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Since antiquity Pindaric scholarship has mainly been concerned with that vexing problem of unity in his odes.1 Lesky's formulation2 gives a clear outline of this problem: 'Pindars Epinikien erwecken den Eindruck einer oft geradezu kaleidoskopischen Mischung verschiedener Elemente, die häufig durch lose, ja willkürliche Übergänge miteinander verbunden sind. Anderseits wird sich niemand, der Dichtung aufzunehmen imstande ist, dem Eindruck entziehen, dass alle diese Mannigfaltigkeit letzten Endes in einer grossartigen Einheit gebunden bleibt'. Except for a few scholars4 nearly everyone since Boeckh has to this day believed in this 'grossartige Einheit'. But wherein does this unity consist? It is precisely on this point that opinion differs.

The following is an outline of this problem based on Young's6 division into three chronological periods:

a. The Unitarian Phase (1821–1894) in which the predominant theory was that of the 'Grundgedanke'. The idea of a 'Grundgedanke' was formulated by Dissen6 resulting from the fact that he and Boeckh had in their joint commentary of 1821 attempted to paraphrase the content of an ode. Characteristic of his premise was the phrase 'et aliud maius vinculum adsit omnes partes complectens', thus implying that a single unit (vinculum) somehow independent (aliud) of the various parts (omnes partes) caused the unity of an ode.7 This notion strongly influenced subsequent studies, and Dissen in the main gained the support of Hermann, Rauchenstein, Schmidt, Croiset, Fennell, Bury, Fraccarolli, and Bornemann.8

3. These elements are praise of the victor, his father, etc., gnomic utterances, mythical material, personal statements, and prayers.
4. E.g. Wilamowitz, Schroeder, Drachmann and Dornseiff.
5. See note 1.
6. L. Dissen, Pindari Carmina, Gotha 1843, 2nd ed., p. LXXXIX.
8. For their individual contributions to Pindaric studies, see Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', pp. 11–38.
b. The Anti-Unitarian Phase (1885–1922) was initiated by Schroeder's critical bibliography of Greek lyric poetry in the 'Jahresbericht des philologischen Vereins' (No. 2) in which he suggested that the artistic qualities of Pindar's odes should be held in less esteem (p. 341). This phase was characterized by its ultimate denial of unity in the odes; the predominant figure in this school was Wilamowitz,\(^9\) who regarded Pindar's odes merely as a historical and biographical source, unimportant as literature. His method of criticism is known as the historical-empirical, although many an argument put forth in his 'historische Analyse' was without demonstrable basis. The premise of the historical method of criticism was that Pindar wrote in the first place for historical persons, commemorating historical events/successes, and that even in his maxims and myths he had historical circumstances and situations in mind. The notion that the odes lack unity was adopted by the Danish scholar Drachmann\(^{10}\) who concluded that unity was a fiction created by scholars, that unity was impossible because the various elements were linked together merely by word-association, which had no real unifying value, and that many passages contained bad poetry.

c. The New Period (1928– ). It was left to that able scholar Schadewaldt\(^11\) to impart new impetus to the study of Pindar. He once again looked for unity in the odes, and for this purpose returned to Boeckh's theory of the subjective and objective aim. The odes were interpreted according to three 'Zwecke' or 'Gesichtspunkte'\(^{12}\) which he called the 'stilistisch-formale', the 'objektiv-historische' and the 'subjektiv-persönliche'. The 'objektiv-historische Gesichtspunkt' comprises the praise of the victor, while the 'subjektiv-persönliche Gesichtspunkt' consists in the poet's personal 'purpose'. But Schadewaldt was especially interested in the formal aspect of the odes (the 'stilistisch-formale') and provided us with a valuable insight into the form of poetry called 'epinikian'. This aspect of his work opened a new field of study as may be seen in the works of Bundy,\(^{13}\) Thummer,\(^{14}\) and recently Hamilton.\(^{15}\) Meanwhile Schadewaldt introduced a new phase in the study of Pindaric unity, one in which subsequent scholars looked for new 'Einheitsbegriffe'. Fraenkel\(^{16}\) believed in

\(^{9}\) Cf. Hieron und Pindaros, SB Berlin 1901; Pindar's siebentes nemeisches Gedicht, SB Berlin 1908; Pindaros auf die Söhne Lampons, SB Berlin 1909, and especially Pindaros, Berlin 1922.

\(^{10}\) A. B. Drachmann, Moderne Pindarfortolkning, Copenhagen 1891.

\(^{11}\) W. Schadewaldt, Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion, Halle 1928.

\(^{12}\) Schadewaldt, op. cit., p. 5.

\(^{13}\) E. L. Bundy, Studia Pindarica, 2 vols., Berkeley 1962.

\(^{14}\) See note 1.

\(^{15}\) R. Hamilton, Epinikion. General Form in the Odes of Pindar, The Hague 1974. This is an excellent study and the first to give a comprehensive and systematic exposition of the general form of the epinikion.

\(^{16}\) H. Fraenkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums, Munich 1951; Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens, Munich 1955.
a maius vinculum, one, however, that comprises not the individual ode, but the
corpus (omnia carmina complectens, as Young put it17) – thus a unity of the
entire corpus! Arete ('Wert') is the basic concept ('Grundgedanke') of Pindar's
poems as a whole: Pindar's art is 'ein Ausschnitt aus dem einheitlichen Reich
wertafter Wirklichkeit'.18 Lesky,19 declaring that Fraenkel provided us with
the final solution to this problem, wrote: 'Das Epinikion nimmt das bedeutende
Ereignis des Sieges in die Wertewelt auf, aus der heraus der Dichter schafft'.
In contrast to Fraenkel, Norwood20 held a modest opinion of Pindar as
thinker/philosopher, and primarily esteemed him as an artist. He ignored the
corpus and concentrated on the individual odes, claiming that the unifying
force in the odes is a preconceived symbol or image which lies hidden in the
ode, and once discovered, explains its whole purpose. Here we have a unity of
symbolism, which was also advocated by two other scholars, Finley21 and
Duchemin.22 But they both employ the term symbolism in its literary sense,
namely that a symbol, in the broadest sense of the term, is anything which
signifies something else,23 whereas Norwood used the term in a sense for which
there is no known definition.24 Finley suggested that in Pindar water is a
symbol for poetry, gold for heroes, the sun for divinity. This train of symbols is
based on Ol. 1,1ff, and he transferred this symbolism to other poems as well.
Duchemin on the other hand applied her symbols to the corpus, and not to any
individual ode, suggesting that these symbols were familiar in Pindar's society.
The main symbol of his society and of his art was the personal belief in immor­
tality. This symbol was applied to Ol. ii and transferred to the whole corpus as
if Ol. ii represented the corpus. Van Groningen25 studied 8 odes according to
their 'unite compositionnelle' and concluded that there are various degrees of
unity – some odes reflect greater compositional unity than do others. The
reason for this was explained by Van Groningen by the fact that the success or
failure of organic composition depended on the 'activite creatrice du poete' and
concluded: 'L'unite des odes solidement construites est donc plutot le resultat
du hasard ...'26 Writing on the unity of the odes Bowra27 adopted (so to speak)
a middle course by referring to unity and variety in the odes. On the one hand
he discerned a 'single developing pattern' between the four traditional elements
of gods, myths, maxims, and personal comments, and on the other hand

17. Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', pp. 64-65.
18. Fraenkel, Wege und Formen, p. 368 ff.
pp. 168-170.
24. See Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', pp. 79-80.
‘jarring notes of personal animosity or arrogance’ and ‘disturbing divagations’. Dissatisfied with the present state of Pindaric studies Bundy reacted against all who looked in Pindar for personal, religious, political, philosophical and historical references or allusions, and stressed the fact that we forget that the epinicion is ‘an oral, public, epideictic literature dedicated to the single purpose of eulogizing men and communities; that these eulogies are concentrated upon athletic achievement’. With more insight into the conventional elements of choral lyrics than Schadewaldt he studied Pindar’s literary technique and found that ‘there is no passage in Pindar and Bacchylides that is not in its primary intent enkomiastic — that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron’. This theory of the unity of purpose — the purpose of eulogizing men — was accepted by Thummer in his commentary on the Isthmian odes, although he rejected Bundy’s conception of a linear development in the odes. He analysed the individual odes according to the various ‘Lobesthemen’ (the victor, the victory, the victor’s family, the victor’s Heimat, the poet and his art), and attempted to prove that all these ‘Lobesthemen’ as well as wishes (‘Wünsche’) are concerned with the glory of the victor. Within this conception it follows naturally that the prooimion and the myth are for him (as they were for Bundy) ‘vorwiegend dekorative Bestandteile des Epinikion’! The middle part of his first volume (pp. 122–158) deals with Pindar’s literary technique (the connection of these themes of praise, and stylistic media intensifying the praise) and contains very useful material regarding Pindar’s style. Despite Bundy’s and Thummer’s protest against studies which regarded Pindar as politician or historian, Ellen Wüst, in her doctoral thesis, again referred to Pindar as such. She acknowledged the contribution of R. W. Macau (‘Pindar as Historian’, 1931) who, according to her, was the first scholar who took Pindar seriously as a historian. Two quotations from Macau are especially elucidative: ‘To Pindar . . . the myth was good history and he told it as such’ (p. 44) — ‘Pindar’s own works preceded the birth of Greek prose historiography’ (p. 46). Taking this line she writes: ‘Wenn Pindar sich als “Zeugen” grosser Leistung . . . versteht, der diese durch sein Lied ins Licht stellt, ihnen Ruhm . . . verschafft und dadurch Dauer verleiht, so betrachtet er sich auch selbst mit Bewusstheit als historischen Autor. Mehr noch, er sieht alle Dichtung unter diesem Aspekt’. This viewpoint of Pindar’s art is indeed far

29. See note 13.
32. See note 1.
removed from Young’s verdict in a study published a year after the thesis of
Wüst: ‘The study of P. 11 implies . . . that Pindaric criticism should have less
to do with personalities and politics, more to do with poetics’.38 He concluded
that in the case of Pyth. 11,3 and Ol. 7 ‘each poem proves to be a unified,
meaningful work of literary art’.39 This conclusion should be regarded in the
light of his previous study on Pindaric criticism (note 1) in which he defined
unity in a truly literary sense: ‘“Unity”, when applied to a poem, is a critical
term simply meaning that the poem makes sense as a whole’ (note 3 pp. 2–3).
It is in this sense that I will use the term unity in my discussion which follows
this review of Pindaric scholarship. This at the same time brings us to a final
study recently published by A. Köhnken (1971) and accepted as his ‘Habili­
tationsschrift’ a year previously.38 Pointing out the unsatisfactory results of
the ‘Grundgedanke’-theory and of the historical method of interpretation,
Köhnken studied the odes (six odes in fact) in the light of the function of the
vom Mythos aus’.39 He rejects as totally incomplete previous studies related
to the function of the Pindaric myth. These studies regarded the function of
the myth as the ‘Heraushebung der Stimmung über das Alltägliche ins
Heroische’ (Schroeder), or as the ‘repräsentative Darstellung der Wertewelt,
in die der frische Sieg aufgenommen wird’ (Fraenkel), or again as an allegory
of contemporary/historical circumstances (Finley), as having a merely
instructional purpose (Bowra), or finally as being a purely decorative element
of the epinikion (Thummer). Köhnken rightly believes that the myths are more
closely connected with the non-mythical parts, not having an ‘Eigenleben’
with no related function in the ‘Gedichtganze’ as so many scholars have
analysed them, Illig40 from a ‘konstruktiv-erzählerischen’, Fehr41 from the
‘inhaltlichen’, Wilamowitz from the ‘quellenkritischen’, and Wüst from a
‘historischen’ point of view. This is a real deficiency in previous studies seeing
that the myths ‘sind das Eigenartigste und vielleicht am wenigsten Konven­
tionelle in Pindars Dichtung . . . und (dass sie) gerade deshalb den meisten
Epinikien ihr besonderes Gepräge geben’.42 He concluded that Pindar set value
on ‘inhaltliche und kompositionelle Einheit’ in the odes and for this reason the
‘Art der Gestaltung des Mythos’ should be a decisive factor in this respect.

This concise, more or less descriptive43 review clearly reveals the dilemma of
modern Pindaric scholarship. It shows how this one notion of unity has

38. Köhnken, op. cit. (see note 1).
41. K. Fehr, Die Mythen bei Pindar, Zürich 1936.
42. Köhnken op. cit., p. 14. He refers to Perotta’s statement that Pindar is the poet of
myth (Safo e Pindaro, Bari 1935, p. 30).
43. For a critical review see the works listed in note 1.
conditioned scholars' approach to Pindar. This does not imply that the results of any individual scholar's study may lightly be discarded once his particular approach has been 'labelled', that is placed into a certain category. This, unfortunately, has been done time and again. Young\textsuperscript{44} rightly calls this fact the greatest misfortune in Pindaric scholarship: 'The greatest obstacle to an increased understanding of the poems has been the unwillingness of the various critics to recognize and utilize the ideas of their fellows. Many a critic has proclaimed that he and he alone has found the secret for discovering the unity (or the disunity) of the odes. It has always been assumed that the odes must remain an unassailable mass unless some special insight into Pindar's method of composition or thought were discovered, a special theory of criticism that would work for Pindar and Pindar only'.\textsuperscript{45} The aim of this paper is to put forward a method of analysis which is applicable to any kind of literature, prose as well as poetry, and not one that applies to Pindar only. It is not a theory of criticism, but a method of analysis, as said above. It is, I believe, a method through which one can arrive at a fairly accurate interpretation of the meaning of a given piece of literature as a whole. And this is important, for it is in this light that we must define unity – as a 'critical term . . . meaning that the poem makes sense as a whole'.\textsuperscript{46}

Unity then does not mean a single unit that somehow or other binds together apparently disparate elements. Unity is not to be found in any given part of a poem either – the praise, or gnome or myth, as in the case of the Pindaric ode for instance. Unity, to underline it once again, has to do with the meaning of the poem as a whole and the meaningful interrelation of its various parts.

If unity has to do with the meaning of the poem as a whole and the meaningful interrelation of its various parts, then the term 'meaning' needs clarification. Meaning operates on two levels, the internal or deep level, and the external or surface level. The meaning of a given poem for instance, is formed in the poet's mind, and this arrangement of meaning in the mind is called in Semantics the deep structure. When this deep structure is codified to form language, we have what is called the surface structure. To understand the meaning of that transformed language one has to transform the surface structure to the deep structure, and afterwards again observe its patterning into the surface structure. Although the deep structure contains the basic meaning, the surface structure is also important in determining the meaning of the whole, because the surface structure conveys the specific focussing of the basic meaning. The

\textsuperscript{44} Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', p. 91.
\textsuperscript{45} Italics are mine.
\textsuperscript{46} Young, 'Pindaric Criticism', note 3, pp. 2–3.
method to get behind the surface structure to the deep structure is known as structural text analysis or discourse analysis.\textsuperscript{47}

In the light of the preceding remarks on the deep structure and the surface structure, and the method of structural analysis, the following points must, however, be borne in mind: (a) the statement that meaning is first formed in the mind of the poet and then codified to form language must not be confused with Norwood’s preconceived symbol; (b) the distinction between the deep structure and the surface structure has no relation to Schadewaldt’s distinction between the objective aim and the subjective aim in the odes; (c) since the aim of this paper is to demonstrate a method of analysis in the light of a Pindaric ode, and not to offer a theory of criticism, I intend to recognize and utilize the results of previous studies, and I am indebted to all who have to a larger or lesser extent contributed to an increased understanding of Pindar’s art.

Structural text analysis or discourse analysis consists in breaking-up the surface structure into \textit{cola}, which are essentially thought-units based on the theory that the sentence unit (= Noun Phrase + Verb Phrase) constitutes a single grammatical construction comprising the sense unit in question.\textsuperscript{48} In other words, all items linked together in such a sentence are related to the overall thought-unit of such a ‘string’. The various \textit{cola} or thought-units are then grouped together to form clusters of thought-units, each cluster conveying a basic notion, and the interrelation of these notions constitutes the theme(s). Unity, in the broadest terms, means that these clusters or notions make sense as a whole. To sum up: the structure of the meaning of these notions in their interrelation with each other is the deep structure. The lines or poem as it stands before our eyes is the surface structure in which the poet has chosen to cast his thoughts.

To illustrate how this method operates, and to what extent it may contribute to the understanding of an ode as a whole, I have chosen the Tenth Pythian Ode; and to illustrate the structure of the sentence unit, on which this method is based, we may take lines 7 and 44–46 as examples.


\textsuperscript{48} This theory was developed by the Transformational Generative Grammar.
Pyth. x,7: γεύεται γὰρ ἀέθλων

S(entence unit)

N(oun Phrase)

(οὖνος)

V(erb Phrase)

γεύεται ἀέθλων

Line 7 consists of 1 colon = he is making trial of contests.

Pyth. x, 44–46: θρασεῖα δὲ πνεῶν καρδία

μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς, ἅγεῖτο δ' Ἀθάνα, ἐς ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὄμιλον.

(a)

N

S

Δανάας . . . παῖς

θρασεῖα δὲ πνεῶν καρδία.

V

Adverb

μόλεν

ποτὲ

ἐς ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὄμιλον

= Imbedded sentence

= equal to an attributive adjective = brave

(b)

N

S

Ἄθάνα

ἁγεῖτο

These lines then consist of 2 cola:

(a) The brave Perseus went of old to that host of happy men.

(b) Athena was his guide

A cluster may contain any number of cola provided that these cola form a unity of thought. The marking-off of these cola is based on strict linguistic rules, and must therefore not be confused with content analysis which may give a fairly true picture of the meaning if the content is obvious and uncomplicated, but which can be very subjective and unreliable otherwise.
Since lack of space precludes a detailed exposition of all the *cola* I have confined myself to giving only the thought-clusters. *Pyth.* x contains 49 *cola*, which form 15 thought-clusters, and these represent 6 basic notions.

### OUTLINE OF THOUGHT-CLUSTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Cola</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Content and Transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pindar calls Sparta and Thessaly happy(^{49}) because Heracles, the best of warriors, is the common ancestor of both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Pindar's belief in the virtues of heredity as is here shown in the rule of the aristocracy = his praise of aristocratic excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>This opening praise is not beside the mark, but it is the Aleuadae, noble rulers of Thessaly, who commissioned the ode to enhance the victor's glory, whose success in the games the poet praises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Praise of victor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hippocleas (and man in general) owes his success to the divine aid of Apollo and his inborn (hereditary) <em>arete</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Man's success is due to inborn <em>arete</em> and divine aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The victor's inborn <em>arete</em> is proved by the past successes of his father Phricias, whom the poet praises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Praise of Phricias' successes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pindar prays for their future prosperity and success in the games immune from the envy of the gods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= A prayer related to human success and happiness which is but momentary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{49}\) Burton is of opinion that 'μακαρία carries with it an idea of godlike happiness not perhaps present in ὀλυμπία...', *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962, p. 2. See however Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 11, who rightly objects to this 'Steigerung...in den Adjektiven...'.

9
Only the heart of god knows no pain.
= Everlasting happiness of gods.

Being a successful athlete and seeing his son winning contests, Phricias (and man as such) reaches the acme of human happiness. The fact that he cannot climb the brazen heaven and cannot reach the land of the Hyperbo­reans by ordinary means of travel, implies that human happiness has its limitations and is but momentary.

Perseus reached this happy land as reward for his arete and by divine aid (lines 31ff anticipate 44ff).
= Man’s success due to his arete and divine aid.

The myth of the Hyperboreans stressing three aspects of their life: (a) Their sacrifices to Apollo; (b) their musical festivities = Muse; (c) their life without pain, age and death. = The everlasting happiness of the Hyperboreans.

Perseus killed the Gorgon, killed the inhabitants of Seriphus by turning them into stone, and afterwards came to the Hyperboreans. He did this with boldness of heart (his arete) and by divine aid (Athena was his guide).

A gnome related to divine power = When the gods are doing/have done something wonderful, there is no place for disbelief in the poet’s heart.

Pindar returns to the victor and hopes that his song will enhance his glory.
= Praise of victor.

50. See interpretation below.
53. See note 69.
Man has various desires, but whatever each man strives for, he must cherish it, if he win it, for the future is uncertain.

Gnomic utterances related to man's happiness which is only momentary in the light of the future's uncertainty.

The poet, however, trusts in the hospitality of his patron, Thorax, whose kindness led him to compose this song for the victor. Pindar praises his upright mind.

Pindar praises Thorax' noble brothers by reason of their excellent services to the state of Thessaly as co-rulers. The rule of the nobles, handed down from sire to son, constitutes the best kind of government.

Praise of aristocratic excellence.

**OUTLINE OF THE DEEP STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster/symbol</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/A → A</td>
<td>Aristocracy/heritage arete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/B</td>
<td>Praise of victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/C ← C</td>
<td>Inborn arete/divine aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/B</td>
<td>Praise of Phricias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/D ← D</td>
<td>Human (= momentary) happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/E ← E</td>
<td>Divine (= Everlasting) happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/D</td>
<td>Human (= momentary) happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/C</td>
<td>Inborn arete and divine aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/E</td>
<td>Everlasting happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/C</td>
<td>Inborn arete/divine aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/Ce</td>
<td>Divine power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/B</td>
<td>Praise of victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/D ← D</td>
<td>Human (= momentary) happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/B</td>
<td>Praise of poet's patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/A ← A</td>
<td>Aristocracy/inborn arete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These 15 thought-clusters represent 6 basic notions:

1. Aristocratic excellence  = Spartan/Thessalian aristocratic rule (hereditary arete)
2. Various praise motives.
3. Inborn arete/divine aid  = (a) Gnome/general statement (b) Hippocleas/concrete example (c) Perseus/mythical example
4. Divine power  = Gnome
5. Human = momentary happiness  = (a) Hippocleas/Phricias/man as such/ (b) Perseus
6. Everlasting happiness  = (a) Gods/Gnome (b) Hyperboreans/mythical example.

INTERPRETATION

The Greeks thought highly of athletic arete, and Pindar above all believed that athletes who had triumphed at the games were in some way the counterparts of famous heroes of the past. For this reason he is anxious to establish the heroic origin of the games. This may also account for the fact that Pindar in comparison with Bacchylides was more interested in the inherent qualities of the games than their outward appearance and excitement. In the eyes of Pindar the games reflected man's inborn arete. For to gain a victory at the games a man must be born with this 'potentiality'. In this sense Pindar used words like φυά, τὸ συγγενές, ἀρετά, and the like. It is on account of his inborn arete that man achieves success. This belief is already and very clearly manifested here in his Tenth Pythian Ode. Hippocleas has won, and he has won because of that arete which he inherited from his father:

τὸ δὲ συγγενές ἐμβεβακέν ἵχνεσιν πατρὸς (12)

But this belief in athletic arete is also part and parcel of the poet's common belief in the arete of man as such – man also with regard to his political life. There is no doubt that Pindar praised aristocratic excellence in the belief that aristocracy was the best form of government because it showed that priceless quality of hereditary arete. He begins his poem by calling Sparta and Thessaly happy because both of them are under the royal sway of a race descended

54. Cf. Ol. ii, 2-4; vi, 67-70; iii, 13ff; x, 27ff; Pyth. xi, 15-16; Nem. x, 28; viii, 51.
56. Pyth. x, 12; Nem. vi, 8; i, 28; Isth. iii 13-14; Nem. xi, 12. See also W. Marg, Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung, Würzburg 1938, pp. 80-99.
57. Cf. the phrase ποδῶν ἀρετή in line 23.
from Heracles, whose arete is especially stressed in the word ἀριστομάχου:\(^{58}\) πατρός δ’ ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἕνὸς ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύεται.

And this belief is restated at the end where he firstly praises the rule of the Aleuadae and secondly confirms this in a general gnome on the good guidance of cities that lies in the hands of the aristocracy:\(^{59}\) ἐν δ’ ἄγαθοις κεῖναι πατρωίαι κεῖναι πολίων κυβερνάσσεις.

Much of the ode is also devoted to Hippocleas’ father Phricias. He is a link in this chain of hereditary arete, and Pindar draws attention to this fact by recalling Phricias’ previous successes. Lines 23–24 are especially important:

δὲ ἐν χερσίν ἢ ποιῶν ἀρετὴ κρατήσας
τὰ μέγιστ’ ἄθλουν ἐλη τόλμῃ τε καὶ σέλειν

A fourth figure is drawn into this chain of thought: the mythical example of Perseus who serves as parallel to the victor and his father. Pindar refers to his killing of the Gorgon and his slaying of the inhabitants of Seriphus. By these deeds Perseus displayed his arete, for which he was subsequently rewarded with his participation in the festivities of the happy Hyperboreans.\(^{60}\) The words ὑπερείχα δὲ πνέων καρδίας (44) said of Perseus clearly reflect those of line 23 τόλμῃ τε καὶ σέλειν said of Phricias, thus establishing the close relation between Perseus and Hippocleas-Phricias.\(^{61}\) Thus the aristocracy (the Aleuidae), the victor and his father, and the figure of Perseus are all linked together by this motive of inborn arete.\(^{62}\)

1. μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία (2) : ἐπαινήσομεν (69) ... νόμον
Θεσσαλὼν (70)
2. πατρός ... ἐξ ἕνὸς ἀριστομάχου
gένος Ἡρακλέος (2–3) : ἐν δ’ ἄγαθοίσι ... πατρώιται (71–72)
3. ἀμφοτέραις ... βασιλεύει (2/3) : κεῖναι ... κεῖναί πολίων κυβέρ
νάσσεις (71–72)
4. τὸ δὲ συγγενές ἐμβεβακεν
ἀγκειν πατρός (12) : πατρός ... γένος (2–3)
      : ἄγαθοις ... πατρώιται (71–72)
(Note also the chiastic structure of lines 2–3 and 12.)
5. τόλμῃ τε καὶ σέλειν (24) : ὑπερείχα δὲ πνέων καρδίας (44).

---

59. Cf. Wüst, p. 17, for the meaning of ἄγαθοις in line 71.
62. See also Köhnken, p. 155 note 5; p. 179 note 114.
But Pindar's belief in man's inborn arete is based on his belief that this arete is destined and controlled by divine aid/favour and power. In this ode he makes this clear in three ways:

(a) First by way of a gnome in line 10 directly after his praise of the victor:

"Ἀπολλώνι, γλυκὸ δ᾽ ἀνθρώπων τέλος ἀρχά τε δαίμονος ὄρνυτος αὖξεται

Man's whole exertion or ponos, from beginning to end, is sweet when a god speeds its growing! (b) From this generalisation Pindar moves to the particular. The truth of this general statement in gnomic form is proved by the concrete example of Hippocleas: he has won through divine aid: ὅ μὲν ποιεῖς τε μηδέσι τούτα ἐνυρέξε αὐτῇ (11).

This truth, that man wins happiness by favour of the gods, is stressed repeatedly in this ode by words which, as Strohm has pointed out, reflect this view of Pindar that divine power is at work behind man's achievements and his life in general: μοταρά (17), εὐδαιμον (22), κατ’ αίθαναι (26), νυχῶντα (26), and ἄρχον (62). (c) A third way by which Pindar illustrates this belief is to be found in the mythical example of Perseus. We have already noticed that Perseus killed the Gorgon and the inhabitants of Seriphus and afterwards reached the happy land of the Hyperboreans, and we have shown how Pindar underlines Perseus' arete in the words θρασεία δὲ πνεόν καρδία (44). But also with respect to divine aid Perseus serves as parallel to the victor and his father, for Pindar explicitly states that he succeeded in accomplishing these achievements through the guidance of Athena: ἀγείτο δ᾽ Ἀθάνα (45)! This is stressed by a wordplay in chiastic arrangement: at the beginning of the mythical section Pindar merely states Perseus' arrival at and participation in the festivities in the company of the Hyperboreans παρ’ οίς ποτε Περσεύς ἐδαίμοντο λαγήτας (31). This anticipates line 45: ἀγείτο δ᾽ Ἀθάνα.

= Περσεύς ... λαγήτας = ἀγείτο ... Ἀθάνα

At the end of the myth Pindar underlines this aspect of divine aid in a gnomic utterance: ἕμοι δὲ θαυμάσαι θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδέν ποτε φαίνεται ἔμμεν ἀπίστον (48–50).

---
63. Cf. also Nem. v, 40–41; i, 9; Isth. i, 39–40; Ol. xiii, 104–106; ix, 28; Pyth. viii, 76–77. See D. S. Carne-Ross, 'Three Preludes for Pindar', NS II, 1975, p. 163.
64. For this movement from generalisation to the particular at the beginning of the odes, and vice versa at the end, see Bundy, op. cit., vol. I, p. 28.
66. Wüst, p. 34; cf. p. 11.
68. See also Bowra, op. cit., p. 311.
It is the power of the gods which enables man to attain to success and happiness, and therefore their deeds of wonder leave no place for disbelief. Burton’s observation that Pindar ends the story with a convenient commonplace, detracts from the real importance of this gnome. Burton is also wrong in thinking that this gnome(a) refers ‘in all probability’ to Athena’s guidance of Perseus to the land of the Hyperboreans, if this is in fact the case, and (b) that it does not also refer to Athena’s aid in slaying the Gorgon etc. Burton thus stresses the ‘parenthetic nature’ of vv. 46–48, an opinion which I shall presently query. Through divine aid Perseus killed the Gorgon and the people of Seriphus and for these deeds he was rewarded with a temporary sojourn among the Hyperboreans, but this visit was undertaken not by conventional means (land/sea), but with the aid of Athena by air. The problem of the so-called ‘parenthetic nature’ of vv. 46–48 will be discussed below, but at this stage the close relation between these two myths needs to be stated categorically.

Inborn arete and divine aid, we hear then, are two unconditional requirements for human happiness. The theme of human happiness is seen from several points of view:

(a) The gnome of line 10 forms a cluster with lines 11–12 conveying the notion of human happiness as a result of inborn arete and divine aid. In the outline set out above I have transformed it to the notion/theme of inborn arete/divine aid only, but we must bear in mind that although this is the basic notion of these lines, Pindar does link it with human happiness. Thus the word γλυκό (10) and τοῦτο εἰπρεξέναι (11) relate to this happiness and success. In this cluster (no. 3) we already have elements that will be taken up more fully below in nos. 5 and 7.

(b) The future prayer in lines 17–21 (cluster 5) relates directly to human success and happiness: Pindar prays for their future prosperity and success in the games free from the envy of the gods. The phrases ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον ἀνθείν σφίσιν (18), τὸν ... τερπνὸν λαχώντες (19-20) indicate this clearly.

69. I follow Hermann and Kohnken (op. cit., pp. 176–177 and note 98) in connecting θαυμάζατα with θεῶν τελεσάντων: When the gods do something miraculous, it seems to me not unbelievable. In this sense θαυμάζατα picks up the θαυμασάντα δόν (30); the way to the Hyperboreans is not to be found by conventional means, i.e. by land or by sea. It is a wondrous way, which Perseus found by the aid of Athena, i.e. by air. And when the gods by their aid make this possible, there is no place for unbelief. Contra Wüst (op. cit., p. 14) and others who have taken θαυμάζατα as an expository infinitive with either ἐπιστεύειν or φαίνειν. θαυμασάντα (30) and θαυμάζατα (48) are also reflected in θαυτόν (58).


71. See Kohnken, pp. 175–181. See also Carne-Ross, p. 170. Further note 52 above.

72. The third is πόνος. Cf. Bowra, op. cit., chapter IV. In this ode the πόνος is represented in τέλος ἀρχά (10). Through his inborn arete and especially by divine aid, man’s πόνος (= τέλος) is brought to fulfilment: τέλος – θεῶν τελεσάντων. See also Carne-Ross, p. 162–3.
The fact, however, that Pindar adds to these the prayer μη φθονεραξις ἐκ θεῳν μετατροπής ἐπικύρωσεν (20–21) implies that this happiness depends on divine favour and is consequently limited and temporary. These two aspects of human happiness are the basic themes of the following lines, as well as of lines 59–63.

(c) In lines 22–30 Pindar begins with the statement that a man is happy and poets sing of him whoever gains a victory at the games and sees his son achieve the same success. Yet it is clear that Pindar has Phricias and his son in mind, although the statement is expressed in general terms. The poet, it is true, speaks of he, him, us, you, thus regarding Phricias as representative of mortal man, and therefore represents man's happiness as depending on divine favour (εὐδαιμονίαν, 22), a reality full of glory and joy; and yet it has its limitations! In a style which Fraenkel neatly called 'Pendelschlag' Pindar sets as limits on the one hand the divine as such, on the other hand the happiness of the Hyperboreans. But there is an important difference between these two limits: the one, that of the life of the gods as such, is negative and absolute: man cannot reach the gods = οὐδεμία ὠρανός οὐ ποτὲ ἀμβατός αὐτῷ (27); the other, the land of the Hyperboreans, is positive and can be reached – but not by conventional means, only through divine aid (as is shown by the example of Perseus).

(d) In lines 59–63 (cluster 13) Pindar again refers to man’s happiness with its limitations: he says that man has various desires, but whatever he strives for, if he win it, he must cherish it, for the future is uncertain. Thus again Pindar states the reality of human happiness, but it is limited by the uncertainty of the future.

Man can reach the utmost limit of human happiness, but his happiness is surpassed by the everlasting bliss of the gods and of the Hyperboreans. In this respect too Perseus serves as model: for although he visited the Hyperboreans, his sojourn was only temporary.

The limits set for human happiness are related to the theme of everlasting blessedness, that bliss which surpasses human happiness. This theme of everlasting bliss is set out in two clusters:

---

73. Cf. Köhnen, p. 158.
74. Fraenkel, Dichtung und Philosophie, p. 563 note 16. Note also the chiastic structure in which these two limits are arranged: ὁ ἄγαλμα διόρισεν – ἀμβατός: οὕτω... ἔδροις... ἑταῖρας δόδον.
75. This is in my mind the correct interpretation as set out by Köhnen, pp. 159ff, and Carne-Ross, pp. 170–172 (cf. pp. 166–167).
76. See Köhnen, p. 181ff for this theme of the vicissitude, see also Carne-Ross, pp. 165–166.
(a) In lines 21–22 (cluster 6) Pindar states: θεός επὶ ἀπήμων κέφω = the life of the gods knows no pain, their happiness is, in fact, everlasting. The position of this gnome in the ode is of the utmost importance: it follows Pindar’s prayer for the future prosperity and success of the victor, and precedes the statement of man’s limited happiness. Man’s future is uncertain, he may encounter pain and failure, but this is not applicable to the gods. Man can reach the utmost limit of happiness, but there is a limit. The juxtaposition of the words ἀπήμων and εὐδαιμον (22) indicates clearly this difference between divine and human happiness (cf. the chiastic pattern: θεός – ἀπήμων: εὐδαιμον – ἀνήρ).

(b) In the main part of the mythical material, the description of the life of the Hyperboreans, the theme of everlasting happiness is again referred to: The myth can be divided into three parts:77 in the first (33–36) Pindar relates their sacrifice of asses to the god Apollo; in the second part (37–40) he describes the way in which they celebrate their festival, with the Muse prominent; (c) in the third part (41–44a) he explains the reason for their happiness: no sickness or cursed old age touches their bodies; without toil, without war, without death78 they dwell in a paradise of everlasting harmony.

Although the happiness of the Hyperboreans is related to that of the gods – ἀπήμων (22), said of a god, clearly picks up πόνον ... ἀτρ (42), said of the Hyperboreans – there is a difference: man cannot reach the abode of the gods with their everlasting happiness, but he can, with divine aid, for a moment share the happiness of the Hyperboreans, as is shown in the example of Perseus. The gnome of lines 21–22 contrasts divine happiness with human happiness, but the myth of the Hyperboreans only differentiates between human happiness in this life and the everlasting happiness of the Hyperboreans, who are human, not divine! We must not place the everlasting happiness of the gods on an equality with the δυνατὸς of the blessed/happy people, that is the Hyperboreans.79

If Perseus with divine aid and in reward of his arete could share for a time in the happiness of the Hyperboreans, how is it possible for the victor? The answer is simply: in the song of the poet. Phricias, by virtue of his successes and those of his son, is happy, and is ἡμετῶς ... σοφοῖς 9 (poets sing of him). Again, Pindar hopes that his song will make the victor more splendid than ever, for the wreathe he has won, among his friends, elders, and the young girls. And this is reflected in the myth of the Hyperboreans with its music and the presence of Apollo and the Muse (cf. lines 37/40). The Muse is also the inspiration of the poet’s song, and he celebrates the victor’s successes in the Pythian

77. Cf. the detailed commentary of Köhnken, p. 158ff.
78. Köhnken, p. 163ff. See also Carne-Ross, p. 171.
games of Apollo (cf. 26/56ff)! Köhnken rightly refers to the importance of these three elements of song, the Muse, and the wreaths of victory: 'Diese Parallelität ist sicher beabsichtigt und führt zu dem Schluss, dass die beiden Athleten in der Stimmung des Sieges ebenso glücklich sind, wie die Hyperboreer es immer sein dürfen' . . . 'Pindars Lied bringt Phrikias (und Hippokleas) in das Land der Hyperboreer und lässt sie für einen Augenblick an einer Seligkeit jenseits der irdischen Grenzen teilhaben.' Due to his inborn arete and consequent success man constitutes a theme of praise for the poet’s song, and the poet’s song not only for this day enhances his glory, but his glory will last for ever through the poet’s song. In this particular case Pindar has a word of praise for his patron, Thorax, as well: his kindness towards the poet gave occasion for writing this song for the victor and his father. In this way Thorax contributed to the poet’s task of enhancing their glory. And consequently the various praise motives (victor, father, patron) are all closely related to each other and to the other themes of the ode. Taken as a whole these 6 basic notions form a meaningful unity.

THE PROBLEM CONCERNING PERSEUS‘ SLAYING OF THE GORGON

One particular problem in this ode, and one that is related to the ‘problem’ of its unity, is Perseus’ slaying of the Gorgon and the consequent death of the people of Seriphus. The connection between this story and the myth of the Hyperboreans has puzzled scholars ever since antiquity. A few examples will suffice: Schroeder wrote ‘was die Herbeiziehung des Perseus hier bedeuten solle, fragt man bisher vergebens’. Van Groningen endeavoured to avoid the problem by suggesting that Pindar is not interested in Perseus, but in the Hyperboreans. He consequently called the story of Perseus and the Gorgon an appendage, a ‘hors d’oeuvre’: ‘Pindare se laisse tenter par le charme de la figure de Persée pour rappeler à son sujet deux exploits quin’ont aucun rapport avec son voyage en pays hyperboréen’. Burton closely followed Van Groningen: ‘No connexion has been found between the Gorgons and the Hyperboreans, and this appendage to the myth is best accounted for by the poet’s desire to round off the story of Perseus by adding his most famous exploit

82. Cf. for instance A. Dihle, Griechische Literaturgeschichte, Stuttgart 1967, p. 97: ‘... und der Rest des 72 Verse langen Gedichtes umfasst Sentenzen religiöser-moralischen Inhalts, die wiederum keine logisch zwingende Beziehung zu den benachbarten Themen besitzen'. The view that Pindar’s youth is to be blamed for the so-called disunity in Pyth. x is wholly unfounded. Cf. Köhnken, op. cit., p. 154, and note 2; and Carne-Ross, p. 162.
83. O. Schroeder, Pindars Pythien erklärt, Leipzig 1922, p. 95.
Wüst argues on historical lines and states that Perseus' visit to the Hyperboreans followed the Gorgon episode, and hence the description of this visit of the 'historical' Perseus is for Pindar confirmation of the truth of the myth; this reflects the divine makaria, which man cannot hope to attain to, and against which the uncertainty of human life is set: 'Doch nicht in schwer­
nütiger Sehnsucht wird nach diesem Reich geblickt. Das fromme und recht­
lche Hyperboreergeschlecht ist als solches Vorbild, dem es nachzustreben gilt. Dafür darf es aber kein ersonnenes Wolkenkukuckseheim bewohnen, seine Existenz muss wahr, somit wirklich sein. Darum wird das Bild des Hyper­
boreerlebens in der Geschichte des 'historischen' Perseus, des Ahns der Heraklidien, verankert und an seiner Wirklichkeit glaubig festgehalten, um seine paradeigmatische Gültigkeit zu behaupten'. But this connection will not do. There is no need to confirm the existence of the Hyperboreans historically. Neither does Pindar confirm the existence of the abode of the gods. It is better to connect these two stories on the lines of Köhnken’s argument that Perseus’ visit to the Hyperboreans came as a reward for his killing of the Gorgon and the inhabitants of Seriphus: 'Ohne den Leistungsbericht wäre ganz unklar, wieso der 'Sohn der Danae' zu den Hyperboreern reisen durfte'. It also serves as contrast between the painless life of this holy people and the laborious life of the hero. He only visits this happy land, and his happiness is therefore not everlasting as is the bliss of the Hyperboreans.

The function of this myth in the 'Gedichtganze' is thus twofold: (a) firstly it serves to illustrate Pindar's belief that man through inborn arete and divine aid achieves happiness; (b) secondly it serves as parallel to the victor that as a reward for his arete he can partake of such happiness, as Perseus did when in the song of the poet he visited the Hyperboreans.

86. Wüst, op. cit., p. 35 = Illig, op. cit., p. 91.
87. See Köhnken, pp. 175-176.
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