another is its contrast to dry land: it is a dark mass, undifferentiated, and as fluid and mobile as the Earth is stable and fixed. At an ambiguous or intermediary state, somewhere between an undifferentiated mode of existence and a differentiated one, are floating islands: they are neither completely without form and limit (as Pontus or primordial waters) nor yet in a distinct and limited state (as a stable, permanently situated island or as the unshakable [*asphales*] Gaia herself.) [39] Even though Rhodes was not herself a floating island, accounts of how such islands became permanently situated illuminate nesogonies in general—especially amidst the paucity of straightforward accounts of island-births from the depths of the sea.

The idea of a floating island appears in *Od.* 9.3 (Aeolus' home), as well as in *Paian* 76.43-49 (Delos). In the *Paian*, Asterie or Ortygia, once a floating island, was anchored by four pillars and renamed Delos just after Apollo's birth, presumably in response to so momentous an event. In the *Argonautica* (2.288ff) the Floating Islands (Ploades), where Iris prevents the Boreads from overtaking and dismembering the Harpies, are also renamed. After Iris swears that the Harpies shall never again visit Phineus' house, the Boreads "wheeled round and set their course for safety and the ship; which is the reason why the Floating Isles have changed their name and are now called the Islands of Return." *Re*nam-

terrestrial elements, belong to an older order of the cosmos, from the period when land and sea were not yet fully differentiated.

[37] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* (New York/London 1959; trans. from Fr. by Willard R. Trask) 130, remarks that "immersion in water signifies regression to the preformal, reincorporation into the undifferentiated mode of pre-existence."

[38] On Pontus as primordial water see Jean Rudhardt, *Le thème de l'eau primordiale dans la mythologie grecque* (Berne 1971), with an excellent bibliography; Vernant and Detienne (note 14, above) esp. 151-55 and 211-14; and Vernant, "Alcman" (note 14, above).

[39] On floating islands see: T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sikes, edd. *The Homeric Hymns*[2] (Amsterdam 1963) 211-12; Jack Lindsay, *The Clashing Rocks* (London 1965) esp. 96-117 and 413-20; and Cook (note 13, above) II, 975ff. Eliade (note 37, above) 130, comments that "*E*mersion repeats the cosmogonic act of formal manifestation; *im*mersion is equivalent to a dissolution of forms. This is why the symbolism of the waters implies both death and rebirth." Eliade calls the island that suddenly manifests itself "one of the paradigmatic images of creation."

Detienne and Vernant (note 14, above) 248, discuss Delos as a windy island, a land without roots, a floating island, which, in contrast to the deeply anchored Earth whose roots assure to humans a solid and immobile seat, is a portion of land halfway immersed in water and subjected to a double movement, horizontal and vertical: as much buffeted by the waves as emerging from the depth of the sea in order to be lost once again in the immensity of Pontus. They also see the floating island as homologous with the seals that inhabit it (note 36, above).

ing seems generally to mark the appearance of an island in its new and permanent form; it is not, however, a component of straightforward accounts of island births from the sea, although naming may be such a component.

The Rhodogony of *Olympian* 7 retains both the sense of a spontaneous and sudden emergence of land from the sea, and the temporal sequence characteristic of all aetiological myths. There is no mention of naming or renaming the island, as one finds in accounts of floating islands that become fixed. The island of Rhodes begins emerging just after Zeus has apportioned the universe; before that, Rhodes was not floating, but existed under the sea ready to become visible. Since it "had not yet risen on the open sea but lay concealed in salty depths below" (56-57), it typifies the first kind of nesogony, direct emergence from the sea, comparable (in inverted form) to Delos' feared submergence in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*Hom. h.* 3.66-78).

Although Pindar follows the pattern of this first kind of nesogony, he deviates from that pattern as well, changing the focus from an aetiological to an epinician one. Just before the emergence of Rhodes, Pindar shifts his emphasis to the sun-god Helius, who in his need for a portion of land and a bride stands in a parallel relationship to the athlete deserving to be honored in song. Helius had been left without a share when Zeus apportioned the earth, and he declined Zeus' offer to re-allot (61-68):

> Instead, he said he'd seen a land arising from the watered salt with ample sustenance for men and sheep; he asked that, there and then, Lachesis of the Golden Snood should raise her arms and swear the great inviolate oath of gods, concurring with the son of Cronus that, when the isle appeared beneath the shining sky, it would be his forever.

In this expanded nesogony Helius arranges his own acquisition of Rhodes by binding Lachesis and Zeus under oath; others in the ode who receive gifts (the son-in-law in the simile; prize-winning athletes and Diagoras in particular in the victor-praise/poetic programme) never obligate the giver in such a manner. It seems that Pindar has conflated two character-types in Helius, the one seeking a gift and the one effecting its allotment: by binding the gods of destiny Helius virtually assures himself of attaining his bride-prize, Rhodes. This is more than any mortal athlete or poet can achieve, even through excellence in sports or poetry. By using *geras* to depict Helius' bride-prize Pindar aligns Helius with athletic winners; and by showing Helius in a supplicant's relation to Zeus Pindar aligns the sun-god both with himself when he prays (87-94) and with the worshipful Rhodians (48-49).

Pindar's ode and the newly visible island share many features. Both the ode and the island are "sent" (cf. 8: *pempôn* and 67-68: *pemphtheisan. . .geras*) to deserving recipients (7-8: prizewinning athletes and 67: Helius). Both are pictured as organic products (cf. 8:

karpon "fruit" and 69: *blaste*, "sprouted"). Both came into being more readily and smoothly because a recipient awaited them: Helius brought Rhodes more certainly into being by his expectation, by the oath binding Lachesis and Zeus, and perhaps even by his sunrays; and Pindar's patron likewise, by anticipating and commissioning the poem, can be seen as helping to bring *it* into being. And finally, ode and island are both expressed in terms of liquid or are associated with liquids (the epinician is "poured" nectar and the island emerges from the sea), recalling both the simile's liquid-filled goblet "bubbling with the dew of the vine" and the golden rain of Zeus. Moreover, all are gifts: island, ode, goblet and rain.[40]

Just as Rhodes' fertility as a homeland suggests the fecundity of epinicia, so her union with Helius producing seven sons and three grandsons implies future amplifications for Pindar's odes. Others have written of Pindar's sense of time as extending into the future; [41] here we see the use of genealogy to suggest continuity for his verse. Likewise, in praying for Zeus to honor both Diagoras and the ordinance *(tethmon)* of his song, the poet intimates that Zeus will respond to him as earlier to Helius, that he like Helius can influence the gods to grant blessings in the future. Verbal and semantic echoes (such as *geras* and words connoting movement and organic growth) indicate and strengthen links between the Rhodogony and victor-praise/poetic programme, while the shift in emphasis from the newborn island to its recipient enables the Helius myth to accrue significance not otherwise inherent in the epinician narrative.

Olympian 6

This ode to Hagesias, son of Sostratus, citizen of Syracuse and of Stymphalus in Arcadia, commemorates his victory in a mule-drawn chariot race. The ode was composed in 472 or 468 B.C., and consists of a proem (1-4), victor-praise (4-9, 12-21 [enclosing a mythic example], 25-27, 77-81), poet's task (1-4, 6-7, 20-28, 82-90), myth (28-70) and a concluding prayer for the future (97-105). It details the birth of two semi-divine children, Euadne, the daughter of Pitane and Poseidon, and Iamus, the son of Euadne and Apollo. The major focus of the mythic section is on Iamus. Fehr, calling the story of Iamus a "birth of a hero" myth, mentions the motifs of impregnation of an earth-maiden by a god, abandonment of the child by its mother, foster parentage "somewhere else" of the child, and a consequent new destiny.[42] Stern, treating the

[40] Lawall (note 11, above) discusses the gift motif in this poem.

[41] Paolo Vivante, "On Time in Pindar," *Arethusa* 5.2 (1972) 107-35 and Anna Komornicka, "La notion du temps chez Pindare: Divers emplois et aspects du terme 'Chronos'," *Eos* 64 (1976) 5-15. See also Gretchen Kromer, "The Value of Time in Pindar's *Ol.* 10," *Hermes* 104 (1976) 420-36.

[42] Fehr (note 1, above) 99ff. See also Laura Nash, "*Olympian* 6: *Alibaton* and Iamos' Emergence into Light," *AJP* 96 (1975) 110-16, who observes that Iamus' tale "corresponds to the general pattern of heroic development in myth, namely that of birth in obscurity, youth in isolation, emergence and attainment."

same ode, adds that in this type of myth the hero's birth causes anger in an elder king due to "fear of destruction or at least exile at the hands of the newborn hero." Such anger endangers the hero, requiring that he be sequestered (a motif reduplicated in *Ol.* 6 in the Pitane and Euadne episodes).[43]

From Greek variants available to us one may plausibly construct the following sequence for myths of semi-divine children: [44]

(1) a god desires an earth-maiden or princess, or she desires a god
(2) the god woos and impregnates her, often using force or deceit; or she takes him willingly as a lover, or seduces him through trickery
(3) an elder male (father, grandfather, uncle) usually the king, learns of the affair and pregnancy
(4) he is angered, often regarding the future offspring as a political or familial threat—sometimes, due to an earlier oracle
(5) he threatens the pregnant mother (or the unborn child) with death or banishment
(6) the child is born (often secretly, in a meadow or near the sea [45])
(7) the child gains special powers or invulnerabilities
(8) the mother abandons the child (to the earth, to the sea) or exposes the child (on a mountain, in the forest) or hides the child
(9) foster parents (often shepherds) or an animal rescue and rear the child
(10) the child sleeps in a cave or hut
(11) the child grows to maturity
(12) he returns as a youth to the city of his origin
(13) someone (a servant, the mother) recognizes him by a birth token
(14) the elder male or king learns of his return and,
(15) to destroy the youth, sends him on an impossible mission (to slay a beast or monster, to bring back a magical object)
(16) the youth succeeds, often with the help of a divine parent or patron

[43] Jacob Stern, "The Myth of Pindar's *Olympian* 6," *AJP* 91 (1970) 332-40.

[44] My list of incidents is only a preliminary effort toward a typology. It is designed primarily for the present study. What is relevant for my purposes is that certain events which Pindar uses do not belong to the standard myth-type, and that Pindar omits or de-emphasizes some of the events that are normally present.

Cf. the survey of common motifs of this tale-type by Ann Pippin Burnett, *Catastrophe Revisited* (Oxford 1971) 104; although she is treating a different variant of this myth-type (viz. the story of the hero Ion), she too addresses the question of what an author has changed in a traditional narrative *type* in order to accommodate present needs and concerns. For the Ion as for the Iamus tale we have no corpus of other versions of the same myth, so examples of the same abstract myth-type must suffice.

[45] Motte (note 27, above) 169ff, calls these birth-sites characteristic for offspring from hierogamies. He cites (168, note 31) Aristaeus (*Py.* 9.1-75) and Iamus (*Ol.* 6.29-56), as well as Epaphus (Aesch. *Suppl.* 556-589 and *Prom.* 812-815) and Ion (Eur. *Ion.* 492 and 949) as examples of heroic births connected to the themes of hierogamy, exposition, or the birth of a city. Eliade (note 37, above) 130, calls the *leimôn*—the "humid field"—a symbolic underworld in which heroes experience a "death" and from which they reemerge, "reborn."

(17) the youth brings back a token of the slain beast or the magical object and/or a maiden he has won on his mission
(18) he returns once again to the city of his origin
(19) he becomes king either as a result of the success of his quest or by marriage or by an act of violence (purposeful or accidental)
(20) eventually he dies, sometimes violently, sometimes after expulsion from his kingdom, and is worshipped as a culture-hero, a city-founder, or the ancestor of an important *genos*.

The myth of Iamus follows this sequence in many details. His mother, herself a foster child of Aepytus, was wooed and impregnated by Apollo, as had been her mother Pitane by Poseidon.[46] Learning of the affair, King Aepytus, an elder male, becomes infuriated (37: *en thumôi piesais cholon ou phaton oxeiai meletai*). The mother Euadne behaves as if Aepytus had actively threatened her son: after bearing her child in forest shade (40: *lochmas hupo kuaneas)* she abandons him to the ground (45: *leipe chamai*). Two snakes nurture him (45-47) and hide the five-day-old infant in the rushes (54). The household is presumably sworn to silence (52-53). When Iamus has matured (57-58) he prays for the honor of kingship.

How does Pindar's use of the material differ from the traditional presentation of the myth of the semi-divine hero? First, in Pindar's narration there is no warning of a dangerous offspring, no hint of an earlier oracle predicting death or exile at the newborn's hands (item 4). Nor does Aepytus once he has learned of the infant's birth act out his rage; rather, he immediately and piously seeks oracular advice.[47] Apollo's response to that request, moreover, differs in content as well as timing from the usual ominous oracle. King Aepytus learns from Phoebus that the child is the god's own son and will become a mighty prophet (50-51), and he returns from Delphi calmed by this new knowledge of Iamus' lineage and future destiny (49-51). The mitigation of his anger makes unnecessary the traditional exile, return, and impossible mission of the hero.

In Aepytus's absence, Euadne gives birth to her godly son (41) in a delivery which is blissful, even ecstatic. Pindar's account of Iamus' birth minimizes any sense of danger to the child, or shame for the mother, traditionally accompanying such secret births. Indeed, Pindar seems to present the birth in a very positive light. He stresses the presence of birth

[46] By another version of the myth Iamus was Poseidon's son (schol.*Ol.* 6.59 b); see Bowra's discussion of how Pindar combines the two versions (note 1, above) 287. Johannes Th. Kakridis, "Des Pelops und Iamos Gebet bei Pindar," *Hermes* 63 (1928), reprinted in William M. Calder II and Jacob Stern, *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt 1970) 172f, sees rudiments of an old saga in the prayer midway in the river and in the appeal to Poseidon. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 308, finds Pindar's reduplication of the nymphs Pitane and Euadne clumsy and unnecessary.

[47] Aepytus, like Tlepolemus in *Ol.*7, is overcome by anger (cf. *en thumôi piesais cholon*, *Ol.*6.37, and *cholôtheis*, *Ol.*7.30); but whereas Tlepolemus first murders his uncle and then consults Delphi, Aepytus seeks oracular advice right away—before committing an impulsive act.

deities (41-42), the loveliness of the birth-pangs (43: *ôdinos eratas*),[48] and the rapidity and spontaneity of the delivery itself (44: *es phaos autika*). Iamus' emergence "straightway into the light from Euadne's womb in lovely childbirth" suggests speedy, timely, and painless parturition. The sense of danger traditionally linked with childbirth is neutralized, and the favorable characteristics of the delivery even anticipate Iamus' happy future.[49]

As animal nurses (item 9) Pindar chooses grey-eyed snakes "to nurse Iamus with the harmless venom of the honey bees."[50] The five-day old infant is hidden "in the reeds amidst thick bushes, where the purple glow of violets suffused with yellow rays bathed his tender body" (54-56). This bed of violets is aptly described as a second womb by Stern, who terms Iamus' emergence from it a second birth.[51] Instead of an impossible mission (item 15) Pindar's hero is given another type of journey: Apollo responds to Iamus' prayer for kingly honor by enjoining his son to arise and follow his voice "to a place where many congregate" (62-63). Thus it is not a rancorous and hostile king who assigns the task or journey, but a benevolent and omniscient father. Pindar has removed the element of hostility and strife between generations, not only by the mitigation of Aepytus' anger but also by the depiction of Apollo as a concerned and protective parent.

When Iamus arrives at the designated site, Apollo grants him a double treasure, "first, the gift of hearing the voice immune to falsity; second, the right to establish an oracle at the highest altar of Zeus" (65-70). Although in his desire for kingly power Iamus resembles the traditional hero, his double gift from Apollo differs from the kind of acquisition

[48] Conceding that the expression "lovely birthpangs" is an oxymoron (Basil Gildersleeve, *Pindar. Olympian and Pythian Odes* [New York 1890] 176, still it seems clear that the epithet "lovely" represents the dominant and final point of view on the birth. The tone does not therefore shift haphazardly, as Stern (note 43, above, 334f) argues, between violence and loveliness, darkness and light, danger and safety, doubt and joy; instead, the negative aspects are transformed to positive because the epinician rather than the traditional mythic context dominates. What U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*Isyllos von Epidauros* [Berlin 1886] 165, n. 12) finds "nicht wohl zu glauben" and probably corrupt, viz. the use of *eratos* to modify *ôdines*, is central to Pindar's presentation of the myth.

[49] Stern (note 43,above) 334, J.H. Finley (*Pindar and Aeschylus* [Cambridge, MA 1955] 113-118), and others surely overemphasize the tonal ambivalence, overlooking the contexts of the "negative" diction: Euadne is *knizomena,* "chafing," only at having to abandon her son; and the birth is designated as *atlatlou pathas,* "unendurable suffering," only as a representation of Aepytus' thought and feelings when he seeks advice at Delphi. Moreover, the phrase *hupo splagchnôn,* "out from under her womb," far from connoting violence simply describes a physiological event (cf. *LSJ*, s.v. *splagchnon* 2, "to come from the *womb*, of a babe"). In sum, while Euadne's expectations of danger are a feature of her actions, the actuality of events (for her and for Iamus) counters that expectation.

[50] Stern's rich analysis overemphasizes the danger suggested by the oxymoron "harmless venom": the context surely reveals that whatever power to destroy Iamus was present at first, Pindar has converted to a constructive use. No sense of lurking danger lingers as we move through the Iamus story.

[51] Stern (note 43, above) 336. For a discussion of the twiceborn motif in the mythology of other cultures, see Mircea Eliade, *Rites and Symbols of Initiation. The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth* (New York 1958) 53-59 and 104; cf. also Duchemin (note 21, above) 160, n. 3

(kingship and political power) common in the traditional myth. The prowess and cleverness characteristic of the traditional hero is absent too: Iamus (like the Heliadae in *Ol.* 7 or Apollo in *Py.* 9) acquires his gift/prize almost effortlessly, i.e. without the traditional test or trial. His attainment results simply from obeying his father's command.

The Iamus story concludes with material absent from the traditional myth-type (71-76):

> From this time the race of the Iamidae was much famed in Greece; wealth (*olbos*) attended them. Honoring virtues they travel along an open path. Each deed attests to this. Blame from others who are envious hangs over them—on whom once a chaste Charis distilled her well-famed beauty (*morphan*) when they were first to drive round the twelfth racecourse.

This sequel, like the sequel to the birth of Athena in *Ol.* 7, is surely Pindar's own. He parallels the Iamidae to Hagesias, who is both victor in a chariot race and a member of their *genos*.[52] He prays that his ode will achieve what the Iamidae already have achieved—*olbos*, *charis*, *kleos* (98-105):

> May Time with lovely kindliness receive the choral celebration of Hagesias arriving from the Stymphalian walls, from one home to another, leaving the mother(land) of sheep-rich Arcadia. It's good on a wintry night that two anchors be fastened to a swift ship. May god be kind and provide for both these and those a famed destiny (*klutan aisan*). Lord who rules the seas, grant a straight sailing which is apart from trials (*kamatôn ektos eonta*), you, golden-distaffed Amphitrite's husband; and of my songs, increase their joyous bloom (*euterpes anthos*).

Besides the parallel between the Iamidae and Hagesias, correspondences between the ode and Iamus enable Pindar to make a variety of cogent arguments on behalf of his poem. By asking in his prayer for a home and a warm reception for his ode, Pindar recalls Iamus' initial hostile and implied eventual friendly welcome at Aepytus' home. The ode, like the infant Iamus, is a new creation, which also leaves its "mother" (100: *mater eumêloio leipont' Arkadias*; cf. 45: *leipe chamai*) and undergoes a journey (from Stymphalus to Syracuse). Secondly, as others have shown,[53] the final request for joyous bloom echoes the florescence of Iamus when he reaches manhood (57-58). The poem's fate is in the hands of the gods, as the literal nature of such material requires; but, as in *Ol.* 7, by developing an analogy to the unqualified success of the child/plant Iamus, Pindar strengthens the likelihood that his song will increase its joyous bloom. Finally, the success with which Iamus surmounted obsta-

[52] See Gildersleeve (note 48, above) 171 for further background on Hagesias as a member of the noble *genos* of the Iamidae.

[53] Stern (note 43, above) esp. 339-40.

cles (aided as he was by Apollo) allows Pindar to argue once more (as in *Ol.* 7) that his poem too should receive a blessed future and overcome any begrudging or envious compatriots' opposition.

Pindar's manner of argument resembles Sappho's in her cletic poem to Aphrodite (1LP): "Come to me now, as once you heard my far cry, and yielded,. . .and came. . . .Then come to me now. . .". However, Pindar's plea is not so explicitly based on past divine behavior as Sappho's, and the original recipient of divine favors in Pindar's case was a mythic hero, whereas in Sappho's it was the poetess herself.

In the proem Pindar stated his intention that his ode be a permanent and readily visible structure (1-4):

> We'll raise our house's vestibule, with its good walls;
> and, placing golden columns in support
> we'll build a wondrous shrine in poetry—first, a
> facade that shines for miles.

As a wondrous shrine (*thaêton megaron*) his poetry resembles the oracle which Iamus will establish in response to Apollo's command and gift. Iamus embodies at once artisan and artifact, creator (as builder of the oracle) and creation (as blossoming flower and as son of Euadne and Apollo). The same is true of the hero Heracles, both as founder of the Olympian games (67-70) and as a genealogical and floral culmination (68: *thalos Alkaïdân*). Their two "foundings" will coincide even in time (67: *eut' an*; 70: *tot' au*), and both founders have divine fathers whom they honor.[54]

One effect of this conflation of creator and creation is to blur the distinction between Pindar the "builder" and his constructed ode, so that his future prayer on the ode's behalf indirectly pleads on his own behalf as well. Pindar's poem was composed to "bear witness" (21: *marturêsô*) to the worth of Hagesias; the deeds themselves, he claims, will testify to the worth of the Iamidae (73-74: *tekmairei*. . .). In like manner, his accomplishment, his choral ode, will testify that he deserves a good name.

Earlier, Pindar had expressed a concern for his own reputation when he asked the chorus leader "to learn next if we've escaped by true words the insult of old, 'Boeotian pig' " (89-90). That taunt clearly resulted from envy and was undeserved. Now Pindar hopes to have escaped what victors like Hagesias and the Iamidae would surely escape, blame (*oneidos*) and envy (*phthonos*). The language of 89-90 draws attention to a comparison between him and them: *pheugomen* echoes *phugoi* of the Hagesias passage (6-7), and *oneidos* inverts *humnon* of that same passage ("what song would that man escape") and echoes *môмos* of the Iamidae passage (74). Pindar suggests obliquely that he deserves *humnon*, just as the athlete who succeeds, and not the taunt of "Boeotian pig."

[54] Cf. Iamus' establishing an oracle to honor his father with Heracles' founding the games to honor his. The "place where many congregate" (63: *pagkoinon*. . .*chôron*), site of Iamus' oracle, provides a semantic parallel to the "much-peopled festival" (69: *heortan*. . .*pleistombroton*), where Heracles will establish the Olympian games.

Critics have written much about the recurrent "two" in *Ol.* 6.[55] Pindar, like Iamus and Amphiareus and the Iamidae, has the gift of prophecy: in drinking the waters of Metope and using true words he resembles Iamus, the future prophet, who waded in the Alpheus when he prayed to his grandfather Poseidon. Pindar too prayed to Poseidon, Lord of the Seas (103), and drank "new rills of inspiration" from his maternal ancestor Metope.[56] His strength, like Iamus', came from an ancestral source. In addition, Pindar is talented in athletics, if we take "seriously" the implications of the figurative description of his task (22-27):

> Now, quickly, Phintis, yoke the strength of mules
> for me, so that the chariot of my poetry may take
> the open road that leads me to the matrix of such men;
> such mules are best equipped to lead the way,
> for they have won Olympic wreaths.

He competes in a figurative mule-drawn chariot race, using prize-winning mules and journeying to Pitane in the Peloponnesus. His return course presumably takes him back to Syracuse from Arcadia (99-100), along with his poem.

Such parallels between Pindar and Iamus suggest a final outcome for Pindar similar to Iamus'. If Iamus' name will be immortal, if he will excel all mortals in prophecy and if, when he matures, he even will communicate with the voice of Apollo, perhaps Time will be generous to the name "Pindaros" (as to his wondrous shrine of poetry), and perhaps the gods will favor him with a positive response to his prayers.

The Iamus myth carries epinician significance for the victor. Hagesias, as remarked above, belonged to the family of the Iamidae: hence, on a historical plane, their glory would enhance his own. In this sense he is *semnon thalos*, "sacred scion," of the Iamidae, as Heracles was of the Alcidae. More strikingly, Hagesias is doubly-gifted like Iamus and, as a citizen of Stymphalus and Syracuse, double-homed like the typical semidivine hero raised by foster parents, and specifically like Iamus. He has as two anchors these two sets of relatives, on whose behalf Pindar requests a glorious fate. Moreover, in Arcadia Hermes (whom Hagesias' maternal ancestors had honored) will bring him *eutuchia*, "good fortune," as Apollo brought guidance and renown to Iamus (fulfilling his own prediction that Iamus "was to be for men on earth a mighty prophet, whose race would never end") and presumably to the Iamidae, skilled in prophecy and contests. It is Hagesias' safe journey in the sea of life which Pindar requests in 103-104: "grant a crossing straight and

[55] Cf. Gildersleeve (note 48, above) 171ff; Norwood (note 7, above) 129 comments on this "governing idea of duality," but does not mention the poet's second talent as a charioteer of song.

[56] Cf. Duchemin (note 21, above) 251ff, on Pindar as poet and prophet, and Stern (note 43, above) 339 and n. 27, on parallels between poet and prophets in *Ol.* 6. On water as a sacred source of inspiration see Duchemin, 253ff.

safe" (*euthun de ploon kamatôn ektos eonta didoi*). Since submergence in the sea would, as earlier discussed, suggest oblivion and obscurity, Pindar is asking here for its very opposite, renown and visibility. He wants Hagesias to be like the poem itself ("a facade that shines for miles") or like Iamus, who "rises up" from the dark bed of violets into the light.

Most of these implications for poem, poet and victor can be drawn from the expanded significance attached to the figure of Iamus whose myth Pindar has reshaped. As Iamus triumphs in spite of initial obstacles to his success, so by analogy will the poem/poet/victor. Pindar's maxim, "advantage won with pain is long remembered" (11: *polloi de memnantai, kalon ei ti ponathêi*) captures but one reason for embedding a myth of the hero-tale type in the ode; he extracts from it a whole array of meanings which enhance the epinician experiences and extend their importance into future time.

Section 3: Summary

The point of this paper has been to show how myths, which are not subject to reality constraints, can be used to expand the significance of epinician poetry, and how Pindar has managed such expansion in several of his odes.

The poet, for example, cannot guarantee that either the achievements of the victor or the work of the poet will gain divine favor and survive. He is able, however, to depict the success of mythic characters as well as their ultimate access to divine grace and blessedness. By setting up analogies between the mythic and the epinician portions of his odes, he can suggest a favorable future destiny for his work, for himself, and for the victor. In my examples, Pindar establishes an analogy between his poems and the births of gods, heroes, and islands, thereby imputing a vitality and organic quality to his own creations. By juxtaposition of his work with mythological events such as the birth of Athena, he endows it with an importance he could never ascribe to it directly. In addition, such a technique assures the cohesiveness of the epinician form.

Addendum

Pindar's extension of myth that I have outlined in this paper is paralleled, in a much simpler manner, by his use of simile. If the vehicle (*comparée*, *illustrans*) of a simile is seen as embedded and secondary, and the tenor (*comparant*, *illustrandum*) as dominant and primary, then the whole simile becomes a microcosm of the unit myth and victor-praise/poetic programme. Both vehicle and myth, as embedded structures which are freer than the primary structures from the constraints of time and verisimilitude, add meanings to the more limited and literal tenor and victor-praise/poetic programme: both can convey expansive and sometimes extravagant meanings which would be absurd if stated directly. Thus, just as the victor-praise/poetic programme absorbs meanings

from the embedded myth, so the tenor absorbs meanings from the vehicle.

Ol. 10.86-96 may serve as a brief example. In this ode Pindar uses the image of a late-born son given by a wife to her longing husband in order to express meanings for (and add significance to) his late creation of a poem for the expectant young victor. In the simile the embedded vehicle illuminates the tenor, suggesting multiple meanings for it which partake of past, present, and especially future time. Although it contains no magical or miraculous elements (as one finds in Pindaric myth), the vehicle does express meanings for the tenor in the same oblique and suggestive manner as does myth for the victor-praise/poetic programme. In the vehicle of the simile, the father obtains his hold on the future through receiving his late-born son; this suggests obliquely that the victor will likewise obtain his promise of blessedness and security through receiving Pindar's belated gift of an ode. A similar immortality for the ode and the victor's and poet's future was suggested by Athena's birth, the birth of Rhodes, and the birth of Iamus. Apparently, childbirth as a symbol tends to suit Pindar's epinician purposes, and to convey similar meanings whether it occurs in the vehicle of a simile (*Ol.* 10) or in embedded myths (*Ols.* 6 and 7).

University of Georgia NANCY FELSON RUBIN

I would like to thank Jerry Clack, the CW referee, and Harriet M. Deal for helping me put this study in its present form.