CHAPTER 1

Hesiod and the Poetics of Lyric

Any attempt to understand Hesiodic poetics must begin with the proem of the *Theogony* (1–115), where we find the most extensive exploration of poetic creativity and performance in the entire Hesiodic corpus. The *Theogony* defines good poetry as a mental diversion from the miseries of everyday life, a function best served when the subject matter pertains to the realm of the divine and/or the distant mythological past. The idea is introduced in *Th.* 53–62, as the birth of the Muses from Zeus and Mnemosyne establishes a genealogical connection that acknowledges the importance of memory in the composition and performance of oral poetry, but also evokes the cognitive process involved and underscores its commemorative aspect.[1] And yet, at the same time, the offspring of Memory are said to have been born "as forgetfulness of evils and as respite from worries" (λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων, *Th.* 55). The poem develops this idea further in its portrayal of the ideal human poet in *Th.* 94–103. According to this passage, a successful poet is endowed by the Muses and Apollo with the gift to distract and soothe his human audience with his performance.[2] The language that describes the effect of poetry upon its audience here reiterates the tension between remembering and forgetting as well as the preoccupation with anxiety and its temporary relief expressed in *Th.* 53–62:[3]

> . . . γλυκερὴ οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.
> εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέι θυμῷ
> ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς
> Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων

[1] Pucci 1977: 22–25, Clay 2003: 68–70, Stoddard 2003: 11–12; on the discourse of remembrance, see also Bakker 2002: 67–73. On the poetics of diversion, see Pucci 1977: 17–19 and, in response, Ferrari 1988: 55–56.

[2] On the parallel between divinely favored poets and kings in *Th.* 80–103, see, e.g., Duban 1980, Thalmann 1984: 139–43, Clay 2003: 69–70, Stoddard 2003, Blößner 2005.

[3] On the difficult syntax of this passage, see Rijksbaron 2009: 257–59.

ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεούς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
αἶψ᾽ ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων
μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.
(Hesiod, *Theogony* 97–103)

. . . sweet flows the voice from his mouth. For, even if someone who has sorrow in his newly afflicted spirit is parched in his heart with grief, but if then a poet, the attendant of the Muses, sings of the glorious deeds of earlier men and of the blessed gods who inhabit Olympus, immediately this man forgets his anxieties and does not remember his worries at all. For quickly the gifts of the gods divert his mind (παρέτραπε).

Unsurprisingly, escapist poetry is not concerned with its audience's 'here and now' but focuses instead on gods and heroes. The Hesiodic text is vague, but *Th.* 100–01 probably encompasses not only heroic epic and hymnic poetry, as Clay has suggested,[4] but also theogonic and genealogical poems, as well as combinations of genealogical and heroic poetry, such as the Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles*.[5]

The lyric poets Pindar and Bacchylides are certainly familiar with the idea of poetry as diversion, as their poems occasionally envision their own soothing effect.[6] Yet the main focus of scholars who have studied the contribution of Hesiodic ideas regarding poets and poetry to fifth-century lyric has been on two other, interconnected elements: the ideal of a close relationship between the poet and the Muses, and Hesiod's claim to the truth. Early in the proem of the *Theogony*, the first-person voice, who identifies himself as 'Hesiod' (*Th.* 22), recounts the incident that transformed him from a shepherd into a poet, namely his encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Th.* 22–34). After a brief initial utterance, the Muses gave Hesiod a staff of laurel (*Th.* 30–31) and breathed into him a divine voice (αὐδὴν / θέσπιν, *Th.* 31–32) that could divulge "what will be and was before," i.e. what lies outside the immediate experience and limited knowledge of a mortal man (*Th.* 31–32).[7] The Muses then

[4] Clay 2003: 70; cf. Marg 1970: 101. Contrast West 1966: 188.

[5] The formulation of *Th.* 101 (ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεούς) echoes the Muses' mandate to Hesiod in *Th.* 33 (ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος). Nagy 1990a: 61.

[6] Ba. *Ode* 5.6–7 in a context that engages more broadly with the proem to the *Theogony* (see below), *Dith.* 19/5.35–36, Pi. *N.*1.1–5, fr. 124a–b SM; cf. *P.*1.5–12.

[7] Clay 1988: 330 with n.31, who takes the formula to mean exclusively eternal matters that pertain to the divine, and juxtaposes *Th.* 32 with *Th.* 38 (song of the Muses) as well as *Il.* 1.70 (Calchas' oracular power); cf. West 1966: 166 and Arrighetti 1998: 316–17. The Muses give Hesiod the capacity to sing of the past and the future (*Th.* 32), yet the latter is absent from the *Theogony*, as Lucian's fictional character complains in *Hesiodus* 1–3. Note, moreover, that the Muses are explicitly evoked as the divine source of the *Theogony* in *Th.* 114–15 (ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι ... / καὶ εἴπαθ᾽ ὅτι πρῶτον

ordered Hesiod to sing of the immortals, starting and ending with the goddesses themselves (*Th.* 33–34).[8] Though brief, this account succeeds at establishing the poetic authority of the Hesiodic voice.

The words with which the Muses address Hesiod before they bestow their material and immaterial gifts upon him are central to Hesiodic poetics:

> ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἷον,
> ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
> ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.
> (Hesiod, *Theogony* 26–28)

Field-dwelling shepherds, base disgraces, mere bellies, we know how to say many lies similar to genuine things, and we know how to utter true things whenever we wish.

Cryptic as it is,[9] the contrast between a full account that leaves out nothing (ἀληθέα < ἀ- + λανθάνω) and falsehoods that resemble what is genuine (ψεύδεα . . . ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα) in *Th.* 27–28 has invited several interpretations.[10] For instance, the lines have been interpreted as a denunciation of the poetry that Hesiod produced before he met the Muses on Helicon.[11] The text, however, seems to indicate that, before his encounter with the goddesses, the narrator was just a shepherd and that the Muses' epiphany marked the beginning of his life as a poet, not just the improvement of his poetry (*Th.* 22–23, 30–31; cf. *WD* 658–59).[12] Other interpretations view the passage as Hesiod's attempt to justify fictional elements in his own poetry,[13] or, more recently, as an admission that the complex rhetoric of the *Theogony* includes a mix of

γένετ' αὐτῶν. "tell me these things, Muses . . . and say which of them came to being first") and in the proem to the *Catalogue* (fr. 1.1–2), also a poem about the mythical past. Even though the proem of the *WD* does not involve the goddesses as an authoritative source for Hesiod's advice to Perses (see below), the poetic voice does depend on them for the part of his teaching that falls outside his immediate experience (*WD* 646–49 on seafaring).

[8] For an analysis of the Muses' gifts, see Stoddard 2003: 6–9 with bibliography; cf. also Nagy 1990a: 52–53 and Clay 2003: 65–67.

[9] For a reading of the Muses' statement as a riddle, see Pratt 1993: 110–11.

[10] On the semantics of ἀληθής and ἐτήτυμος/ἔτυμος, see Krischer 1965. On ψεῦδος, see Luther 1935: 80–90 and Levet 1976: 201–14. For an overview of the various interpretative approaches to *Th.* 26–28, see Pucci 2007: 60–64 and 2009: 42–44; cf. Bowie 1993: 20–23 and Koning 2010a: 300–04.

[11] West 1966: 162.

[12] Cf. Arrighetti 1998: 312–13 and Nagy 2009: 307–08 with connection to hero-cult.

[13] See, e.g., Wilamowitz 1928: 48–49 and Mayer 1933: 682. By contrast, Wade-Gery 1949: 86 envisions Hesiod as a proto-scientist and sees in *Th.* 27–28 Hesiod's attempt to liberate his imagination in order to put forth his hypotheses regarding the cosmos. Verdenius 1972: 235 with n.1 offers further bibliography on this interpretative line as well as a reasonable refutation.

truths and falsehoods.[14] The passage has also been interpreted as a commentary on the human inability to determine the degree of truthfulness in divinely inspired poetic language.[15] Reading the lines as an introspective acknowledgement of fictionality or as a disclaimer regarding the truthfulness of Hesiodic poetry may be attractive to modern scholars, but it becomes problematic when we take into consideration the context of *Th.* 26–28, which is an attempt to establish poetic authority. Though not entirely impossible, it is highly unlikely that the account of the poet's initiation would begin by preemptively undercutting the truthfulness of Hesiodic poetry. Hence, another group of interpretations suggests that *Th.* 26–28 are polemical against other poets in general,[16] against poets who are dependent upon their patrons,[17] or, much more plausibly, against poets of rival theogonies.[18] Yet the most prominent polemical interpretation of these lines, which was already popular in antiquity and has left its mark on the biographical tradition,[19] views *Th.* 26–28 as an attack against Homeric heroic epic.[20] The reading of the passage as a contrast between Homer, through whom the Muses spread verisimilar lies, and Hesiod, the

[14] Stroh 1976; cf. Pratt 1993: 110–11 and Ferrari 1988: 70–71.

[15] Pucci 1977: 8–16 reads in *Th.* 26–28 the admission that the mortal poet "does not personally have any direct knowledge of that which he sings," and that humans do not have the ability to distinguish which of the Muses' accounts are truthful imitations of what is and which are distorted; cf. Pucci 2009: 42–44. On the ambiguity of language, see already Detienne 1973: 51–80; cf. Arthur 1983: 104–07, Thalmann 1984: 143–52, and Clay 2003: 62–64. For a thoughtful critique of Pucci's Derridean interpretation, see Ferrari 1988. For far less ambitious justifications of Hesiod's inability to know whether the content of his poem is true or not, see Walcot 1960: 36–37, who interprets *Th.* 26–28 as preemptive finger-pointing to the source of the poem in case a god becomes offended by it, and Harriott 1969: 113, who reads the passage as a warning that, should Hesiod offend the gods, he will produce poetry of lies without knowing it.

[16] Griffith 1983a: 48–49 interprets the lines as a generic reminder of the inferiority of poetry produced by poets who are not enjoying the Muses' favor as Hesiod does.

[17] Svenbro 1976: 59–61.

[18] According to Nagy 1990a: 45, Hesiod here asserts the superior, Panhellenic appeal of his theogonic narrative against local traditions; this view is reiterated in 2009: 277–78. Hesiod's proem includes also genealogical accounts similar to, but distinct from, the genealogies found in the theogony proper. Since they are ultimately (albeit subtly) refuted, these accounts can be read not only as foils for Hesiod's truthful account but also as representing the types of narratives described in line 27; see Clay 1989 and 2003: 54–56. For a reading of *Th.* 27–28 as a defense of originality and new material, see also Bowra 1952: 40–41. Paley 1889: xiii speaks of pre-Hesiodic poetry, but in his commentary on *Th.* 28 he reads a contrast between didactic (truth) and epic (lies).

[19] On the *Certamen* as a product of a polemical (anti-Homeric) interpretation of Hesiodic passages, see Graziosi 2002: 170 and Steiner 2005: 350; cf. Rosen 1990, esp. 100 and 112, as well as Nagy 1982: 66. See also Introduction, pp. 4–5. There is no reason to assume with West 1966: 44–45 that the *Theogony* was actually performed at the funerary games of Amphidamas and is thus tailored to such an agonistic performance; cf. the discussion in Arrighetti 1998: 280–81.

[20] Luther 1935: 124–26; Latte 1946: 159–62; Maehler 1963: 41–42; Verdenius 1972: 234–35; Murray 1981: 91; Cole 1983: 21–22.

truthful poet, has been particularly encouraged by the verbal proximity between *Th.* 27 and *Od.* 19.203, where the Homeric narrator refers to the false autobiographical tale that Odysseus tells Penelope while still in disguise as "many lies … similar to genuine things" (ψεύδεα πολλὰ … ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα).[21]

However one may interpret *Th.* 26–28, it is safe to say that, as a whole, Hesiod's encounter with the Muses (*Th.* 22–34) establishes the poet's claim to a truthful account of material that lies beyond his own experience. This elaborate construction of authority comes in sharp contrast to the proem of the *WD* (1–10), where Hesiod promises to reveal ἐτήτυμα ("things as they are", *WD* 10) without recourse to any divine source.[22] The Muses are involved in this context only as a chorus invited to sing a hymn for their father Zeus (Δί' ἐννέπετε, *WD* 2). Nonetheless, Hesiod emerges from both poems as a poet with access to truthful and genuine information about both the human and the divine realm. The authority that was bestowed upon the Hesiodic poetic voice in the *Theogony* still informs the *WD*, as the didactic voice admits his dependence on the Muses for matters of which he has no immediate experience (*WD* 646–62 on seafaring). After all, the narrator evokes his life-changing encounter with the Muses on Helicon when he recounts that he dedicated to the goddesses the trophy he won at the poetic competition in Chalcis (*WD* 658–59).

According to Hesiodic poetics, the Muses grant a truthful account to a poet only when they choose to (εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, *Th.* 28). Therefore, singing ἀληθέα implies that the poet curries special favor with the goddesses and that his close relationship with them sets his poetry apart from fallacious competition (*Th.* 22–34). Scholars have occasionally linked these ideas to the persistent assertion of truthfulness found in the Pindaric corpus.[23] According to the most recent extensive iteration of this view, the reception of Hesiod in lyric poetry of the fifth century is supposedly framed through a distinction between the Hesiodic poetics of truth, to which Pindar and Bacchylides subscribe, and its Homeric counterpart that stands for

[21] Goldhill 1991: 45 and Lada-Richards 2002: 73–74. On *Th.* 27 and *Od.* 19.203, see Neitzel 1980: 389–90, who juxtaposes Homer's full awareness and control of the truths and lies of his narrative with Hesiod's lack thereof. See also Arrighetti 1996: 53–60.

[22] Pucci 1996: 192–93 and, similarly, Clay 2003: 77–80.

[23] E.g., Kirkwood 1982: 20 and Puelma 1989: 88 apropos of *O.*1.28–35; cf. also implicitly West 1966: 162. Contrast Hubbard 1985: 102, who reads *Th.* 27–28 as an assertion of the "ambivalent potential for both truth and lies" and draws a parallel with Pindar's discourse of selective remembrance and forgetting.

seductive yet false poetry.[24] It is certainly true that the *personae loquentes* of Pindar as well as Bacchylides often draw attention to their close connection with the divine, especially the Muses, but this connection is not an indispensable part of lyric poetics, since there are several odes where the divine patronage of the Muses is absent.[25] Furthermore, whenever it does surface, the relationship between the mortal voice and its immortal patrons is treated with considerable variation,[26] which incidentally does not include recourse to a single crucial moment of initiation in the poet's past. Overall, the lyric interaction with the Muses is not "Hesiod-like" at all, in that it is friendly and cooperative rather than hierarchical and abusive (*Th.* 26), and it allows the *persona loquens* an active role,[27] even when the latter presents itself as the Muses' mouthpiece.[28]

Pindar's discourse about truth and falsehood is rich and varied, as Komornicka has shown,[29] but a joint consideration with the Bacchylidean corpus reveals that his perceived preoccupation with the truth is, in fact, a *topos* rather than a piece of Boeotian heritage, as Kirkwood puts it,[30] or a form of Hesiodic reception. In the *Theogony*, both truthfulness and falsehood are dependent on the whim of the Muses (*Th.* 27–28). A survey of Pindaric and Bacchylidean poetry yields that ἀλάθεια is a concept important enough to be invested with agency[31] and addressed as a divinity,[32] but its dependence upon a divine source is only occasional.[33] E.g., when Pi. *O.*1 promotes its account of Pelops' story through polemics against

[24] Koning 2010a: 310–18, esp. 314–16.

[25] Among Pindar's epinician odes, the Muses are not mentioned in *O.*2, *O.*4, *O.*5, *O.*8, *O.*12, *O.*14 (addressed to the Charites), *P.*2, *P.*7, *P.*8, *P.*9, *P.*12, *N.*2, *N.*11, *I.*3, *I.*5; cf. Bacchylides' lacunose *Odes* 7, 8, 11, and 14. Cf. Harriott 1969: 53 n.2 for a list of the references to the Muses in the surviving poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides.

[26] See Harriott 1969: 52–70.

[27] Bowra 1964: 4, Calame 1995: 51, Mackie 2003: 47–48 and, more importantly, 64–67.

[28] For the *topos* of the Muses' προφάτας, see Ba. *Ode* 9.3 and Pi. *Pa.*6/52f.6; cf. Pi. fr. 150 SM, where *persona loquens* appears to be active or even proactive in its relationship with the Muse (μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ). Notably Ba. *Ode* 10.28 employs προφάτας with no apparent connotation of oracular speech. On προφάτας Μοισᾶν as Hesiodic reception, see Koning 2010a: 310–11 (cf. Sperduti 1950: 230–33); for a more critical approach, see Ledbetter 2003: 62–68.

[29] Komornicka 1981 and, more recently, Park 2013. See also n.33 below.

[30] Kirkwood 1982: 20.

[31] Ba. *Ode* 13.204–05, *Hyp.* fr. 1.2–5.

[32] Pi. *O.*10.4, fr. 205 SM; cf. Ba. fr. dub. 57 (but see Maehler 1997: 314–15).

[33] On the contrast between Pindaric ἀλάθεια and Hes. *Th.* 27–28, see Park 2013: 21–22. Ἀλάθεια occurs with no explicit connection to divine sources in *O.*2.91–95, *P.*3.103–04, *I.*2.9–10 where the source is clearly a mortal, as well as in Ba. *Odes* 3.96, 8.20–21 (cf. also 9.85–86). For claims to the truth without a divine source, cf. Pi. *O.*11.4–6, *O.*13.98–100, where the evoked "truthful witness" is the mortal herald's shout (cf. *Parth.* 2.36–41), N.7.61–63, as well as *O.*4.17–18, *N.*8, and fr. 11 SM. As I mention above, *O.*1.28–35 does not attribute Pindar's revision of the Pelops story to any divine insight. Perhaps relevant to this discussion is also the straight-talking man of *P.*2.86 (cf. the ideal of the sincere leader in *P.*1.86). For associations of ἀλάθεια with non-human entities, see *O.*8.1–8,

competing versions (28–35), it does not establish its validity with recourse to some authoritative divine source. It does credit, however, χάρις for rendering even incredible stories credible in the context of bestowing τιμή (30–32). Lyric poetry, and especially praise-poetry, has a pronounced social dimension that one does not find in Hesiodic poetry. The public performance of ἀλάθεια in lyric is determined largely by what is deemed socially appropriate and expected. Pindaric and Bacchylidean odes weave narratives that aim to extoll the *laudandi* directly or indirectly and thus rescue their deeds from obscurity. These narrative accounts are selective and controlled rather than exhaustive, and the *personae loquentes* are constantly aware of what is fitting for the occasion and the genre, and what is not.[34] Perhaps one of the most illustrative contemplations of lyric ἀλάθεια and its limitations occurs in *Nemean* 5:

> στάσομαι· οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων
> φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει᾽ ἀτρεκές·
> καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώ-
> τατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι.
> (Pindar, *Nemean* 5.16–18)

I will stop; for indeed not every truth is more advantageous when it shows its precise face; and often keeping silent is the wisest thing for a man to heed.

In this passage, the speaker not only acknowledges the conditional value of a full and complete account that leaves nothing out (ἀλάθεια), but also restrains the narrative in accordance with those considerations and draws attention to this elision. Reading the lyric ἀλάθεια as a reception of Hesiod's implicit claim to ἀληθέα in *Th.* 26–28, therefore, is reductive and misleading.

Finally, the argument that lyric associates Hesiod with its own poetics of truth in contrast with Homer, whose poetics supposedly represent deception, oversimplifies the reception of both poets in the lyric corpus.[35] Homer's association with deceptive and false poetry is based on *Nemean* 7:

where Olympia is called the mistress of truth probably in connection with empyromancy (cf. *P.*11.6) and *O.*10.53–55 with reference to Time (Χρόνος). In *O.*10.4 the *persona loquens* constructs Ἀλάθεια as the daughter of Zeus, and evokes her along with the Muse; cf. Pi. fr. 205 SM and the highly problematic Ba. fr. dub 57. For other concepts connected with ἀλάθεια (e.g. ἀτρέκεια) and its opposites (e.g. ψεῦδος), see Komornicka 1972 and 1981 as well as Pratt 1993: 115–29.

[34] For a nuanced discussion of ἀλάθεια as representation rather than reduplication, see Hubbard 1985: 102–04; cf. also Komornicka 1972, Gianotti 1975: 56–65, Puelma 1989: 87–88, Nagy 1990b: 65–72, and Park 2013, who examines Pindar's ἀλάθεια in the context of the *laudator*'s obligation towards the *laudandus*.

[35] A recent iteration of this argument can be found in Koning 2010a: 310–18, esp. 314–16, but see already Segal 1967: 441–42 on *N.*7, and Kirkwood (1982): 52.

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον᾽ ἔλπομαι
λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν
διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γενέσθ᾽ Ὅμηρον·
ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσί οἱ ποτανᾷ <τε> μαχανᾷ
σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις. τυφλὸν δ᾽ἔχει
ἦτορ ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος. εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἓ τὴν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὔ κεν ὅπλων χολωθείς
ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν
λευρὸν ξίφος

(Pindar, *Nemean* 7.20–27)

But I expect that the story of Odysseus became greater than his suffering thanks to Homer of sweet verses, since upon his lies and his winged resourcefulness there is some majesty; skill deceives, misleading with stories, and the majority of a crowd of men has a blind heart. For, if they could have seen the truth, mighty Ajax would not have planted a smooth sword through his midriff, angered over the arms (*sc.* of Achilles).

This is admittedly a challenging passage.[36] Lines 20–22 express the view that Homeric poetry has immortalized an enhanced account of Odysseus' experiences that does not correspond to the actual events. The following statements about the deceptive power of poetic skill and people's inability to see through it (22–24) offer commentary on Homeric epic, but they also amplify the ode's earlier point about accurate representation in the context of praise-poetry (11–20, also linking poetic language with vision and visibility).[37] Rather unexpectedly, the speaker then turns to the judgment of Achilles' arms in order to illustrate the noxious effects of partial and misleading narratives on glorious men such as Ajax (24–27). The text here either invites us to envision epic verses about the deeds of Odysseus and Ajax being performed in the Greek camp when the judgment of the arms was taking place or, more likely, it alludes to a debate in which Odysseus' accomplishments were inflated whereas those of Ajax were underrepresented.[38] The ode concludes its treatment of Ajax with an account of his

[36] On these difficult lines, see Köhnken 1971: 46–60, Most 1985: 148–56, Park 2013: 32–34 with comparison to *N.*8 and *I.*4. Cf. Nagy 1990b: 203 (with n.17) and 423–24.

[37] Köhnken 1971: 46; cf. Segal 1967.

[38] Cf. *Little Iliad* fr. 2 W (= sch. Ar. *Eq.* 1056a), which attests to a debate about the accomplishments of each warrior between two Trojan maidens; cf. Davies 1989: 61–62. A line from *N.*8 on the same subject may be pointing to a debate featuring Ajax, who proved to be an insufficient advocate of himself (*N.*8.24–25, ἤ τιν᾽ ἄγλωσσον μέν, ἦτορ δ᾽ἄλκιμον, λάθα κατέχει / ἐν λυγρῷ νείκει); cf. Ovid *Met.* 13.382–83. The contrast between Odysseus and Ajax as orators is established already in *Iliad* 9. In the cyclic *Aethiopis*, which also included Ajax's suicide (fr. 6 W = sch. Pi. *I.*4.58b), the judgment of the arms depended on an athletic competition; see Procl. *Chr.* p. 106, 15–17 Allen and Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 5.6 with West 2013: 159–62.

valor in battle full of epic resonances (*N.*7.27–32).[39] Thus, by commemorating the deeds that would have earned Ajax the arms and prevented his suicide, if facts had been accurately represented, the ode compensates for the failure of the epic tradition to do justice to Ajax.[40]

*N.*7 criticizes the epic tradition circulating under Homer's name for misrepresentation, but we should not extrapolate from this ode that Pindar consistently associated Homeric poetics with falsehood.[41] *Nemean* 7 is one of three Pindaric odes that dwell on Ajax's suicide. Much like *N.*7, *N.*8 mourns Ajax mainly as a victim of envy and praises his great deeds (*N.*8.21–34). The language of falsehood, deception, and obscurity resonates with that of *N.*7, but in *N.*8 there is no explicit condemnation of Homer.[42] *Isthmian* 4, on the other hand, commemorates the suicide as a widely known event and praises Homer for honoring and immortalizing Ajax's deeds with his poetry (*I.*4.35–39). Far from vilifying Homer, the Pindaric speaker considers his epic poetry a model for the ode's own epinician poetics (*I.*4.40–45).[43] There are, therefore, two distinct attitudes towards Homeric epic in these odes. The crucial difference between *N.*7 and 8, on the one hand, and *I.*4, on the other, is the performative context: the first group was intended for an Aeginetan audience, whereas *I.*4 was composed for a Theban victor. The Aeacidae, and especially Ajax, were central to the cult, culture, and identity of the Aeginetans.[44] Therefore, by condemning the epic narrative of the hero's defeat during the judgment of the arms and by 'restoring' his glory, Pindar's epinician responds to the local culture and appeals to its primary audience.[45] No such considerations apply to Thebes, thus no tension between local and Panhellenic needs to be resolved in *I.*4.

In what follows, I examine first how epinician poetry appropriates Hesiodic poetry to lend authority and support to its own commemorative function, thus complementing its reception of heroic epic. Bacchylides' *Ode* 5 evokes Hesiod's authoritative voice to justify celebration through praise-poetry. Hesiodic poetics are particularly important in the context

[39] On verbal echoes of Homeric epic in *N.*7.25–30, see Most 1985: 153 with n.88.

[40] According to my reading, *N.*7.20–34 deal with the issue of adequate representation and commemoration through poetry. For a different view, see Most 1985: 152–54, who argues that, while Odysseus' case exemplifies false (exaggerated) commemoration through poetry, Ajax's plight reflects insufficient reception of a narrative by a poor audience.

[41] On the Homeric tradition, including the epic cycle, in Pindaric poetry, see Nisetich 1989: 9–23 with emphasis on context and occasion, as well as Nagy 1990b, esp. chapters 2 and 14.

[42] On the parallels, see, e.g., Park 2013: 33–34.

[43] Privitera 1982: 181 on *I.*4.43–5; cf. *P.*4.277–79, where Homer's authority is also evoked without any reservation.

[44] See, e.g., Nagy 2011: 49–59 and 75–78, Athanassaki 2011 (esp. 279–93), Indergaard 2011 (esp. 317–20 on the centrality of the Aeacidae in odes for Aeginetan victors), Hedreen 2011, and Irwin 2011: 405–10.

[45] Cf. Lloyd-Jones 1973: 130 on *N.*7 and *N.*8.

of negotiating the relationship between the *laudator* and a powerful *laudandus* not only in *Ode* 5 but also in *Ode* 3. After exploring how epinician appropriates ideas about poetry and power from the Hesiodic corpus, I turn to lyric that distances itself from Hesiodic poetics. I hope that my discussion of *Pa.*7b/52h in conjunction with Ibycus S151 *PMGF* will illuminate how poems can juxtapose Homeric and Hesiodic poetics only to reduce them to foils for their own poetic message.

Fame and the Divine: Bacchylides' *Ode* 5

Composed for Hieron's Olympic victory in 476 BCE,[46] *Ode* 5 consists of a lengthy mythological narrative (56–175) framed by extensive praise for the *laudandus* (1–55; 176–200). In its laudatory conclusion, the ode reiterates the idea that praise is owed to Hieron:[47]

Χρὴ] δ' ἀλαθείας χάριν
αἰνεῖν, φθόνον ἀμφ[οτέραισιν
χερσὶν ἀπωσάμενον,
εἴ τις εὖ πράσσοι βροτῶ[ν.

Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ τᾶδε φών[ησεν, γλυκειᾶν
Ἡσίοδος πρόπολος
Μουσᾶν, ὃν <ἂν> ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶσι, τούτῳ
καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[εσθαι.
Πείθομαι εὐμαρέως
εὐκλέα κελεύθου γλῶσσαν οὐ[κ ἐκτὸς δίκας
πέμπειν Ἱέρωνι· τόθεν γὰ[ρ
πυθμένες θάλλουσιν ἐσθλ[ῶν,
τοὺς ὁ μεγιστοπάτωρ
Ζεὺς ἀκινήτους ἐν εἰρήν[ᾳ φυλάσσοι.
(Bacchylides, *Ode* 5.187–200)

For the sake of the truth [one must] praise any mortal who succeeds, pushing away envy with both hands. Thus spoke the Boeotian man, Hesiod, the minister of the [sweet] Muses, that, whomever the immortals [honor, him] also the good repute (φήμαν) of mortals [follows]. I am easily persuaded to send Hieron a song of good fame without [straying from] the path [of justice]. For, from there do the tree-stocks of good things flourish; these [may] Zeus, the greatest father, [preserve] unshaken in peace.

[46] The same victory is celebrated by Pindar's *O.*1; on the evidence for dating, see Maehler 1982: 78–90 and Cairns 2010: 75–76.

[47] Assuming, of course, that Kenyon's χρή in 5.187 is correct. For the *topos* of obligation, see already Schadewaldt 1928: 278–79, Bundy 1962, esp. 10–11, 55–58.

The poetic agenda articulated here calls for a truthful account of Hieron's achievements and offers the victor not only commemoration of his glory but also protection against the malicious effects of envy.[48] In this context, the ode evokes the "Boeotian man," i.e. Hesiod,[49] as an established authority whose words and ideas are appropriated, reformulated, and reframed in a way that lends support and legitimacy to the poem's laudatory program.

Identifying the Hesiodic passage embedded in 5.191–94 has been a challenge, since there is no exact match to the Bacchylidean text in the surviving Hesiodic corpus. One proposed solution to the problem has been to declare the Hesiodic reference false. Along these lines, Jebb entertained the possibility of a memory slip, claiming that Bacchylides is actually citing Theognis:[50]

> Ὃν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν, ὁ καὶ μωμεύμενος αἰνεῖ·
> ἀνδρὸς δὲ σπουδὴ γίνεται οὐδεμία.
> (Theognis, 169–70)

Even the fault-finder praises whomever the gods honor; but a man's effort amounts to nothing.

At first glance, Thgn.169 appears to overlap with 5.191–94 in its focus on divine favor as a prerequisite for human success and on positive human speech as a manifestation of divine approval. In addition, Bacchylides' ὃν <ἂν> ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶσι (193) bears close resemblance to the beginning of 169 (ὃν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν).[51] When considered more carefully, however, Thgn. 169 seems to be an inappropriate intertext for Ba. 5.191–94: depending

[48] For Bacchylides' ἀλήθεια as truthful commemoration, see Cairns 2010: 215 on Ba. 3.96–98 (with bibliography) and 245–46 on 5.187–90; see also Stenger 2004: 113, 158. Pratt 1993: 115–20 (cf. 17–22) rightly points out that ἀλήθεια is a claim to truthfulness, but goes too far in excluding any connotation of memory and commemoration; cf. Heitsch 1962 and Cole 1983. See also Hubbard 1985: 100–06 and Puelma 1989: 87–89, who much like Hubbard reads the epinician ἀλήθεια as a poetic truth that conveys what is appropriate in the context of a specific (aristocratic) value system.

[49] According to Bonifazi 2004: 405, the non-articular diction of Βοιωτὸς ἀνήρ indicates a figure well known to the audience. Βοιωτὸς ἀνήρ is itself a unique designation for Hesiod. The phrase may be modeled upon Simonides' reference to Homer as "the man from Chios" (Χῖος . . . ἀνήρ , fr. 19.1 W^2), which is itself informed by the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*h.Ap.* 172–73); see Graziosi 2002: 63–64. Proponents of an historicizing interpretation have read Βοιωτὸς ἀνήρ as a teaser, suggesting that Bacchylides presents his audience with the possibility of a reference to Pindar – supposedly his great rival – only to dispel the deliberate ambiguity one line later by naming Hesiod. The most representative proponent of this reading is Steffen 1961, who is nonetheless refuted thoroughly and convincingly by Schmidt 1987. On the rivalry among the epinician poets (Simonides and Bacchylides vs. Pindar) as unreliable fiction created by the scholiasts, Lefkowitz 1991: 98–99.

[50] Jebb 1905: 293.

[51] On the textual problem of Thgn. 169, see Radermacher 1938: 1–2, who rejects Diehls' ὃ καί as well as ὃν καί, the reading adopted by Bergk, Blass, and others. Instead, he favors ὁ καί (already in Crusius), which Radermacher finds consistent with his reconstruction of the Hesiodic idea behind 5.191–94.

on how one reads it, it either eradicates malicious blame altogether or reinterprets it as praise.[52] By contrast, just before citing Hesiod, the epinician ode acknowledges the existence of blame and the need to push it away by means of praise (5.187–90). In other words, Bacchylides' *Ode* 5 makes a sharp distinction between those who praise the successful man and the envious lot who pose a threat. Furthermore, when viewed as a whole, the Theognidean couplet emerges as a commentary on the futility of human effort in the absence of divine favor and thus follows a different trajectory from the conclusion of the Bacchylidean ode(5.195–200). Finally, as I discuss below, variations of ὃν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν (Thgn. 169) are found elsewhere, so *Ode* 5.193 need not be paraphrasing Theognis in particular.[53]

Another interpretation that attempts to solve the problem of Ba. *Ode* 5.191–94 by undermining the Hesiodic reference was put forth recently by Stenger.[54] For Stenger, lines 193–94 are not a statement in indirect discourse ("that, whomever the immortals [honor, him] also the good repute of mortals [follows]"). Instead, he reads them as a reported exhortation ("that, whomever the immortals [honor, him] also the good repute of mortals [should follow]"), preceded by a prescriptive sentence in 5.187–90 (χρή . . .) and followed by an admission of compliance in 5.195–98 (πείθομαι . . .). Stenger argues that, if read as an indirect statement, 5.191–94 imply that successful men *are* in fact accompanied by good repute, at least according to Hesiod. The lines thus appear to contradict the immediately preceding passage (5.188–90) that articulates the obligation not only to praise but also to thwart envy.[55] Stenger's suggested reading

[52] I take the line to mean that whoever is favored by the gods is praised even by those who (generally) blame; for this interpretation, see Radermacher 1938: 1–2, and, more recently, Garzya 1958: 164. Van Groningen 1966: 66–67, on the other hand, prefers a more contrived interpretation: assuming blame is motivated by jealousy, it is a sign that one enjoys the favor of the gods, and it can thus be perceived as praise (cf. Harrison 1902: 214–15). The assumption that Thgn. 169 and Ba. *Ode* 5.191–94 convey the same idea has sometimes dictated the interpretation of the former; see, e.g., Friedländer 1913: 590 n.1, who equates ὁ καὶ μωμεύμενος to "everyone" on the basis of βροτῶν φήμαν in *Ode* 5.193–4.

[53] Márquez Guerrero 1992: 82–83 has traced verbal echoes of Thgn. 167–70 throughout Ba. *Ode* 5: in lines 50–55, 193–94, and (much less convincingly) 160–62. Márquez Guerrero readily assumes that Bacchylides took Thgn. 167–70 into account when he composed *Ode* 5, but he fails to justify the mention of Hesiod in 5.192. He does concede the alternative possibility, however, that both authors may be drawing from the same non-extant Hesiodic source; cf. already Jebb 1905: 293.

[54] Stenger 2004: 163–67.

[55] Stenger 2004: 163. Cf. the paraphrase in Steffen 1961: 16 ("a man who is esteemed by the gods should also obtain his fair share of praise from human beings") and, more recently, the translation of 5.193–94 in Cairns 1997: 38 = 2010: 169 ("that whoever the immortals honour, him should the voice of mortals also accompany"). In his commentary, however, Cairns 2010: 246 endorses Lefkowitz's interpretation of 5.193–94 as a "summary allusion" to *Th.* 81–97 rather than Stenger's idea of a fake reference.

of 5.191–94 is certainly attractive. We must admit, however, that if lines 193–94 are paraphrasing a Hesiodic exhortation in indirect discourse, they do it in a rather unmarked fashion. If we compare Ba. *Ode* 5.191–94 with the reception of Hesiodic instruction in the Pindaric corpus (*I.*6.66–73 and *P.*6.19–27), we observe an important difference. Both *Pythian* 6 and *Isthmian* 6 mark their appropriation of Hesiodic prescriptions with the verb παραινέω.[56] The verb φών[ησεν in Ba. *Ode* 5.191 has broader semantics, however, so the audience receives no unambiguous hint as to whether what follows is a Hesiodic statement or an injunction. Perhaps it is worth considering a more dynamic reading of the Bacchylidean text: 5.193–94 may be paraphrasing a gnomic statement from the Hesiodic corpus, which becomes invested with prescriptive force only in retrospect, once the *persona loquens* utters πείθομαι in line 195.

While Stenger's reading of an indirect exhortation in 5.191–94 merits serious consideration, his thoughts regarding the Hesiodic reference itself are innovative but far less persuasive. He proposes that the idea expressed in 5.193–94 is not actually drawn from the Hesiodic corpus, but that Bacchylides has only attributed it to an authoritative poet in order to give it additional *gravitas*;[57] Hesiod is preferred over other potential sources because the ode has already alluded to the *Theogony* earlier.[58] Of course, if Bacchylides fabricates a precept and simply attaches Hesiodic authorship to it, any attempt to recover the original Hesiodic passage behind the supposed allusion is futile. Perhaps the main counterargument to this suggestion is that there is no legitimate reason to doubt that this Hesiodic reference should be taken at face value. For Stenger, all utterances attributed to authoritative sources in epinician poetry are variations of the same poetic technique: by citing and paraphrasing these sayings, the lyric *personae loquentes* draw authority from widely accepted and established sources of wisdom, be it poets, mythological figures, or anonymous speakers representing tradition.[59] While this is by no means a false assessment, it fails to take into consideration what conventions or

[56] See Chapter 3, pp. 108 and 116.

[57] Cf. D'Alessio 2005b: 231 for the possibility that Bacchylides here attributes to Hesiod a traditional *sententia* in order to retroject the poetics of praise-poetry upon a significant poetic authority of the past.

[58] Stenger 2004: 166. On Hesiodic allusions earlier in the ode, esp. in 5.1–16, see Lefkowitz 1969: 48–51 and 1976: 44–45, followed by Goldhill 1983, and Cairns 1997: 37–38 with emphasis on the ring-composition.

[59] Stenger 2004: 164–66.

expectations determine a poem's interaction with a certain type of source. When we look at other lyric poems that, like Bacchylides' *Ode* 5, claim to quote or paraphrase lines attributed explicitly to ancient poets, we find that the allusions are indeed genuine.[60] Instead of inventing a Hesiodic utterance, then, it is much more likely that Ba. 5.191–94 reformulates an original Hesiodic passage in a manner that conforms to the expectations of the ode's audience(s) and invites them to recall the intertext.

It stands to reason, then, that we should approach *Ode* 5.191–94 as a genuine Hesiodic allusion. Yet, since no extant passage in the Hesiodic corpus corresponds precisely to these lines, tracking the reference depends largely on our presumptions regarding τᾶδε φών[ησεν (5.191): how loose a paraphrase would the audience expect or allow based on this phrase? Compared to other lyric passages that single out and draw attention to individual sayings, τᾶδε φών[ησεν seems to be vague.[61] Scholars who have assumed that line 191 sets the audience up for a near-quotation have concluded that Ba. 5.191–94 must allude to a part of the Hesiodic corpus that no longer survives;[62] given the gnomic nature of the evoked passage, some have even surmised that the lost intertext was part of the *Chironos Hypothekai*.[63] Others, however, maintain that the lines allude to an extant Hesiodic passage, namely the discourse about divinely favored kings and poets:[64]

> ὅντινα τιμήσουσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο
> γεινόμενόν τ' ἐσίδωσι διοτρεφέων βασιλήων,
> τῷ μὲν ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ γλυκερὴν χείουσιν ἐέρσην,
> τοῦ δ' ἔπε' ἐκ στόματος ῥεῖ μείλιχα· οἱ δέ τε λαοὶ
> πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι διακρίνοντα θέμιστας
> ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν· ὁ δ' ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων
> αἶψά τι καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσεν·

[60] Simon. fr. 19.1–2W² ~ *Il.* 6.146; Pi. *I.*6.66–69 ~ *WD* 412, *P.*4.277–78 ~ *Il.* 15.207; cf. *O.*9.1–2 (Archilochus) with Pavlou 2008: 541–42.

[61] Simon. fr. 19.1–2W² (ἓν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χῖος ἔειπεν ἀνήρ·) cf. Pi. *I.*2.9–11 (νῦν δ' ἐφίηται <τὸ> τὼργείου φυλάξαι / ῥῆμ' . . ., / "χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ"), *I.*6.66–69 (Ἡσιόδου. . . τοῦτ' ἔπος) and *P.* 4.277–8 (τῶν δ' Ὁμήρου καὶ τόδε συνθέμενος / ῥῆμα). See also *P.*6.20–27 (. . . ἐφημοσύναν / τά ποτ' . . . φαντὶ / Φιλύρας υἱὸν . . . / . . . παραινεῖν, followed by precepts in indirect discourse) and *P.*9.94–96 (μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω· / κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν / παντὶ θυμῷ σύν τε δίκᾳ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν). The degree to which these passages replicate the language of the text they allude to varies. Simonides quotes a line from *Iliad* 6 in its entirety, and Pindar's *I.*6 involves a close paraphrase of Hesiod's *WD* 412 (see Chapter 3, pp. 106–11). On the other hand, the Homeric allusion in Pi. *P.*4 can be linked to *Iliad* 15.207 only as a combination of loose paraphrase and interpretation.

[62] See, e.g., Jebb 1905: 293, Maehler 1982: 122 on Ba. *Ode* 5.191–93, and D'Alessio 2005b: 231.

[63] Snell and Maehler 1970: xxii. On the reception of *Chironos Hypothekai* in Pi. *P.*6, see Chapter 3, pp. 113–18.

[64] On *Th.* 97–103, see also above, pp. 30–33.

τοὔνεκα γὰρ βασιλῆες ἐχέφρονες, οὔνεκα λαοῖς
βλαπτομένοις ἀγορῇφι μετάτροπα ἔργα τελεῦσι
ῥηιδίως, μαλακοῖσι παραιφάμενοι ἐπέεσσιν·
ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀν' ἀγῶνα θεὸν ὣς ἱλάσκονται
αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισι.
τοίη Μουσάων ἱερὴ δόσις ἀνθρώποισιν.
ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἑκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
ἄνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί,
ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες· ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὅντινα Μοῦσαι
φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.
εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέι θυμῷ
ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς
Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεούς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
αἶψ' ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων
μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.
(Hesiod, *Theogony* 81–103)

Whomever of the kings who are nurtured by Zeus the daughters of great Zeus honor and look upon when he's born, upon his tongue they pour a sweet dew, and from his mouth flow soothing words. And all the people look at him as he settles disputes with straight judgments; and, speaking in the assembly without fail, he quickly and expertly ends even a great quarrel. For kings are prudent for this reason, namely that, when people are harmed in the assembly, they achieve restitution easily, appeasing them with gentle words. And as he comes up to the gathering place, they placate him like a god with soothing reverence, and he stands out among the gathered men. Such is the sacred gift of the Muses to humans. For poets and lyre-players upon the earth are from the Muses and far-shooting Apollo, but kings are from Zeus. And, whomever the Muses love, he is blessed. Sweet flows the voice from his mouth. For, even if someone who has sorrow in his newly afflicted spirit is parched in his heart with grief, but if then a poet, the attendant of the Muses, sings of the glorious deeds of men of old and of the blessed gods who hold Olympus, immediately this man forgets his anxieties and he does not remember his worries at all. For quickly the gifts of the gods divert his mind (παρέτραπε).

An allusion to *Th.* 81ff. was first proposed by Sitzler[65] and was subsequently noted by Rzach, even though he assigned the Bacchylidean lines to Hesiod's *incerta fragmenta* (fr. 202 Rzach). Likewise, Merkelbach and West classified lines 5.193–94 among the *dubia fragmenta* of the Hesiodic corpus (fr. 344 MW) but suggested an allusion to *Th.* 81–97 in their *apparatus criticus.* The idea has become increasingly popular in recent years. Lefkowitz, Goldhill, and Cairns have made a strong case for an

[65] Mentioned in Buchholz 1898⁴: 154.

intertextual connection between the Bacchylidean passage and the proem of the *Theogony*,[66] while in his 2004 commentary Maehler refers to lines 5.193–94 as a possible "approximate 'quotation'" of *Th.* 81–97.[67]

Proponents of this interpretation point out that the language of 5.193 (ὅν <ἄν> ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶσι) is a close paraphrase of the relative clause that introduces the ideal kings in *Th.* 81 (ὅντινα τιμήσουσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο). The Bacchylidean line has expanded its view of divine favor to include all gods; furthermore, it has divested the Hesiodic line of its specific reference to the βασιλεῖς (*Th.* 82) and has thus reformulated the idea in an all-encompassing manner that fits the epinician genre best, since not all *laudandi* are political leaders.[68] Given the particular context of *Ode* 5, however, the political dimension of the Hesiodic intertext inevitably remains active, since the *laudandus* in this case is, in fact, the man who rules Syracuse. In addition, the good repute of men that follows those favored by the gods in *Ode* 5.193–94 (τούτῳ] / καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[εσθαι) has been read as an adaptation of *Th.* 84–85, a passage in which the people watch their leader as he performs his duties, and (more persuasively) of *Th.* 91–92, namely the veneration of the people towards their king.[69]

The allusion to Hesiod's celebration of just kings, to whom the gods have granted the ability to resolve conflicts successfully with reconciliatory words rather than violence and whom men revere for their leadership, enriches the ode's praise of Hieron. Furthermore, the evocation of Hesiod's *Theogony* in 5.193–94 contributes to a ring-composition, as the first strophe is replete with allusions to *Th.* 81–103.[70] Most of these are drawn from the Hesiodic treatment of successful poets (*Th.* 97–103) and are woven into the ode's poetics: the prospect of setting aside one's worries at the sound of this song (5.6–8) recalls *Th.* 98–103, although epinician celebrates gods and heroes of the past (*Th.* 100–01) in the context of extolling the deeds of contemporary men. Moreover, the

[66] Lefkowitz 1976: 72–73, Goldhill 1983: 67–68, Cairns 1997: 34 and 2010: 246 on Ba. *Ode* 5.191–93.

[67] This is a departure from Maehler 1982: 122 with n.39.

[68] One could even argue that, by eliminating the particulars of *Th.* 82, line 193 plays with the similarities between good kings and divinely favored poet in the *Theogony*, given that the latter group is introduced with a similar clause (ὅντινα Μοῦσαι / φίλωνται, *Th.* 96–97). The evocation may be aided by the echo of *Th.* 100 (Μουσάων θεράπων) in 5.191–93 (γλυκειᾶν] / Ἡσίοδος πρόπολος Μουσᾶν). If read in this manner, the Bacchylidean passage seems to collapse momentarily the distinction between praiseworthy leaders and poets, and to invite praise for the poet as well as the victor. Nonetheless, the *persona loquens* immediately resumes the role of the *laudator* already in the following line (πείθομαι, 5.195).

[69] Lefkowitz 1969: 91 and Maehler 2004: 128.

[70] On the ring-composition in *Ode* 5, see Cairns 1997, esp. 38–39 on the Hesiodic allusions; cf. Lefkowitz 1969: 50–52 and 90–91, as well as 1976: 45–46 and 72–74.

poetic *persona* in *Ode* 5 describes himself as the χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας / κλεινὸς θεράπων (lines 13–14), which adapts the phrase Μουσᾶν θεράπων (*Th.* 100); this Hesiodic line also underlies Bacchylides' [γλυκειᾶν] / Ἡσίοδος πρόπολος Μουσᾶν in the final strophe of *Ode* 5 (191–93). The "sweet-gifted adornment of the violet-crowned Muses" ([ἰ]οστεφάνων / Μοισᾶν γλυκ[ύ]δωρον ἄγαλμα, *Ode* 5.3–4) reiterates the sweetness that defines the voice of those favored by the Muses (kings in *Th.* 83; poets in *Th.* 97), while the metaphor of one pouring voice out of their chest (ἐθέλει γᾶρυν ἐκ στηθέων χέων / αἰνεῖν Ἱέρωνα) in *Ode* 5.14–16 may be adapting Hesiod's metaphor of voice flowing from one's mouth (kings in *Th.* 83 and poets in *Th.* 97, modeled upon the Muses themselves in *Th.* 39–40). In this context, it also seems likely that Hieron's εὐθύδικος φρήν (*Ode* 5.6) is informed by the Hesiodic portrayal of the divinely favored kings as administrators of justice (*Th.* 84–90, esp. ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν in *Th.* 86) and thus looks forward to the allusion to the same Hesiodic passage in *Ode* 5.191–94.

It is certainly plausible that the verbal echoes of *Th.* 81 in 5.193 trigger a condensed evocation of the *Theogony*'s ideal kings, which enriches and amplifies the ode's praise of Hieron. There is, however, a pending problem with this interpretation: lines 193–94 establish a correlation between divine favor and human speech that is not found in the proem of the *Theogony*. The Hesiodic poem envisions as a manifestation of divine favor the effective use of language, be it in the realm of public rhetoric or poetry. In *Ode* 5, on the other hand, those honored by the gods stand out not for what they say but for what is said about them. Lefkowitz attempts to bypass this inconsistency by taking ἱλάσκονται of *Th.* 91 to mean "greet"; the semantics of the verb, however, do not necessarily privilege verbal over other sorts of interactions, and its use in *Th.* 91 underscores the god-like treatment of the ideal kings (cf. θεὸν ὥς, *Th.* 91) rather than their good reputation. It is certainly possible that the Bacchylidean lines allude to a version of the *Theogony* that no longer survives.[71] I propose, however, that Bacchylides' allusion to the good kings of the *Theogony* may be informed by the association between divine favor and reputation found elsewhere in the Hesiodic corpus, namely in the proem to the *WD*:

> Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν ἀοιδῇσι κλείουσαι,
> δεῦτε, Δί' ἐννέπετε σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι
> ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε,

[71] D'Alessio 2005b: 231.

ῥητοί τ᾽ ἄρρητοί τε Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔκητι.
ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ῥέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει,
ῥεῖα δ᾽ ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξει,
ῥεῖα δέ τ᾽ ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφει
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει.
(Hesiod, *Works and Days* 1–8)

Muses from Pieria, glorifying with songs, come here, tell in song of your father Zeus, through whom mortal men are obscure and famed alike, and spoken of and not spoken of, by the will of great Zeus. For easily he strengthens, and easily he crushes the strong, easily he diminishes the conspicuous and increases the inconspicuous, and easily he straightens the crooked and withers the proud – high-thundering Zeus, who inhabits the highest abode.

This short hymn celebrates Zeus's power to assign and control the relative importance of individuals in their communities, an apt introduction to a poem preoccupied largely with justice.[72] One's power and success are in the hands of Zeus (*WD* 5–8), but so is one's renown (ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε, / ῥητοί τ᾽ ἄρρητοί τε, *WD* 3–4). The proem distinguishes between those who are known because they are talked about and those without reputation and thus obscure. Whether one belongs to the famous or the unknown depends entirely on Zeus, and the text underscores this fact by framing the two sets of opposite adjectives in *WD* 3–4 with reminders of the god's crucial role in the process (*WD* 3, ὅν τε διά "through whom" punning on Δί᾽ in line 2; *WD* 4, Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔκητι).[73] Much like *Ode* 5.193–94 (esp. βροτῶν φήμαν, 194), *WD* 3–4 seem to envision reputation exclusively as positive talk, and to regard its presence or absence as a manifestation of divine judgment.[74]

Bacchylides, therefore, may have grafted into his Hesiodic allusion to the ideal kings of the *Theogony* a view about reputation that is expressed in a different part of the Hesiodic corpus. While not a complete fabrication,

[72] On the hymn as a proem to the *WD*, see Ercolani 2010: 119–20.

[73] For ἄφατος and ἄρρητος meaning "not famous," "obscure" (cf. ἄδηλος in line 6) see sch. Hes. *WD* 3c, 4a, as well as West 1978: 139 (with emphasis on social status), Verdenius 1985: 4, Mancini 1986, Calame 1996: 171, Rousseau 1996: 98–99, and Ercolani 2010: 121.

[74] Note that in *WD* 760–64 βροτῶν φήμη stands exclusively for malicious gossip. The passage does not implicate the gods at all in the dispensation of bad reputation, thus indicating that this is a purely human phenomenon and not part of Zeus's dispensation of fame as seen in *WD* 3–4. On *WD* 3–4 and 760–64, see Clay 2003: 148 and Canevaro 2015: 133–34; cf. Arrighetti 1998: 397–98 and Ercolani 2010: 411. If Bacchylides' word choice in 5.194 is informed by *WD* 760–65, the epinician poet is redefining and rehabilitating Hesiod's pejorative concept of βροτῶν φήμη into something positive and desirable that lies at the heart of praise-poetry (cf. the unambiguously positive inclusion of Φήμη in Ba. *Odes* 2.1 and 10.1). Admittedly, though, weaving a 'correction' of *WD* 760–64 into the already dense fabric of *Ode* 5.193–94 may be somewhat implausible.

as Stenger has suggested, the Hesiodic reference in *Ode* 5.191–94 may be a creative merging of two Hesiodic ideas rather than a close paraphrase of a single passage. Through this complex Hesiodic intertext, *Ode* 5 not only aligns Hieron with the idealized kings of the *Theogony* but also casts epinician poetry as a conduit through which Zeus's dispensation of fame and obscurity becomes part of human reality. In other words, lines 5.191–94 appropriate Hesiodic poetry into the song's epinician poetics by casting the ode itself – and praise-poetry in general – as a specific application of the all-encompassing statement in *WD* 3–4.

Birds of Song, Birds of Prey: Bacchylides' *Ode* 3

Bacchylides' *Ode* 3 was composed for the victory of Hieron's chariot at Olympia in 468 BCE.[75] Even though the occasion for the performance of Bacchylides' ode is an athletic achievement, the poem is preoccupied with death and the inevitability of decay, perhaps in response to the tyrant's deteriorating health.[76] Ultimately, in the final triad Bacchylides suggests that poetry offers a path towards immortality both for its object and for the poet himself. Immortality through poetic commemoration is, of course, the quintessence of heroic epic; nonetheless, I argue that the construction of Bacchylides' poetic *persona* in these closing lines is informed by the Hesiodic representation of the poet in the *WD*. Here too, just as in *Ode* 5, Hesiodic poetics help the lyric speaker define and shape the relationship between the poet and the *laudandus*.

After a long mythological section that commemorates the miraculous rescue of Croesus and his daughters from the pyre as a reward for his piety and concludes with a statement about the unpredictability of mortal life uttered by Apollo to Admetus, his pious protégé,[77] the *persona loquens* returns to the 'here and now' and approaches the theme of mortality from a different perspective:

> φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω· βαθὺς μὲν
> αἰθὴρ ἀμίαντος· ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου

[75] Hutchinson 2001: 328, who points out that the song also celebrated Hieron's dedications to Delphi; Cairns 2010: 63.

[76] Hieron died the following year and it is possible that he was already sick when he celebrated this Olympic victory. However, Hutchinson 2001: 329–30 is right to recommend caution when it comes to biographical assumptions and historicizing interpretations.

[77] On the mythological section of *Ode* 3 and how the featured characters (esp. Croesus) relate to Hieron, see Cairns 2010: 65–74 and 202–11. On 3.83–84 and the problem of the speaker Cairns 2010: 210–11 on 3.81; cf. Maehler 1982: 58 and Stenger 2004: 89–90, 93, 95–96.

οὐ σάπεται· εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός·
ἀνδρὶ δ' οὐ θέμις, πολιὸν π̣[αρ]έντα

γῆρας, θάλ[εια]ν αὖτις ἀγκομίσσαι
ἥβαν. ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει
βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]α̣τι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ
Μοῦσά νιν τρ[έφει.] Ἱέρων, σὺ δ' ὄλβου

κάλλιστ' ἐπεδ[είξ]αο θνατοῖς
ἄνθεα· πράξα[ντι] δ' εὖ
οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον σι]ω-
πά· σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[είᾳ] καλῶν
καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν
Κηΐας ἀηδόνος.
(Bacchylides, *Ode* 3.85–98)

I utter things that can be comprehended by one who understands. The deep sky is undefiled, the water of the sea does not rot, and gold is merriment. But it is not right for a man to bring back again flourishing youth, having pushed aside grey old age. However, the light of men's excellence does not diminish along with their body, but the Muse nourishes it. Hieron, you have displayed to mortals the most beautiful flowers of prosperity. To one who is successful silence bears no adornment; but, along with the truthful account of fine deeds, one will praise also the grace of the honey-tongued nightingale from Ceos.

The asyndeton in line 85 marks a new direction in the poem, and the speaker engages in an elaborate priamel that contrasts the eternal elements (sky, sea, gold) with the decaying nature of mortals, but also brings up the complementarity of wealth and poetry.[78] Wealth offers solace in merriment (3.87, 92–94), while poetry rescues one's excellence from his physical decline (3.90–92) and commits a full account of his deeds to immortality (3.96–98).

The complicated priamel is introduced with a first-person statement that demands the attention and active intellectual participation of the audience in the final triad: φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω (3.85). We find similar statements in epinician poetry, in which the audience's insight is somehow marked as a prerequisite for full access to the poetic message. Take, for instance, the following passage in Pindar's *Olympian* 2, an ode composed in 478 BCE. The poem offers a long account of the afterlife that includes

[78] Modern interpretations of 3.87 vary greatly. For gold as one of the eternal elements, see already Kenyon 1897: 28, Jebb 1905: 264–65; more recently, Race 1982: 85–86 and Crane 1996: 68–69. On gold in relation to the human condition, see Segal 1976: 111–12, Carey 1977/78, Capra 1999: 168–72, Maehler 2004: 97. For an inclusive reading of the line as looking both backward and forward, see Carson 1984: 117–19 and Cairns 2010: 211–13 with a very perceptive interpretation of the priamel.

the judgment of Rhadamanthys and even the prospect of joining heroes like Achilles on the Isle of the Blessed after several transmigrations of the soul (*O.*2.56–83). After this *katabasis*, the ode breaks off into a different direction with the following statement:

πολλά μοι ὑπ᾽
ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη
ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας
φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν ἑρμανέων
χατίζει. σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ·
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὣς ἄκραντα γαρύετον

Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον. (Pindar, *Olympian* 2.83–88)

In the quiver under my arm, I have many swift arrows that speak to those who understand, but for the crowd there is need of interpreters. One who knows many things by nature is wise, but those who have learned (things), boisterous in their babbling, they cry out in vain like a pair of crows against the divine bird of Zeus.

The meaning of lines 85–86, which is crucial for our understanding of the entire passage, is unclear and often debated.[79] Yet it seems likely that the *persona loquens*, presumably the poet (83–85), makes a distinction between those who are συνετοί and understand his poetry (φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν, 85), and those who are not συνετοί and thus cannot access the poetic message directly. This distinction is followed by another contrast between the one who knows a lot by nature and those who know only by learning. The language (σοφός, παγγλωσσίᾳ, γαρύετον) and the bird-simile imply that this is a juxtaposition between Pindar, a superior poet by nature, and lesser poets.[80] While *O.*2.86–88 point to poetic rivalry relatively clearly,

[79] Ever since antiquity, lines 83–85 have been read as a contrast between the few who know and the crowd (ἐς δὲ τὸ πὰν) who need interpreters: see sch. Pi. *O.*2.152b (attributed to Aristarchus), 153a–b, as well as Gildersleeve 1885: 152, Farnell 1932: 21 (who equates τὸ πάν with οἱ πολλοί while acknowledging that the meaning is unattested), and Kirkwood 1982: 75. Race 1981 has objected to the traditional interpretation, arguing that ἐς δὲ τὸ πάν means "for the whole subject." Most 1986 proposed that ἐς δὲ τὸ πάν is a synonym of πάντως and that ἑρμηνεύς stands for a performer; lines 83–85, therefore, express the *topos* that the poet has many ways of praising the *laudandus*, even if he cannot include all of them in this ode (cf. sch. *O.*2.153c). In defense of the traditional view, see Gentili et al. 2013: 408–10 (cf. Lavecchia 2000).

[80] See the discussion in Gentili et al. 2013: 411; on the metapoetic dimensions of arrows, birds, and flying, see also Arrighetti 1987: 104–08. Steiner 2007 sees here a transformation of the Hesiodic *ainos* of the hawk and the nightingale, whereby the conflict is not between a power-figure and a poet but between different poetic *personae* representing different moral and aesthetic perspectives. While her study of Pindar's avian metaphors for poetry and poetics is sharp, I am not entirely convinced that the conflict between the eagle and the crows is an instance of Hesiodic reception rather than Pindar's version of a *topos*. Steiner argues in passing that *O.*2.83 alludes to Hesiod's *WD* 202 but

the commentary on knowledge in the previous lines (83–86), including the formulation σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ in 86, is vague enough to encompass both the poet and the συνετοί.[81] Another convergence between the epinician speaker and the συνετοί is explicit in Pindar's *Pythian* 5:[82]

ἄνδρα κεῖνον ἐπαινέοντι συνετοί·
λεγόμενον ἐρέω.
(Pindar, *Pythian* 5.107–08)

Those who know praise that man; I will report what is said.

In this passage, the speaker voluntarily channels the voice of the συνετοί, so that it may be commemorated and proliferated through song, and may thus reach even those who do not belong to that exceptional group. Finally, sometimes lyric draws attention to the capacity of its audience to appreciate the poet's work in a less convoluted manner; see, for instance, the *captationes benevolentiae* in Bacchylides' *Ode* 5.3–5 (esp. γνώσῃ, 3) and Pindar's *O.*1.103–105 (esp. ἴδριν, 104).[83]

The study of these passages has yielded several interpretations for Bacchylides' φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω in *Ode* 3.85. The way in which the Bacchylidean line privileges one group among the audience, much like *Ode* 5.3–5 and Pindar's *O.*1.103–05, has been identified as an epinician convention: praise-poetry requires that a poet construct the *laudandus* as erudite and sophisticated.[84] On the other hand, Nagy has interpreted Ba. 3.85 in conjunction with Pi. *O.*2.85 and *P.*5.107, and he has traced in these passages that appeal to the intellect of their audience a different generic trait of the epinician, namely the poetics of exclusivity. In Nagy's opinion, these passages are programmatic in so far as they reiterate the idea that praise-poetry is a coded message (ἔπ-αινος) meant to be deciphered and understood by a specific social group (κῶμος) consisting of comrades (ἑταῖροι) bonded by φιλότης.[85] More recently, Currie has

does not dwell on the problems surrounding the meaning of the Pindaric line. On the subject, see also Morgan 2015: 123–32.

[81] Cf. Kirkwood 1982: 75 and Lavecchia 2000.

[82] Contrast Pi. *N.*4.30–32, where the *persona loquens* isolates a certain kind of audience for lack of understanding.

[83] Cf. also Pindar's praise of Thrasyboulus in *P.*6.47–49, although the passage may be reiterating the idea that Thrasyboulus has gained wisdom from poetry (cf. 19–42, esp. 19–27), rather than celebrating "his sophistication in the ways of the Muses" as Bundy 1962: 25 reads it.

[84] For the elite audience's presumed sophistication, see already sch. *O.*2.152c and 153a; cf. Maehler 1982: 58 for Ba. 3.85. See also Bundy 1962: 24–26, on the conventional combination of the appreciation of poetry with other elements of praise as a reflection of social values, and Arrighetti 1987: 115–16.

[85] Nagy 1999: 222–42. On συνετός, a term used in aristocratic self-description, see Battisti 2011.

suggested that the exclusionary poetics are not based on social networks but on cult. Currie points out that language of understanding (συνίημι, συνετός/ἀσύνετος) is often associated with mysteries and initiation. Therefore, he reads in Ba. *Ode* 3.85, Pi. *O.*2.83–5, and in two other Pindaric passages addressed to Hieron (*P.*2.80 and fr. 105a.1 SM) a direct engagement with the tyrant's involvement in mysteries.[86] Finally, there is a literary interpretation of *Ode* 3.85 which dates back to the nineteenth century and does not take into consideration any of the other passages.[87] According to this view, φρονέοντι stands for literary expertise and the line invites its audience (and especially Hieron) to recall the priamel in Pindar's *O.*1.1–2 in preparation for Bacchylides' own priamel in the immediately following lines(3.85–87).

There is little doubt in my mind that Bacchylides' φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω in 3.85 is informed by exclusionary aristocratic poetics, which are only reinforced by the subsequent emphasis on χρυσός (3.87), ἀρετά (3.90), and ὄλβος (3.92). Unlike similar passages discussed above (Pi. *O.*2.85 and *P.*5.107), however, 3.85 isolates an exceptional individual rather than a group, thus establishing a rapport between the speaker and this insightful man who has the intellectual capacity to understand the message of the priamel. While Hieron's name does not appear here, the speaker addresses him directly and by name after the priamel has come to a conclusion (3.92). I suggest that, with the singular φρονέοντι in line 85, the speaker implicates Hieron and thus engages with him already from the very beginning of the last triad, before addressing him directly in line 92. In 3.85–92 the *persona loquens* not only singles out a powerful figure as the primary addressee of the coded poetic message but also underscores his capacity to access and appreciate its meaning, namely the value of commemorative poetics: praise-poetry can save a man's excellence from his inevitable physical decline and death. In the final three lines the ode decodes this message, as it explicitly underscores the poet's commitment to securing Hieron's immortality by linking

[86] Currie 2005: 389–90; his discussion of mystical elements in Bacchylides' *Ode* 3, however, is admittedly only tentative (386–87). Cf. Krummen 1990: 258, Hutchinson 2001: 352–53. On the mystical elements in *O.*2 in particular, see Lloyd-Jones 1990: 88; contrast, however, Willcock 1995: 157–58, who views the Homeric (*Od.* 4.561–69) and Hesiodic (*WD* 166–73a) elements as predominant.

[87] On the priamel in *Ode* 3 as a creative allusion to the opening priamel of *O.*1, see Kenyon 1897: 27, Jebb 1905: 264, Gentili 1958: 92–93, Maehler 1963: 93 and 1982b: 58 on 3.85, Wind 1971, and Morrison 2007: 87–88. In the light of Simonides 256.3–5 Poltera, however, Cairns 2010: 212 objects that the common imagery of the Pindaric and the Bacchylidean priamels may actually be a matter of convention rather than intertextuality.

inextricably the fame and reputation of the *laudator* and the *laudandus* (3.96–98).[88]

In the concluding *sphragis*, Bacchylides is identified as the "nightingale from Ceos." Early Greek poetry associates the nightingale with song and springtime, and it is a bird a poet may compare himself to (e.g. Thgn. 939).[89] In *Ode* 3, however, the bird stands for the poet himself. The only precedent for the nightingale as an embodiment of a poetic figure is Hesiod's *ainos* in the *WD*:

> Νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσι[90] καὶ αὐτοῖς·
> ὣδ' ἴρηξ προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον
> ὕψι μάλ' ἐν νεφέεσσι φέρων ὀνύχεσσι μεμαρπώς·
> ἣ δ' ἐλεόν, γναμπτοῖσι πεπαρμένη ἀμφ' ὀνύχεσσι,
> μύρετο· τὴν ὅ γ' ἐπικρατέως πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·
> "δαιμονίη, τί λέληκας; ἔχει νύ σε πολλὸν ἀρείων·
> τῇ δ' εἶς ἣ σ' ἂν ἐγώ περ ἄγω καὶ ἀοιδὸν ἐοῦσαν·
> δεῖπνον δ', αἴ κ' ἐθέλω, ποιήσομαι ἠὲ μεθήσω.
> ἄφρων δ', ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃ πρὸς κρείσσονας ἀντιφερίζειν·
> νίκης τε στέρεται πρός τ' αἴσχεσιν ἄλγεα πάσχει."
> ὣς ἔφατ' ὠκυπέτης ἴρηξ, τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις.
>
> (Hesiod, *Works and Days* 202–12)

And now I will tell a fable (αἶνον) to the kings who themselves understand: a hawk addressed a nightingale with a colorful neck in this way, as he was carrying her very high in the clouds, having snatched her with his talons, and she was weeping pitifully, pierced by the curved talons. To her he spoke forcefully: "Silly one, why are you screaming? Someone much superior holds you now; you are going wherever I may take you, even if you are a singer. I will make (you) my dinner if I want, or I'll let you go. Whoever wishes to contend against those who are stronger is stupid. He is both deprived of victory and suffers pains in addition to humiliations." Thus spoke the swift-flying hawk, the long-winged bird.

Bacchylides involves a variety of animals in the context of his poetic self-representation: he is the rooster of Ourania in *Ode* 4.7–8 and a bee

[88] The syntax of 3.96–98 is not without problems. See Hutchinson 2001: 356–58, Maehler 1982: 60–61, Stenger 2004: 113–15, and Cairns 2010: 214–15.

[89] Thgn. 939: οὐ δύναμαι φωνῇ λίγ' ἀειδέμεν ὥσπερ ἀηδών. Nightingales are mentioned as songbirds in Hom. *Od.* 19.518–19 and Alcman *PMGF* 10a.6–7 and fr. 224 Calame (who reads the ἀηδών as the chorus' reference to the *choragos*); cf. Lesb. inc. auct. 28.5–7V. Nightingales are mentioned as the herald of spring in Sapph. fr. 136 V; Alcaeus fr. 307c V; Simon. F 294 Poltera. For a survey of all passages linking birds with poetry and song in early Greek poetry, see Nünlist 1998: 39–60. The nightingale as a metaphor for poets occurs often in Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic poetry, especially in epigrams; see Maehler 1982: 62–63 nn.97–98 and Nünlist 1998: 351 with n.54.

[90] On the preference of φρονέουσι over the *varia lectio* νοέουσι, see West 1978: 205.

in *Ode* 10.10. I suggest that the choice of the nightingale in the *sphragis* of *Ode* 3 alludes to the fate of the nightingale/poet in the Hesiodic poem. Through the evocation of *WD* 202–12, the ode defines more sharply the relationship it envisions between Hieron and the epinician poet. The *ainos* is part of Hesiod's elaborate effort to persuade Perses and the corrupt kings that *dike* is preferable to *hybris*. Its meaning is the subject of an ongoing debate among scholars, but, according to the most straightforward interpretation found already in the scholia, the anthropomorphic interaction between the two birds demonstrates vividly the suffering of the helpless nightingale/poet in the hands of those who wield power in an arbitrary and overwhelming fashion.[91] The primary intended audience for this *ainos* is not Perses but the kings, and the introductory line requires special attention because it bears similarities to *Ode* 3.85. Much like Bacchylides' φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω, the Hesiodic line νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς involves a first-person statement by the poet that marks the upcoming lines as intellectually challenging (αἶνος, cf. συνετά); it also employs a participle of the verb φρονέω to herald the exceptional capacity of the primary intended audience to comprehend the message.[92] Ba. 3.85 thus emerges as the first allusion to the Hesiodic *ainos* in the final triad of the ode.[93]

I suggest here that *Ode* 3 alludes to the Hesiodic *ainos* in order to intensify the bond it forges between the poet and Hieron. Both poems imply that poet and ruler share some knowledge: in the *WD* it concerns the abuse of power, while in the epinician ode it revolves around the mortality of the flesh and the immortality of poetry. The Hesiodic passage casts poet and ruler as opponents and laments the helplessness of the poet;

[91] The hawk and the nightingale stand for the corrupt kings and Hesiod according to sch. *WD* 202, 202a, 207–12 and, more recently, Wilamowitz 1928: 64, Sellschopp 1934: 83–86, Nicolai 1964: 50–53, Verdenius 1985: 117. For a different modern approach that interprets the fable as a commentary on the relationship between Zeus (hawk) and the kings (nightingale), see Jensen 1966 and Nelson 1997. For a reading of the fable as pertaining to poetics, see Puelma 1972, Hubbard 1995, Mordine 2006, Steiner 2007 and 2012. Cf. also the survey in Ercolani 2010: 204–05.

[92] Mordine 2006: 365; cf. Wilamowitz 1928: 64. There is little point in taking the participial phrase φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς as concessive, especially since the fable is left open-ended and the kings are actually invested with the task of interpreting it; cf. the appeal to the kings' intellect in *WD* 248 (καταφράζεσθε καὶ αὐτοί). Notice also that the belated "commentary" on the fable in *WD* 274–81 is addressed to Perses, not the kings, who have presumably already gotten the message. I am not convinced that the kings to whom Hesiod addresses his fable are the ones praised in the proem to the *Theogony*, as in Nicolai 1964: 51, Griffith 1983a: 59, and Mordine 2006: 365 assume. The bribe-eating kings are in a perfect position to interpret the abusive behavior of the hawk; cf. Puelma 1972: 87–88, Nelson 1997, Steiner 2012: 5–6. For a different interpretation, see Dalfen 1994: 163 who reads the nightingale as the arrogant challenger but presupposes that the audience would supply a lot of crucial information not included in the Hesiodic version of the fable.

[93] Cf. Race 1982: 85 n.127 who states that the "correct parallel" for *Ode* 3.85 is *WD* 202, not Pindar's *O.*2.85, but does not justify or elaborate on this statement.

the ode, on the other hand, reconfigures this relationship into a celebration of the ruler. The poetic voice endorses the powerful man and promises to provide immortality after death; more than that, the praise-poet acknowledges that his own reputation is bound to the successful commemoration of the ruler's excellence. In sum, through juxtaposition to the Hesiodic *ainos*, the alignment between Bacchylides and Hieron becomes even clearer; the Hesiodic allusion, therefore, enriches the poetics of praise in *Ode* 3 and contributes a foil for the poem's negotiation of the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus*.

Homer and Hesiod in Pindar's *Paean* 7b

Pindar's *Paean* 7b/52h, a song composed for performance at Delos, is woefully lacunose, but what survives attests to a direct and explicit engagement with Homer. The poem opens with an address to Apollo and a reference to a mother, probably Leto (*Pa.*7b/52h.1–3); in the following lines, the extant text preserves the word παιαν[, possibly a "generic signature" of the song, and some reference to garlands (*Pa.*7b/52h.4–6). After marking the beginning of its song (ἀρχομ[, *Pa.*7b/52h.8),[94] the chorus goes on to elaborate on the poetics of their song:[95]

κελαδ̣ήσαθ' ὕμ̣νους,
Ὁμήρου [~4 τρι]π̣τον κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν
ἰόντες, ᾳ̣[~5 ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις,
ἐπεὶ αυ[~6 π]τανὸν ἅρμα[96]
Μοισα[~10]μεν̣.
ἐ]πεύχο[μαι] δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' ἐυπέπλῳ θυγατρὶ
Μναμ[ο]σύ[ν]ᾳ κόραισί τ' εὐ-
μαχανίαν διδόμεν.
τ]υφλᾳ̣[ὶ γὰ]ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες
ὅ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων
βαθεῖαν ε .. [..] . ων ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν.

ἐμ̣οὶ δ̣ὲ τοῦτο̣[ν δ]ι̣έδω-
κ . ν] ἀθάνατ̣[ο]ν πόνον
(Pindar, *Paean* 7b/52h.10–22)

[94] On the reference to some hero or something pertaining to hero-cult (ἥρωϊ[, *Pa.*7b/52h.9), see Rutherford 2001: 246.
[95] I print the text of Rutherford's 2001 edition.
[96] See D'Alessio 1995: 175 for a discussion of πο]τανόν instead of π]τανόν.

Sing hymns, going on the . . . [trodden] wagon-track of Homer . . . on the mares of another since [we?] . . . the winged chariot [of] the Muse[s]. I pray to Mnemosyne, the fair-robed daughter of Ouranus and to her daughters that they grant poetic resourcefulness. [For] blind are the minds of men, whoever may seek the deep path of skill without the Heliconian (Muses). [They?] have given me this immortal task . . .

After a substantial hiatus, the text resumes with the story of Asteria, daughter of Coeus and sister of Leto (*Pa.*7b/52h.42–52).[97] Asteria evaded Zeus's advances and was turned into a small wandering island. The chorus relates with some reservation her metamorphosis and concludes the story with the name that humans have long assigned to her new form (Ortygia). The immediately following lines indicate that the context of this tale is the birth of Apollo: Ortygia acquired a firm spot in the sea in return for giving refuge to Leto when she was about to give birth. The extant text does not complete the aetiological story with the final transformation of the wandering rock to the fixed and holy island known as Delos,[98] but perhaps it was mentioned in the final five lines that are missing.

Apollo's birth, as well as Delos' crucial aid to Leto and the ensuing reward were treated extensively in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*h.Ap.* 25–90);[99] it is reasonable, therefore, to assume that the paean's engagement with Homer's poetry in lines 11–12 refers primarily to that Homeric Hymn.[100] But what is the relationship that these lines establish between the lyric poem and the authoritative Homeric voice? Is the chorus treading the wagon-track of Homer or not? It all depends on how we supplement the missing text. Di Benedetto suggests Ὁμήρου [πολύτρι]τ̣τον κατ' ἀμαξιτόν / ἰόντες, ἀ̣[λλ' οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις ("going on the much-worn wagon-track of Homer but not on the mares of another"), a reading that declares the paean's dependence on the Homeric tradition.[101] However, the mythological narrative of the paean's extant epode departs significantly from the Homeric Hymn.[102] To begin with, in the *h.Ap.*

[97] The genealogy is found already in Hes.*Th.* 404–10. According to the *Theogony*, Asteria is the mother of Hecate. However, there is no trace in Hesiodic poetry of the story regarding Asteria that is recounted in Pi. *Pa.*52h/52h.

[98] The poem plays with the etymology of Δῆλος / δῆλος already in lines 46–47 (esp. 47, φανῆναι).

[99] Cf. also *h.Ap.* 14–18 and the description of the festival at Delos (146–78), which vividly exemplifies the reward that Delos earned.

[100] Treu 1967: 151 and n.11; Rutherford 1988: 65–70. For the authorship of the *h.Ap.*, cf. Thuc. 3.104.4–6 who also attributes it to Homer. On the Delian part of the *h.Ap.* in particular as representative of the Homeric tradition, cf. Martin 2000: 411–24.

[101] Di Benedetto 1991. [102] Rutherford 2001: 252.

Ortygia and Delos are two separate entities: Leto gives birth to Artemis on the former and to Apollo on the latter (*h.Ap.* 14–18). Furthermore, in the Homeric Hymn the reward that Delos receives consists in honor and wealth through the cult of Apollo (*h.Ap.* 51–65, 79–89; cf. 146–76). It is much more likely, therefore, that lines 11–12 conveyed a statement of departure from the Homeric tradition.[103] Along these lines, Snell supplemented a negation in 11 (Ὁμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]π̣τον κατ᾽ ἀμαξιτόν / ἰόντες, "not going on the much-worn wagon-track of Homer"),[104] while D'Alessio proposed Ὁμήρου [ἑκὰς ἄτρι]π̣τον κατ᾽ ἀμαξιτόν / ἰόντες ("going on an untrodden wagon-track far from Homer").[105]

The metaphor of the voyage that immediately follows lines 11–12 reinforces the poem's declaration of independence from the Homeric tradition. Once again, we encounter textual difficulties. The chorus envisions a poetic journey on the winged chariot of the Muses (*Pa.*7b/52h.13–14),[106] but whom do the horses of this poetic chariot belong to (line 12)? Lobel's reconstruction implies that the horses are not the chorus' (ἀ[λλ᾽ ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν᾽ ἵπποις). Yet D'Alessio has demonstrated conclusively that line 12 should include a negative statement[107] and proposes ἀ[εὶ οὐκ ἀλ]λοτρίαις.[108] While on the winged chariot of the Muses, then, the chorus seems to be propelled by its own poetic horses. In addition, D'Alessio has drawn attention to some similarities between this passage and Parmenides B 1 DK. In the Parmenidean fragment, the speaker

[103] Rutherford 1988: 65–70 as well as 2001: 248 and 252. According to D'Alessio 1995: 178–81, the paean underscores that it differs from the Homeric tradition in terms of genre (form), but Rutherford 2001: 252 rightly points out that the statement of lines 11–14 must also include the divergences in content. On the ἀμαξιτός established by previous poets, contrast *N.*6.53–54, where the first-person voice readily follows the wagon-road of the heroic epic tradition.

[104] Maehler 1989: 37.

[105] D'Alessio 1995: 169 and 172–74. D'Alessio reconstructs the line based on Parm. B 1.27 DK (ἦ γὰρ ἀπ᾽ἀνθρώπων ἐκτὸς πάτου ἐστίν), thus expanding the number of verbal correspondences that he traces between Pi. *Pa.*52h/52h.10–20 and the poem of Parmenides (primarily B 1.21–28 DK and B 6.3–7 DK). Cf. the reception of the road metaphor later by Callimachus. In *Aetia* fr. 1.25–28, the programmatic announcement of Callimachean aesthetics includes a divinely ordained preference for the narrow untrodden path (κελεύθους / [ἀτρίπτ]ους, 27–28) rather than the wide road. Massimilla 1996: 219 points out the passage's debt to *WD* 286–92 as well as the metaphors of the poetic chariot in Pindaric poetry; cf. also Reinsch-Werner 1976: 334–37. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that, while it is very likely that the two roads in Callimachus' *Aetia* are informed by the two paths in the *WD*, Pindar's *Paean* 7b/52h sets up a different contrast, since driving on a road is juxtaposed to flying on a winged divine chariot.

[106] Snell-Maehler supplement line 14 as Μουσᾶ[ν or Μουσα[ῖον ἐζεύξα]μεν or ἀνέβα]μεν. Di Benedetto 1991 prefers ἐλαύνο]μεν.

[107] D'Alessio 1992: 363–66; cf. Di Benedetto 1991, who nonetheless argues that *Pa.*7b/52h.11–14 claim Homer as the song's model.

[108] D'Alessio 1995: 167–69.

recounts his ride on the winged chariot of the Heliades as they flew together to the house of the Night, where he was initiated into privileged knowledge. D'Alessio is right in pointing out that both poems involve mortals riding flying chariots that belong to divinities,[109] but he downplays a crucial difference: in the Parmenidean passage, the Heliades accompany the young man (B 1.4–21 DK), whereas in *Paean* 7b/52h the chorus appears to ride the chariot of the Muses alone.[110]

Lines 12–14, therefore, introduce a crucial aspect of the paean's poetics, namely the relationship between the *persona loquens* and the Muses. Ultimately, the ode appears to claim that it defies mortality (τοῦτον . . . ἀθάνατον πόνον, *Pa.*7b/52h.21–22),[111] but only after it has fashioned itself as the product of a synergy between human poetic skill and divine patronage. In *Pa.*7b/52h.15–20, the speaker prays to Mnemosyne and the Muses for poetic resourcefulness (εὐμαχανίαν, *Pa.*7b/52h.16–17), and criticizes those who seek poetic skill without the support of the Muses:

ἐ]πεύχο[μαι] δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' ἐυπέπλῳ θυγατρὶ
Μναμ[ο]σύ[ν]ᾳ κόραισί τ' εὐ-
μαχανίαν διδόμεν.
τ]υφλᾳ[ὶ γὰ]ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες,
ὅ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων
βαθεῖαν ε . . [. .] . ων ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν.
(Pindar, *Paean* 7b/52h.15–20)

I pray to Mnemosyne, the fair-robed daughter of Ouranus, and to her daughters that they grant poetic resourcefulness. [For] blind are the minds of men, whoever may seek the deep path of skill without the Heliconian (Muses).

The reference to the Muses as the "Heliconians" is rare in Pindar and used only here in connection with poetics and poetic competence.[112] In this

[109] D'Alessio 1995: 170, who also underlines the shared use of ἀμαξιτός (Parm. B 1.21 DK; Pi. *Pa.*7b/52h.11). On Parm. B 6 DK and *Pa.*7b/52h.11–20, see note 110.

[110] Cf. Pi *O.*6.22–27, in which the *persona loquens* invites the victorious charioteer Phintis to yoke the mules so that they may embark the chariot (βάσομεν, 24) and that the *persona loquens* may arrive at the victor's kin (ἵκωμαι, 24). The epinician text blurs the boundaries between reality (Phintis and the victorious chariot) and the figurative trajectory of poetry, but the *persona loquens* envisions riding that chariot with the mortal charioteer, not some divinity. For a careful and intriguing reading of *O.*6 in light of Parmenides B 1 DK, see D'Alessio 1995: 146–67 with ample bibliography. I assume that the *persona loquens* in Pa 7b/52h.14 still represents the chorus based on the assumption that the extant]μεν is the ending of a first-person plural verbal form.

[111] The person of the verbal form in 21–22 is unclear, as is its subject, but it is possible that the paean envisions itself as a commission of the Muses themselves. Cf. δὲλτου (l.24), sadly without context.

[112] There are only two other instances. *I.*8.56a–58 recounts that the "Heliconian maidens" stood by Achilles' pyre and grave, and sang their dirge. On the other hand, in *I.*2.33–34 (οὐ γὰρ πάγος οὐδὲ προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος γίνεται, / εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων), the *persona loquens* declares that nothing can obstruct a man determined to honor glorious men with poetry.

context, the adjective is particularly significant, as it evokes the geographic location where the goddesses encountered Hesiod and initiated him into poetry (*Th.* 22–34).[113] The Heliconian Muses are marked as Hesiodic not only in the proem of the *Theogony* but also in the *WD*: in lines 658–59 the narrator recounts the dedication of the tripod he won at a competition to the goddesses in commemoration of their transformative encounter on Helicon (τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσῃσ' Ἑλικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα / ἔνθα με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς). The evocation of Hesiod's poetic initiation in *Pa.*7b/52h is further facilitated by the invocation of Mnemosyne and the Muses through the frame of their genealogical connection (Μναμ[ο]σύ[ν]α κόραισί τ', *Pa.*7b/52h.16) since the *Theogony* recounts the Muses' birth shortly after the narrative of their encounter with Hesiod on Mount Helicon (*Th.* 53–63).[114] Finally, if indeed they cast the Pindaric paean as a labor that the Muses have bestowed upon the *persona loquens*, lines 21–22 reinforce the allusion to Hesiod's poetic initiation, given that the idea of poetry as a divinely assigned task resonates with his experience in *Th.* 30–34.[115] In *Pa.*7b/52h.18–20, therefore, the decisive role of the Heliconian Muses in the attainment of poetic *sophia* is informed by their active involvement in Hesiod's transformation into a poet. On the other hand, the element of blindness that is central to the criticism of those who seek poetic skill without the Muses' help (τ]υφλα[ὶ γὰ]ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες, 18) seems to resume the paean's polemics against Homer, since he is the blind poet par excellence, albeit in a strictly physical sense.[116] Thus, while the *persona loquens* of *Pa.*7b/52h claims an active poetic role in cooperation with the Muses, poetic authority is established not only by declaring independence from the Homeric tradition but also by

Accessibility is a theme shared between *I.*2.33–34 and *Pa.*7b/52h.18–20. However, the latter refers clearly to poetic skill, while the former underscores the idea that great deeds lead effortlessly to praise: a poet's access to praise is easy when he celebrates famous men (cf. *N.*6.45–46).

[113] Cf. already Gianotti 1975: 61.

[114] Mnemosyne's birth of Gaia and Ouranus is recounted in *Th.* 135.

[115] On poetry as a gift that the Muses bestow upon mortals, cf. also *Th.* 103–04 (ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων. / Χαίρετε, τέκνα Διός, δότε δ' ἱμερόεσσα ἀοιδήν).

[116] See already *h.Ap.* 172. On blindness in Homer's biographical tradition, see Graziosi 2002: 125–63. D'Alessio 1995: 170–72 draws attention to a possible intertextual connection between *Pa.*7b/52h.18–20 and Parmenides' B 6.3–7 DK: ἀμηχανίη γὰρ ἐν αὐτῶν / στήθεσιν ἰθύνει πλακτὸν νόον· οἱ δὲ φοροῦνται / κωφοὶ ὁμῶς τυφλοί τε, τεθηπότες, ἄκριτα φῦλα. While the idea of some intertextual engagement is intriguing, Parmenides' discourse is purely epistemological, whereas in Pi. *Pa.*7b/52h it is most likely that both the εὐμαχανία and the σοφία that comes from the Muses pertain to poetics (even if one concedes that at least the latter may include some epistemological aspects).

appropriating the foundation of Hesiod's poetic authority, namely his poetic initiation.

How are we to interpret the Hesiodic resonances in this paean? It has been argued that the passage iterates the contrast between Hesiod, the poet upon whom the Heliconian Muses have bestowed access to the truth, and Homer, whose poetry does not enjoy this divine privilege.[117] According to this reading, the passage condemns the Homeric tradition as false and, by coopting the Hesiodic poetics, establishes the paean's own claim to a truthful account. Although the polemical tone of the lines is undeniable, I am reluctant to interpret σοφία in line 20 as pertaining primarily to epistemology rather than poetics, given that resourcefulness (εὐμαχανία, lines 16–17), which the Pindaric speaker hopes to receive from Mnemosyne and the Muses, almost certainly stands for poetic skill. That *Pa.*7b/52h.15–20 discuss poetic competence rather than truth is all the more evident when they are compared to Pindar's *Isthmian* 4:

> Ἔστι μοι θεῶν ἕκατι μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος,
> ὦ Μέλισσ', εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας Ἰσθμίοις,
> ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνῳ διώκειν.
> (Pindar, *Isthmian* 4.1–3)

Thanks to the gods, I have countless roads in every direction to pursue in song your (pl.) achievements, Melissus, for you revealed (to me) much resource at the Isthmian Games.

The ode opens by pointing out that, with his Isthmian victory, the *laudandus* has facilitated the poetic praise of his glorious clan. The passage combines the idea of ample access to a poetic subject (εὐμαχανία) with the metaphorical path of song (κέλευθος; cf. ὕμνῳ διώκειν), while linking inextricably the gods (θεῶν ἕκατι, *I.*4.1)[118] not only with the athletic victory but also with the poetic ingenuity involved in its celebration.

[117] Koning 2010a: 316 with Bowra 1964: 33–34. Differently Rutherford 2001: 249–50, who traces an emphasis on "Muses as bestowers of wisdom, particularly in matters of religion" and interprets the choice of the Heliconian Muses "not just as reflecting Pindar's specially Boeotian allegiances, but also, perhaps, as an allusion to the didactic nature of Hesiodic poetry."

[118] The path of poetry is a fairly common metaphor in Pindaric and Bacchylidean poetry; see the parallels cited in Privitera 1982: 172–73. Note that Koning 2010a: 315–16, who discusses *Pa.*7b/52h.11–20 without consideration of its textual problems, reads in these lines a contrast between the well-trodden avenue that needs to be avoided (ἀμαξιτός) and the path (βαθεῖα ὁδός) that is hard to follow but leads to something valuable. According to his reading, this juxtaposition alludes to the contrast between the paths of virtue and sloth in the *WD* 287–92. However, the road metaphor in the *WD* applies strictly to ethical matters, not poetics; more importantly, the role of the gods in the *WD* is to make the desirable path difficult (*WD* 289–90), not to provide exclusive

The juxtaposition between Hesiodic and Homeric poetics in lines 15–20 enhances the ode's programmatic rejection of the Homeric tradition, but the interpretation of this passage could be taken further if we consider the intended location of the paean's performance. In the context of a poetic celebration of Apollo at Delos, the juxtaposition between Hesiod and Homer is more than a means to establish poetic authority: it invites the audience to recall the biographical tradition that envisioned these two great poets performing together in Delos. According to the Pindaric scholion to *N.*2.1:

> δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ Ἡσίοδος λέγων·
> "ἐν Δήλῳ τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀοιδοὶ
> μέλπομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδήν,
> Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορον, ὃν τέκε Λητώ" (= Hes. fr. 357 MW)

And Hesiod reveals (*sc.* the etymology of 'rhapsode' from 'rhaptein') when he says: "In Delos then for the first time I and Homer, bards, stitching a song with new hymns, were singing of Phoebus Apollo with the golden sword, whom Leto bore."

The context of these lines is unknown, but the speaker was clearly understood by the scholiast to be Hesiod himself. The first-person account resembles, and is probably modeled upon, the account of the poetic contest at Chalcis in the *WD* (650–62).[119] Unlike the *agon* at Amphidamas' games, however, which is well attested in the biographical tradition,[120] this is the only extant testimony of a poetic meeting, or rather a poetic competition, at Delos.[121] These lines have rightly been interpreted as a retrojection produced by rhapsodes in order to appropriate Homer and Hesiod and to create a prototypical agonistic rhapsodic performance.[122] It is tempting to think of the first-person narrative in Hes. fr. 357 MW as a response to the *sphragis* embedded in the Delian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*h.Ap.* 169–76),

access to it (cf. *I.*2.33–34 with n.112). I do not see, therefore, how Pa.7b/52h.11–20 would have been perceived as a reception of *WD* 287–92.

[119] Hes. fr. 357 MW disregards *WD* 649–53, according to which the poet never sailed except for his (short) trip to Euboea for the funerary games for Amphidamas. See Bassino 2013: 14–18.

[120] On the *agon* of Homer and Hesiod in Chalcis, see Graziosi 2002: 168–80, Kivilo 2010: 19–24, Koning 2010a: 245–68, and Bassino 2013: 11–52. See also Introduction, pp. 4–5.

[121] Although in Hes. fr. 357 MW the context of performance is not explicitly competitive, it is very likely that the passage refers to a contest; see Martin 2000: 410–23 and Nagy 2010: 70–73. For competitive performances at Delos, cf. *h.Ap.* 149–50.

[122] See Martin 2000: 410–23, Graziosi 2002: 33–34, who reads the passage as an aetiological tale, and Collins 2004: 181 and 194, who emphasizes that the two poets are envisioned in a performance that is not only competitive but also amoebic.

where 'Homer', identified only as a blind man from Chios, asserts his poetic superiority, thus suggesting an agonistic occasion.[123] If the Delian meeting of the two poets was indeed envisioned as competitive, its outcome remains unknown; yet the consistency with which Hesiod wins in all extant versions of the contest at Chalcis (sometimes even against expectation) suggests that in the biographical tradition competitions may have had a set outcome in favor of the Boeotian poet.[124] However that may be, I suggest that, in the context of dissociating the Pindaric poem from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the *persona loquens* in *Pa.*7b/52h.15–20 evokes this legendary competition at Delos and aligns itself with the poet who challenged Homer at the same location and in a similar ritual context, i.e. the cult of Delian Apollo. In other words, by inviting its audience to recall the *agon* between Homer and Hesiod, the paean reinforces its polemical attitude towards the Homeric tradition.

We find a similar creative appropriation of the competitive relationship between Homer and Hesiod in the context of lyric poetics in Ibycus' *Ode to Polycrates* (S151 *PMGF*). This highly allusive ode engages intensely with the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* in an extensive *praeteritio*, in which the *persona loquens* expresses his desire to avoid the martial tales of the Homeric tradition.[125] When the narrative reaches the arrival of the Greek army at Troy (S151.15–22 *PMGF*), the poem offers a variation of this narrative strategy:[126]

καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄ[ν] Μοίσαι σεσοφι̣[σμ]έναι
εὖ Ἑλικωνί̣δ[ες] ἐμβαίεν †λογω[ι
θνατ[ὸ]ς† δ' ο̣ὔ̣ κ[ε]ν ἀνὴρ
διερ[ὸς. . . .] τὰ ἕκαστα εἴποι,

ναῶν ὅ̣[σσος ἀρι]θμὸς ἀπ' Αὐλίδος
Αἰγαῖον διὰ̣ [πό]ντον ἀπ' Ἄργεος
ἠλύθο̣[ν ἐς Τροία]ν
ἱπποτρόφο̣[ν, ἐν δ]ὲ φώτ̣ες

χ]αλκάσπ[ι̣δες, υἱ]ε̣ς Ἀχ̣α̣[ι]ῶν.
(Ibycus, S151.23–31 *PMGF*)

[123] Cf. Martin 2000: 411–24 and earlier Else 1957: 30–31, who reiterates Crusius' idea that the two parts of the *HH to Apollo*, the Delian and the Pythian, represent the poetic contributions of Homer and Hesiod respectively during the performance at Delos mentioned in Hes. fr. 357 MW.

[124] The *Certamen* mentions Homer's voyage to Delos (315–22), but makes no reference to a contest on that island. After his performance of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (*Cert.* 318= *h.Ap.* 1), Homer receives great honor from the Ionians and from the Delians in particular.

[125] See, e.g., Steiner 2005: 350–54, Péron 1982, Wilkinson 2013: 56–57 and 72–73.

[126] I use the text in Wilkinson 2013.

And on these the Heliconian Muses, who have expertise, would embark well in speech, but no living mortal could tell . . . one by one the ships, as many as they came from Aulis through the Aegean sea, from Argos to horse-rearing [Troy], and the bronze-shielded men inside, the sons of the Achaeans.

The evocation of the Muses in the context of a catalogue of ships, coupled with the emphasis on the mortal's inability to perform what the goddesses can with ease, blatantly evokes the proem of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships in *Il.* 2.484–93.[127] In Ibycus' text, human inadequacy is not remedied by divine aid, and the catalogue that the ode actually offers in subsequent lines (33–37) is brief and highly selective. The speaker not only distances himself from the Iliadic narrator, but also undermines him by weaving into S151.23–26 *PMGF* allusions to *WD* 646–62. The Hesiodic passage explains the poet's limited experience with seafaring (οὔτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν, *WD* 649). The only trip he ever made by boat was when he traveled the short distance from Aulis, the place where the Greek army gathered once upon a time before sailing to Troy (*WD* 651–53), to Chalcis, where he competed in a poetic contest and won (*WD* 654–62).[128] In antiquity, the brief engagement with the Homeric world in *WD* 651–53 as well as the contrast between the epic journey to Troy and Hesiod's brief trip to Euboea were interpreted as polemical against Homeric epic and fostered the biographical fiction that Hesiod's opponent at Chalcis was Homer.[129] Ibycus' ode is attuned to the metapoetic dimension of the two journeys juxtaposed in *WD* 650–62, namely the grand, epic expedition across the Aegean and Hesiod's short trip: when the fleet of the Greeks is first introduced, the ships are described as πολυγόμφοι (S151.18 *PMGF*), the adjective used in *WD* 660 (τόσσον τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόμφων).[130] The allusions to the Hesiodic *Nautilia* continue: the ode not only implicates the

[127] Hutchinson 2001: 244–47 with a useful discussion of the textual problems; cf. Wilkinson 2013: 71–72 and Hardie 2013: 32–33, who suggests οὐ παρεὼν δέ κεν ἀνὴρ or οὐ δὲ παρὼν κ' ἀνήρ for line 25 and διερὸς τὰ ἕκαστα ἂν εἴποι for 26.

[128] On the Hesiodic allusions in Ibycus' ode, see Barron 1969: 134, Péron 1982: 53, and Steiner 2005: 347–50, who suggests further intertextual connections in the use ὕμνος/ὑμνῆν for poetry (S151.12 *PMGF* ~ *WD* 657, 662), the metaphor for poetic activity in ἐπέβησαν (*WD* 659) ~ ἐμβαίεν (S151.24 *PMGF*), and the Aeolism Μοίσαι (a nod to the origins of Hesiod's father, *WD* 636). Cf. also Hardie 2013, esp. 9–19.

[129] See Introduction, pp. 4–5 and Chapter 5, pp. 181–83.

[130] Hardie 2013: 18–20 suggests that Ibycus "conflates Hesiod's programmatic contrast of short (personal) and long (Homeric) sea-voyage" to set up a foil for his own arrival on Samos, which was presumably a dominant theme in the non-extant beginning of the ode.

distinctly Hesiodic (and thus anti-Homeric) Muses of Helicon[131] as potential performers of a Catalogue of Ships,[132] but also captures their Iliadic omniscience (*Il.*2.485–86) with the same word that Hesiod employs to renounce any expertise in seafaring (σεσοφισμέναι ~ οὐ σεσοφισμένος). By mixing these particular aspects of Homeric and Hesiodic poetics, the ode clearly undermines the former, yet it is important to acknowledge that it also distances itself from the latter. Once established in lines 23–26, the gap between the Heliconian Muses and the mortal poetic voice is never bridged: they remain two separate voices.[133] In addition, the ode's celebration of Troilus' beauty (S151.41–45 *PMGF*) is as much un-Hesiodic as it is un-Homeric.

I hope to have demonstrated that the appropriation of Hesiodic poetics in Pindar's *Pa.*7b/52h contributes to the distance that the paean puts between itself and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Hesiod's Muses are evoked in a song that resonates thematically with Hesiodic poetry in its focus on Zeus' union with Leto (cf. *Th.* 918-20) and the consequences of his desire for another goddess. Still, to the best of our knowledge, Asteria's story is non-Hesiodic as much as it is non-Homeric. Not unlike Ibycus' Ode, then, Pindar's paean dissociates its celebration of Apollo from the Homeric tradition but remains rather distinct in its content from the Hesiodic tradition too. Lines 10–22, furthermore, acknowledge the need for the Muses' aid but the goddesses do not appear to interact with the first-person speaker,[134] and they seem to be absent from their own chariot. Unlike Hesiod, whose poetry and poetic authority are a result of his personal encounter with the Muses, and unlike Parmenides' young man, who acquires true knowledge through divine revelation,[135] the *persona loquens* in the (extant) text of *Paean* 7b/52h is not defined by such transformative experiences. Thus the paean forges a relationship between the speaker and the Muses that is cooperative but rather remote or, at least, not intensely interactive.

[131] See above, n.120.

[132] Hardie 2013: 24–25 suggests that S151.20–22 and 32–45 *PMGF* are the direct utterances of the Muses, but I find no compelling argument in support of his suggestion. On the contrary, I agree with Hutchinson 2001: 245–46 and Wilkinson 2013: 72 that the ode is more interested in exposing human (including Homeric) inadequacy.

[133] For a very different approach to the relationship between the Muses and the poet in Ibycus' *Ode to Polycrates*, see Hardie 2013.

[134] Unless the Muses are the subject of the verb in line 22, in which case they would have some interaction with the *persona loquens*.

[135] On the reception of Hesiodic poetry in the poem of Parmenides, see, e.g., Jaeger 1947: 92–94, Dolin 1962, Schwabl 1963, Pellikaan-Engel 1974, Northrup 1980, and Koning 2010a: 210–13.