

Pindar's *Ninth Olympian*

Michael Simpson

PINDAR'S ODES have seldom been treated as "unified, meaningful work(s) of literary art."¹ For confirmation I refer the reader to Bowra's recent *Pindar*, for example, with chapter headings such as "Gods, Heroes, and Men," "Echoes of Politics," "The Athletic Ideal."² Nowhere does Bowra examine an entire ode in detail with a view to explicating its use of language, its structure, images, motifs, in short, how a poem functions as a work of encomiastic art.³ As examples Gundert and Duchemin would have served as well and so, to a lesser degree, would Norwood, Finley and Méautis.⁴

Recent criticism of *Olympian 9* reflects this observation and ranges from the limited to the bizarre. Norwood and Bowra, for instance, in their treatment of the ode devote their attention solely to the myth of Heracles (in which that hero is described fighting at Pylos against Poseidon, Apollo and Hades)—which the poet vehemently rejects (31–44)—but their comments do not shed much light even on this short passage.⁵ Finley says *Olympian 9* is "among the lucidest of the odes," but such a judgement does not impel him to give it other than brief and perfunctory treatment.⁶ Méautis is of the opinion that

¹ David C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar, a Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3 and Olympian 7* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 9, Leiden 1968) 106. See also Young's "Pindaric Criticism," *Minnesota Review* 4 (1964) 584–641. Young has been strongly and agreeably influenced by Elroy L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica I and II* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1962).

² C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964).

³ I agree with Bundy, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) I.3, that the "master principle" of the epinician ode is that its "primary intent" is encomiastic; his words serve to correct erroneous ideas about Pindar, e.g., that he engages in irrelevant digressions. Bundy goes too far, however, in denying personal references or historical allusions in the odes (see, e.g., II.35–36). For a fair and balanced account of his criticism see the rev. by Gordon Kirkwood, *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 130–32.

⁴ Hermann Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt am Main 1935); Jacqueline Duchemin, *Pindare, poète et prophète* (Paris 1955); Gilbert Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1945); John H. Finley Jr., *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1955); Georges Méautis, *Pindare le Dorien* (Neuchâtel 1962).

⁵ From Norwood (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.4] 80–81) scant attention, from Bowra (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.2] 54–56) only a little more. The line numbers of Pindar's odes used here are those of *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, ed. Alexander Turyn (Cracow 1948, repr. Oxford 1952).

⁶ Finley (*supra* n.4) 121.

Pindar invented the myth of Heracles fighting three gods in order to express his own religious views.⁷ The entire ode, he thinks, is a protest against—indeed, an indictment of—Oilean Ajax, the only Homeric hero besides Patroclus that Opus, the victor's town, could claim as its own. Pindar could adopt this attitude because he was at the height of his career and Opus was a small obscure place.⁸

It is the purpose of this essay to show how *Olympian* 9 functions as an ode in praise of Epharmostos of Opus for his victory in wrestling at Olympia in 468 B.C.

The central theme of the ode—what van Groningen calls “le motif générateur,”⁹—is that *replacement* and *introduction of people into new situations* (for their benefit) have been the most significant features of the life of Epharmostos and the history of Opus, sources of honor and renown for them. This theme is announced at the beginning of the ode: the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* of Archilochus sung by Epharmostos' friends in an impromptu celebration immediately following the victory, though sufficient then (1–4), is *now* (*ἀλλὰ νῦν*, 5) to be replaced by the present ode:

But now, such songs as these from the Muses'
far casting bows rain upon Zeus of the red
lightning flash and upon Elis' august summit,
which the Lydian hero Pelops won long ago as
superb dowry of Hippodameia;

and send a winged sweet shaft to Pytho.
Nor will you lay hold of words which fall
to the ground in plucking the lyre and
singing of the wrestling of a man from
noble Opus (5–15).

The reference to Pelops in 10–11 offers a sub-variation of the central theme: when Pelops won Hippodameia by defeating her father Oinomaos in a chariot race,¹⁰ he gained in addition the hill of Kronos as her dowry.

⁷ Méautis (*supra* n.4) 414. That Pindar invented the myth of Heracles fighting three gods at Pylos seems to have been first put forth by Didymus, as quoted in the scholia (*Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, ed. A. B. Drachmann, I [Leipzig 1903–27] 277.14–16, hereafter cited as *Schol.* with appropriate volume, page and line numbers.

⁸ Méautis (*supra* n.4) 418.

⁹ B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 342.

¹⁰ See *Ol.* 1.67–89.

The strikingly expressed bow metaphor for poetry intensifies the contrast between the two songs. This figure, one of the most significant symbols for Pindar's conception of his art,¹¹ expresses the aim of that art, as Dr Lefkowitz has said, which is for the poet to speak *κατὰ καιρόν*.¹² That is, he wants to hit the mark, to say what is most significant with accuracy and precision. Here, by means of this figure, Pindar emphasizes the most telling difference between the song of Archilochus and his own: when he plucks the lyre his words do not fall to the ground and miss their mark (*οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεται*, 13), that is, his is *κατὰ καιρόν* and the other is not. This is obviously so on the simplest level, for, as the scholiast said, the song of Archilochus could fit anyone successful in the games since it lacked both the name of a victor and particulars of a contest.¹³ Pindar's ode, by contrast, is of greater value to Epharmostos because, composed specifically for him and devoted exclusively to him, it articulates the significance of the victory for his life, and so, like the achievements of Epharmostos which it celebrates, it is a source of honor and renown for him. Moreover, the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* was merely 'voiced' (*φωνᾶεν*, 2—not a very vivid description of it) while Pindar's 'rains' (*ἐπίνειμαι* 6–7) arrows of song upon Zeus, Elis and Pytho, where Epharmostos had also won a victory. *ἐπινέμω* is used in the middle voice to mean 'spread', as a fire:¹⁴ Pindar's song, raining arrows of fire over Elis, is a vivid source of light, visible itself and making its subjects visible as well, while Archilochus' song is only heard. The image is continued at 23–24. Opus, too, receives a shower of fiery arrows of song (*ἐγὼ . . . πόλιν μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων αἰοδαῖς*).¹⁵ The bow figure not only conveys the appropriateness and vividness of Pindar's ode generally in contrast to the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος*, but is a dramatic and arresting introduction of its central theme: the song of Archilochus is replaced by Pindar's arrows of fire, which never miss their mark. The image thus signals that the poet will speak *κατὰ καιρόν* chiefly by means of that theme.

How is it particularly *κατὰ καιρόν*? First, it implicitly honors the fact that by winning at Olympia the victor gained new status as a *περιοδονίκης* or panhellenic victor, even as Pelops gained the hill of Kronos

¹¹ Manfred Bernard, *Pindars Denken in Bildern* (Pfullingen 1963) 54.

¹² Mary R. Lefkowitz, "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP* 67 (1963) 208.

¹³ *Schol.* I.268.6–9.

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Hdt.* 5.101 and *Polyb.* 14.5.7.

¹⁵ Farnell connected the two passages: *The Works of Pindar*, ed. L. R. Farnell, II (London 1930–32) 68 (repr. as *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar* [Amsterdam 1965]).

in addition to Hippodameia (10–11).¹⁶ Epharmostos' Olympian victory *introduced* him into a new and honored status.

Second, the theme serves to promote a pattern of achievement for the victor. For an instance of it relates that as a boy preparing to wrestle at Marathon, Epharmostos appeared to the judges as older than he was (or perhaps too big for his age), was then not allowed to wrestle in his proper category (Pindar says he was “robbed” of it), but was made to wrestle with older men—yet won his match (95–97).¹⁷ By being introduced into a new and unlooked for situation he gained even greater honors, because of the increased odds against his winning, than he would have had if he had wrestled in his proper class.

¹⁶ He had won at least once at each of the three other great games: Pythian victory (*Ol.* 9.12ff); Isthmian and Nemean victories (9.90–93). There is a problem of dating here. According to one scholion Epharmostos won both victories in the 73rd Olympiad (488); this date was emended by Drachmann to the 78th (468) on the basis of *POxy.* 222 (*Schol.* I.271.22–272.2). If Epharmostos won both victories in the same Olympiad then the Pythian was necessarily the more recent of the two, occurring at the Pythian games in 466; and it was this victory, not the one gained at Olympia, which made Epharmostos a *περιοδονίκης*. Another scholion says that Epharmostos won his Pythian victory in the 30th Pythiad, which was either 470 or 466, depending on whether one reckons Pythiads from 586 or 582 (*Schol.* I.272.7). Since most recent scholars accept Gaspar's dating of Pythiads from 582 (Camille Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique* [Brussels 1900] 2–9) a date of 466 for the Pythian victory would seem assured. The scholiast assigned both victories to the same Olympiad although he made an error, writing 73rd (488) instead of 78th (468), which date, however, *POxy.* 222 fortunately supplies. Even without the scholiast's notice that the Pythian victory occurred in the 30th Pythiad, if both occurred in the same Olympiad, that of 468, the Pythian was by necessity won in 466. That notice, together with the scholiast's (emended) Olympiad date, reinforces Gaspar's computation of Pythiads from 582. In his ode, however, Pindar subordinates the more recent Pythian victory (in fact, barely mentions it: *Ol.* 9.12–13, 19) to the earlier Olympian one and devotes lines 1–11 to the latter. To me, this seems perverse. We need not, however, accept 466 as the date for Epharmostos' Pythian victory. According to H. C. Bennett, “On the Systematization of Scholia Dates for Pindar's Pythian Odes,” *HSCP* 62 (1957) 61–78, the Pindaric scholia follow the earlier (586), not the later (582) date in reckoning Pythiads (see pp.66–69 for the argument on *Ol.* 9). The scholiast thus wrongly assigned both victories to the same Olympiad (that he did so is strangely ignored by Bennett), since the 30th Pythiad would have occurred in Olympiad 77.3 (470) rather than 78.3 (466). And the ode itself gives evidence that the Olympian was the more recent of the two (“ . . . the most natural assumption by a reader unaware of the problem of conflicting Pythian systems would be that the Pythian victory had preceded a recent Olympic victory for which this ode is, unquestionably, the celebration,” Bennett p.68). Boeckh (ed. *Pindari Opera* II.2 [Leipzig 1821] 187) and Hermann, who rightly conjectured 468 for the Olympian victory, both assumed that the Olympian was the more recent of the two. H. C. Montgomery lists Epharmostos as a *περιοδονίκης* as of his Olympian victory in 468 (*RE* 19 [1937] 814 s.v. *Περιοδονίκης*). Considering the evidence for dating and the ode itself, this seems to me the more reasonable view.

¹⁷ See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 350, and Farnell (*supra* n.15) II.73.

Third, by means of the theme Pindar establishes a parallel pattern of accomplishment for the victor's town, thus fitting him into the tradition of its renown. After a general deluge destroyed mankind, the first city created was Opus (from the stones which Deucalion and Pyrrha, in obedience to Zeus, cast behind themselves)¹⁸ where men were re-introduced into the world (45–50). Next, the royal line of Opus, descended from the stone people, was saved from extinction when Zeus made pregnant and then brought to the childless king Lokros Protogeneia, daughter of Opus of Elis and descended from Deucalion and Pyrrha.¹⁹ Lokros named her child, whom he adopted, Opus after his maternal grandfather, and made him ruler over his city (61–71). Thus the royal line of Opus was preserved, indeed, enhanced, by the introduction from without of an adopted heir.

While Opus was king, foreigners flocked to the city from Argos, Thebes, Arkadia and Pisa, among them Menoitios, the father of Patroklos (72–75). Pindar next mentions the friendship between Patroklos and Achilles, formed when they fought Telephos on the Mysian coast.²⁰ A major source of Opus' renown was thus introduced into the city when Menoitios came to it as an immigrant. Thus the fame of Opus has been derived from the introduction into it of people from without, even as Epharmostos has won special acclaim from being introduced into new situations. The same general pattern of achievement operates for both, and Epharmostos has been revealed carrying on in a perfect way his city's tradition of renown.

Following transitional lines in the form of a chariot metaphor for poetry (*εἴην εὐρησιεπῆς ἀναγείσθαι . . .*, 86–89) there is additional praise of the victor and of Lampromachos, a kinsman²¹ of his who was also *proxenos* of Thebes (89) and successful in the Isthmian games. In this part of the ode Pindar enumerates Epharmostos' many victories, including the one at Marathon mentioned above (89–106). In the final lines (107 to the end) a gnomic statement leads to the final praise of the victor. Pindar there says that success is gained by *φύα* rather than by *διδασκαὶ ἀρεταί* (107–110). He proceeds to expand this, however, in an anomalous way:

¹⁸ See *Schol.* I.282.22–283.4.

¹⁹ Pindar does not strive for clarity nor completeness in his telling of the myth. For explanations of difficulties see *Pindar, the Olympian and Pythian Odes*, ed. B. L. Gildersleeve (New York 1885) 206, and Farnell II.71.

²⁰ From the *Kypria*; see Farnell II.72.

²¹ *Schol.* I.296.8–9 and 297.5–6.

A thing accomplished without god is no worse for having been left in silence. Some roads lead further than others, and one ambition will not nurture us all. The way of poetry is steep, but in offering this prize of song²² be bold to cry (*ὄρουσαι*, 117) aloud that this man through divinity has been born skilled in hand, with nimble limbs and valor in his eyes and, Ajax, son of Oileus, victorious he crowned in festival your altar (111–120).

The statement that *φύα* (from which the skill of poets and athletes is derived) is superior to learned ability at once expresses a strong conviction of Pindar²³ and is, at the same time, a convention of the epinician *genre*, as Bundy has shown.²⁴ But the peculiar turn this gnomic statement takes in its expansion would seem to indicate a specific application. Why the reference to silence? Why the concession that some paths lead to greater success than others, which is then qualified by the statement that the same ambition (to traverse a certain path) does not motivate us all? He implies, then, that it is *φύα* which enables a man to choose a road which leads further.

I do not think that these lines are merely conventional. They seem to me to allude to something in particular about which Pindar is negative. The poet then adds, without apparent connection, that the way of poetry²⁵ is steep, but exhorts himself to offer his ode as a prize and to be bold to cry aloud in praise of the victor. That is, his poetical task is difficult, but he asserts a confidence bordering on defiance²⁶ that he is equal to it. The reference to poetry continues the metaphor of the road (in *αἰπειναί*, 116) and so links that statement to the one just made, that some roads lead further than others (now seen as applicable to poetry). Both, in turn, may be said to extend the chariot metaphor at 86–89, in which Pindar prayed to be an ‘inventor of

²² I take *ἄεθλον* as ‘song’, following *Schol.* I.305.8 and despite Farnell II.74, for reasons which follow shortly in the text.

²³ See also *Ol.* 2.94–97 and *Nem.* 3.38–40.

²⁴ Bundy (*supra* n.1) I.16–17.

²⁵ I interpret *σοφίαι* (115) to mean ‘poetry’, as often in Pindar (e.g., *Ol.* 9.41, 1.116; *Pyth.* 1.12, 6.48–49; *Isthm.* 7.17–19), although the meaning here can include athletic skill or excellence generally.

²⁶ *ὠρόομαι* (117) is properly used of the howling or roaring of animals; see *LSJ s.v.*

verse' (*εὐρησιεπής*, 86), fit to advance in the Muses' chariot,²⁷ and then expressed the wish to be attended by 'daring and abundant power' *τόλμα . . . καὶ ἀμφιλαφῆς δύναμις*, 88). This figure is conventional foil²⁸ used to heighten the tone of the narration for the coming enumeration of victors—a kind of fanfare or flourish. The chariot figure and the gnomic statement in the closing lines (107 to the end) are further connected, since *τόλμα* (88) is recalled in *θαρσέων* (117) and *δύναμις* (88) in *ὄρθιον* (117), while his use of *ᾠρυσαι* (117) obviously indicates that the poet is *εὐρησιεπής* (86). Moreover, *πρόσφορος* (87) is reflected in *προσφέρων* (116).

The chariot metaphor and the final lines are, in turn, linked to the myth of Heracles at 30–44. The clause *εἶην . . . πρόσφορος* (86–87) expresses a desire to speak *κατὰ καιρόν*,²⁹ while at 41 (the conclusion of the Heracles myth) the poet says that boasting *παρὰ καιρόν* is in harmony with madness. The statement in the closing lines that a thing achieved without god is better left in silence (111–12) recalls the poet's admonition, "spit out, mouth, this story (of Heracles), since reviling gods is hateful poetry" (38–41). Note, moreover, the reference to good poetry (*σοφία* . . . | *αἰπειναί*) at 116–17 and to bad poetry *ἐχθρὰ σοφία* at 41; and to divinity (*δαιμονία*, 118; *κατὰ δαίμον*, 30).

What is the significance of these repetitions of word and concept joining the chariot metaphor (86–89), the closing lines of the poem (107 to the end), and both passages to the Heracles myth (30–44)? Another instance of the theme of replacement points to the answer. When Pindar says, "Spit out, mouth, this account (of Heracles), etc. . . You should bring your speech to Protogeneia's town," (38–45), he is replacing the Heracles myth with the myth relating to Opus. It is here, I think that the major importance of the central theme lies. I cannot believe that Pindar offered the Heracles myth merely to express his religious views, as Méautis said (see n.8). Nor do I think that he would bring it in apropos of nothing in order to offer another instance of his central theme—a gratuitous one without any organic relation to Epharmostos or Opus. In my view the Heracles myth was part of the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* of Archilochus, which the poet says was sung spontaneously by the victor's friends immediately after his success at Olympia (1–5). Archilochus, according to the scholiast,

²⁷ I follow Farnell's way of construing the passage (II.72–73).

²⁸ See Bundy (*supra* n.1) I.30, 28 and 12 (in that order).

²⁹ Cf. the use of *πρόσφορος* at *Nem.* 3.30–32, 8.48–49 and 9.7.

while at Olympia composed the song about Heracles.³⁰ Heracles founded the Olympian games, and in a hymn devoted to him the narration of his exploits would be appropriate.³¹ The combative and iconoclastic Archilochus would not have had Pindar's scruples in telling an impious story about the hero. Pindar himself speaks of Archilochus as *ψογερός . . . βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν | πιαινόμενος*, "censorious, fattening himself on foul words of hate."³² It seems plausible that Epharmostos' companions, in singing Archilochus' song, would naturally wish to compare the recent victor to Heracles, its subject, who thus would serve as a mythical example for him. Moreover, if, as is not unlikely, they knew of the circumstances of Epharmostos' victory at Marathon, where he fought out of his class against older men (*Ol.* 9.95ff), they could draw a fitting parallel between the victor and Heracles, who fought out of *his* class, so to speak, against Poseidon, Apollo and Hades at Pylos.

³⁰ *Schol.* I.266.5–6.

³¹ For Heracles as founder of the Olympian games see *Ol.* 3.11ff and 10.25ff. One scholion indicates that the song was only three lines long (*Schol.* I.266.17–20). Another, however, quotes Eratosthenes, who said that Archilochus' song was not an epinician but a hymn to Heracles and was called *τριπλός* (*Ol.* 9.2) not because it was composed of three strophes (implying its length?) but because *καλλίνικε* was sung three times as a refrain (*Schol.* I.268.14–17). As for the myth itself, it has been thought that Pindar combines into one three different stories of Heracles fighting gods: Poseidon at Pylos when the god opposed Heracles, who was fighting against his son Neleus; Apollo at Delphi over the tripod; and Hades when he went to the underworld to get Cerberus. This was the view of Didymus (*Schol.* I.277.9–18) and it is accepted without modification by Bowra (*supra* n.2) 55–56. Yet there was a version of the myth of Heracles' battle against Neleus at Pylos, indicated by the schol. at *Il.* 11.690, in which Poseidon, Hera and Hades were allies of Neleus and so opposed Heracles. Apollod. 2.7.3 says that Hades was wounded by Heracles in the battle at Pylos and Paus. 6.25.2–3 says that Hades fought against the hero at Pylos and quotes *Il.* 5.395–97, lines telling of that god's being wounded by Heracles (392–94 refers to his wounding Hera). Farnell thought Pindar was probably combining two stories into one, since Apollo is not known to have been one of the gods allied with Neleus at Pylos (*Il.* 70). But if Pindar himself is combining three or two myths, then obviously the myth of Heracles fighting three gods at Pylos was not in Archilochus' hymn. There are two solutions: (1) Apollo was, in some version of the myth, one of the gods fighting with Neleus against Heracles at Pylos. This is the view of Boeckh, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) II.2.189: *Quidni igitur Apollo quoque eo convenerit? Quem et ipsum ad Pylum dimicantem facere fabula eo maiore specie potuit, quo minus de loco, ubi de tripode Delphico cum Hercule decertasset, priscae consentiebant narrationes.* This would have been the version Archilochus used. (2) Archilochus narrated one or the other of these myths, perhaps the one about Heracles fighting Poseidon and Hades at Pylos, and Pindar, for the purpose of rejecting *all* the stories of Heracles fighting gods, joined the story of the battle with Apollo over the tripod to the one of the battle with Poseidon and Hades at Pylos. I prefer the first but can accept the second.

³² *Pyth.* 2.55–56. Cf. *βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν το ἔχθρὰ σοφία* at *Ol.* 9.41.

To a temperament such as Pindar's, an impious story of this kind is odious enough.³³ When it has a direct application to the victor it becomes dangerous as well. The reference in the gnomic statement at 107ff contrasting *διδασκταὶ ἀρεταί* with *φυσία* is easily applicable to poets³⁴ and, since Pindar has contrasted his poem with the hymn of Archilochus, one naturally applies it to that poet. When Pindar continues with the statement that it is better to be silent about something done impiously (111–12), he is recalling his original rejection of the Heracles myth. When he goes on to say that poetry is difficult, but that he is advancing (as replacement) this ode (115–16), he is again recalling the Heracles myth (*σοφία*, 41: *σοφίαι*, 115), but as well the opening lines of the poem in which the present ode is said to replace the Archilochus hymn. The references in the closing lines back to the Heracles myth and to the opening lines where the Archilochus song is mentioned imply that the two are connected. To an audience who knew the hymn containing, as I believe, the story about Heracles, it would not be necessary to spell out the connection.

While dissociating Epharmostos from Heracles, Pindar associates him with Opus, the adopted heir of Lokros, and Patroklos. Opus, Pindar says, is a man *ὑπέρφατος . . . μορφῆ τε καὶ ἔργοισι* (70–71), while Epharmostos is (or was at Marathon) *ώραῖος . . . καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά τε ῥέξαις* (101). The scholiast noted the identification of Epharmostos with Patroklos.³⁵ It occurs again, significantly, in Pindar's description of the victor at Marathon. Since that victory enabled Epharmostos' companions to make an apparently apt comparison of him to Heracles, Pindar deliberately focuses on the Marathon victory as a means to compare the victor instead with Opus and Patroklos: "Alone (*οἶος*, first word of 95 and hence emphatic)³⁶ in Marathon, snatched from the beardless youth, he was awaiting a contest with older men for silver goblets" (95–97), while of Patroklos

³³ Cf. *Ol.* 1.35–53b.

³⁴ Cf. *Ol.* 2.94–95, where *μαθόντες*, poets whose skill is learned, are contrasted to Pindar, who "knows much because of my *φυσία*."

³⁵ *Schol.* I.295.5–7.

³⁶ All modern editors retain the Mss. *οἶον* at 95 (*sc. ἀγῶνα*, 96–97): "what a contest he awaited!" There is justification, apart from the literary reason, however, for reading *οἶος*. The scholiast reports that some read *οἶον* (glossed *μόνον*) and the passage was interpreted "only in Marathon was he defeated, etc.," which the scholiast rightly rejects as *ἄτοπον* (*Schol.* I.298.16–19). In my view *οἶος* was corrupted into *οἶον* and that was then "corrected" to *οἶον*, the correction influenced by *ῥοσσὰ βοῆ* at 100. Jurenka also conjectured *οἶος* (cited in *Pindari Carmina*, ed. W. Christ [Leipzig 1896] *app.crit. ad lin.*).

he says, “Alone (*μόνος*, first word of 77 and so also emphatic) he stood with Achilles when Telephos hurled the valiant Danaans in rout back upon the ships by the sea” (76–79). In both instances the fighting is against heavy odds and the courage of both subsequently great. Heracles, too, had fought against heavy odds, but it was an impious battle. Moreover, a comparison to Patroklos is quite appropriate for an Opuntian victor.

If we understand the Heracles myth to have been part of the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* of Archilochus which was sung by friends of the victor, who then took Heracles to be a mythical example for him and saw in the victory at Marathon a parallel between Epharmostos and the hero fighting gods at Pylos, we can see the point—indeed, the urgency—in Pindar’s central theme of replacement. He wants to exorcise, as it were, the victor’s association with a figure in an impious myth. The first instance of the theme (5–15) intensifies the contrast between Archilochus’ poem and his own by emphasizing, by means of the bow image in these lines, the *κατὰ καιρόν* nature of the latter. *παρὰ καιρόν* at 41, used to describe the Heracles myth, then makes explicit what was metaphorically expressed in the bow figure. The *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* turns out to be *παρὰ καιρόν* in two ways. First, it lacks any kind of particular reference to the victor and so is unable to articulate the significance of his deeds. Second, it contains an impious story which can be applied to the victor and so is ‘hateful poetry’.

The significance of the connection discussed above between the three passages, Heracles myth and its rejection (30–44), chariot metaphor for poetry (86–89) and closing lines (107 to the end), is now clear. The chariot figure conveys Pindar’s wish to speak *κατὰ καιρόν* but yet with originality and daring as he enumerates Epharmostos’ victories, and especially as he singles out the significant victory at Marathon, originally a basis for comparison of the victor to Heracles, for he will now dissociate Epharmostos from Heracles at Pylos, a *παρὰ καιρόν* story since it is impious, and associate him with Opus and Patroklos.

At the end of the ode Pindar alludes to what has gone before, beginning with a contrast between *φνῆ* and *διδασκταὶ ἀρεταί*, implying a contrast between himself and Archilochus. He then sharpens his focus: silence is better in some instances, referring to the Heracles myth and his rejection of it. All roads are not the same, one ambition will not nurture us all, good poetry is difficult. Now he is

alluding to the chariot metaphor, extended in the road metaphor, as if to say “the road *I* traverse in the Muses’ chariot”—the Marathon story with its effect of dissociating Epharmostos from Heracles and associating him with Opus and Patroklos —“is better because of my *φύα*”; and he is also contrasting his good poetry to the ‘hateful’ poetry which related the Heracles myth. He offers this poem *κατὰ καιρόν*, thus recalling that his ode, as he said at the beginning, is a *replacement* for the song of Archilochus. The poet is now bold to cry aloud, convinced that his prayer to be original, *κατὰ καιρόν*, daring and powerful has been answered (the chariot metaphor). What he cries is that Epharmostos’ prowess was inborn through divinity, recalling that men are *σοφοί* and *ἀγαθοί* through divinity (*cf.* the beginning of the Heracles myth, 31). We might even say that *σοφοί* refers to good poets, such as Pindar, among whom Archilochus is not; and *ἀγαθοί* to brave and pious men, such as Epharmostos, among whom Heracles, in the impious story told of him, at least, is not.³⁷ This is the line referred to, then, in the contrast between *φύα* and *διδασκταὶ ἀρεταί*.

The central theme of *Olympian 9*, replacement, or introduction of people into new situations for their greater glory, has a dual purpose. It enables the poet at once to combat the *παρὰ καιρόν* Heracles myth in the *καλλίνικος ὕμνος* of Archilochus, which is itself generally *παρὰ καιρόν* since it lacks specific reference to Epharmostos, and to praise the victor in the most significant and appropriate way. Pindar’s ode is *κατὰ καιρόν* first because it rejects a sacrilegious myth which could be applied to the victor, and dissociates him from it. Second, it is more to the point *vis à vis* Epharmostos, since it locates through the central theme a pattern of accomplishment in his life which shows him to be solidly in the tradition of renown of his city, for which there is a parallel pattern of achievement. Moreover, the theme—although without specific mention—implicitly honors Epharmostos’ new status as *περιοδονίκης* into which his Olympian victory introduced him. In short, it is the central theme itself which makes the ode *κατὰ καιρόν*.

Its particular instances are: (1) Pindar’s ode replaces Archilochus’ hymn; (2) the offensive Heracles myth is replaced by the myth centering on Opus, the victor’s city; (3) in the new myth Deucalion and Pyrrha re-introduce mankind into the world in Opus; (4) an heir, Opus,

³⁷ I agree with Farnell II.69 that the passage at 30ff should be interpreted, “We are all dependent on god for our valour and wisdom, for how could it have been true that Herakles successfully defied gods in battle? Let us reject that story as impious.”

is brought to the childless king, Lokros, and so introduced into the royal line in order to preserve it; (5) immigrants are introduced into the city, Opus, among them Menoitios, father of Patroklos, who enhance its stature, so establishing its pattern of renown; (6) in recounting Epharmostos' victories Pindar singles out the contest at Marathon at which he was introduced into a class of older athletes, yet won his match. In this instance of the theme Epharmostos is dissociated from Heracles and associated with Opus and Patroklos. At the same time Pindar makes manifest a pattern of achievement in his life parallel to his city's. His introduction into the ranks of panhellenic victors extends the pattern to the present and, as it were, joins the two patterns into one: his added glory is also Opus'. The central theme is, one may say, the poetic counterpart of the most significant aspects of the life of victor and city, embodying them in itself. Thus it is truly *κατὰ καιρόν*.

SMITH COLLEGE

April, 1969