Unity in Context. Cohesion and Coherence in Pindar's *Olympian* 3

Lukas van den Berge*
Utrecht University

1. Introduction

Typically, the epinician odes of Pindar are characterized by a variety of different themes and elements. Whereas the opening and closing sections of the poems are usually devoted to the victor and his present success, a central section almost invariably contains a narrative from a distant, mythical past. Moreover, Pindar's odes characteristically abound with generalized maxims concerning human existence (*gnomai*). This diversity of themes and elements has confronted scholars with an abundance of interpretative problems. A basic question underlying these problems could be formulated like this: should the Pindaric ode be seen as a thematically disjointed conglomerate of independent elements, or as a whole, in which the various parts are meaningfully interrelated?

1.1 Cohesion and coherence

Since its emergence with Boeckh's 1821 commentary on Pindar's extant works, modern Pindaric scholarship has been divided on this issue. Roughly speaking, the scope of opinions on Pindaric unity could be described as ranging from strictly 'unitarian' to convincedly 'anti-unitarian'.[1] In this paper, Pindaric unity will be examined while analyzing Pindar's *Olympian* 3 as a case in point. In my analysis of this poem's unity, I shall rely on insights from text linguistics and speech act theory in differentiating between two levels. First, unity will be described in terms of *cohesion*, defined as the set of linguistic and literary devices that create relations in discourse. Complementary to cohesion, moreover, I shall examine the ode's unity in terms of *coherence*, referring to the sense on the part of an individual interpreter that a text is meaningful as a whole.[2] Thus defined, *cohesion* is confined to a

---

[1] Unitarian approaches are, e.g., proposed by E.L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica, I, II,* Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1986 [1962], D.C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar. A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*, Leiden, 1968, G.W. Most, *The Measures of Praise. Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, Göttingen, 1985 and I.L. Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A commentary on Nem. V, Nemean III, Nemean V and Pythian VIII*, Leiden, 1999; anti-unitarian views are, e.g., defended by e.g. U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, H. Fränkel, *Wege und Formen des frühgriechischen Denkens*, München, 2nd edition, 1960 and W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar, I: O.3, 7, 12, 14*, Leiden, 1987.

[2] Cf., e.g., J.R. Martin, 'Cohesion and Texture', in: D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge Mass., 2001, p. 35.

text's formal structure, whereas *coherence* is constructed by a text's recipient and depends heavily on a specific communicative context.[3]

In their canonical *Cohesion in English*, Halliday and Hasan do not make this distinction. In their view, cohesive ties are the structural realization of a coherence that is presupposed. This view can be clarified by giving one of their oft-quoted examples:

'Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.' [4]

In this example, that could be found as an instruction in a cookery book, *them* in the second sentence cannot be understood on its own. Therefore, it should be interpreted as anaphoric to *six cooking apples* in the first sentence. Thus, a cohesive tie is established between the two sentences. Guided by this cohesive tie, it is indeed not difficult for even a beginning cook to see how the sentences logically cohere. It is, however, easy to conceive of a cohesive concatenation of sentences that is unlikely to be viewed as coherent by any interpreter. The following example of this is provided by Enkvist:[5]

'I bought a Ford. A car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs Elysées was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussions between the presidents ended last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs. The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.'

It is clear that despite the cohesive ties (*Ford-car* etc.) these sentences do not cohere; properly speaking, therefore, their conglomerate does not qualify as a text.

On the other hand, it should be noted that an incohesive series of utterances can still be perfectly coherent. An example of this can be taken from Pratt:[6]

A (unaware Bill is in the room): Bill makes me sick
B: Heard any good jokes lately?

In the past decades, it has been widely acknowledged in discourse analysis and pragmatics that while interpreting linguistic signals, partakers in communication are usually led by a default principle of coherence.[7] In some cases, a coherent interpretation of a text can be arrived at on the basis of cohesive elements within a text's formal organization only. In other cases, however, interpretations of textual coherence depend mostly or even solely on what can be inferred within a specific communicative context. Pratt's example is a case in point. On the formal level of what Austin has called the *locution, B*'s question in answer to *A*'s statement does not make any sense. Provided, however, that *A* considers *B* as a sincere partner in their conversational enterprise, it is unlikely for *A* to overlook the

---

[3] For a more elaborate account of the cohesion-coherence distinction, see, e.g., J.O. Ostman (ed.), *Cohesion and Coherence*, Abo, 1978; G. Brown & G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 223-271 and W. Heydrich et al., *Connexity and Coherence. Analysis of Text and Discourse*, Berlin, 1989.

[4]   M.A.K. Halliday & R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, London, 1976, p. 2

[5]   N.E. Enkvist, 'Coherence, pseudo-coherence and non-coherence.' In: J.O. Ostman, *Cohesion and Coherence*, Abo, 1978, p. 110

[6]   M.L. Pratt, *Toward a Speech-Act Theory of Literary Discourse*, Bloomington & London, 1977, p. 162

[7]   See, e.g., H.P. Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', in: P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York, 1975, pp. 41-58; D. Sperber, & D. Wilson, *Relevance*, Oxford, 2nd edition, 1995.

relevance of what *B* may implicate on Austin's *illocutionary* level.[8] Only seemingly dis-obeying the Gricean maxim of relation,[9] *B* makes it clear enough to *A* that Bill is within earshot, or at least that he regards Bill's allegedly sickening behavior as an inappropriate topic for their conversation.

It may thus be understood that any examination of a textual coherence should take the communicative context into account. Therefore, my approach to Pindaric unity will differ fundamentally from the strictly text-immanent perspectives chosen by scholars like Young and Most. In his *Three Odes of Pindar*, Young sets out to examine unity in the odes of Pindar while detaching them from their context altogether, studying them as "individual works of literary art"[10], whereas Most seeks in his *Meaures of Praise* to uncover a "formal design"[11] in which all elements would be meaningfully integrated in an "immanent com-positional unity".[12] Examinations of the formal structure of Pindaric poetry (as of any text) alone, however, can only lead to interpretations of unity in terms of cohesion, but not of coherence.

To understand a Pindaric ode's unity more profoundly, therefore, it is essential to study the poem within a specific communicative framework. In this paper, I will take the perspective of the ode's first performance. Theoretically, I could have chosen any commu-nicative situation as long as it is well-defined; in this paper, however, I intend to examine the coherence of the ode as a ritual act that plays a part in the celebration of the return-ing victor's advent. Of course, one may conceive all kinds of scenarios in which Pindar's epinician poetry was regularly reperformed.[13] In this paper, however, I will focus on its ceremonial context of its original enactment, formally celebrating an athletic achievement. This context may be regarded as unique in being institutional: only at the occasion of the ode's first performance, a Pindaric ode may have functioned as a ceremonial act of praise, publicly bestowed on the *laudandus* while officially commemorating his victory.

In this article, I would like to accept as a working hypothesis that the ode's original audience may have been inclined to expend an even more extensive effort in inferring rel-evant implicatures than discourse analysts usually take for granted with regard to natural language use.[14] Perhaps it can safely be conjectured that the ode's original recipients, who were active partakers in a celebratory rite, may have been particularly eager to expect that the poet was saying something that mattered to them.

1.2 Context of original performance

Generally, it should be admitted that most odes' *concrete* circumstances of first performance can only be reconstructed to a restricted extent because of limited historical sources; almost nothing is known with any certainty about most odes' *concrete* contextual circumstances.

---

[8] For his introduction of the terms 'locution' and 'illocution', see J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words*, Oxford 1962, p. 101-102.

[9] See Grice 1975, p. 45.

[10] Young 1968, p. ix

[11] Most 1985, p. 48

[12] Most 1985, p. 42

[13] Cf., e.g., L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, New York, 1991, p. 5; B. Currie, "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes", in: C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden, 2004, pp. 49-69.

[14] Cf., e.g., A. Pilkington, "Relevance Theory and Literary Style", *Language and Literature* 5, 1996, pp. 157 ff..

To some extent, however, Pindar's Third Olympian may be an exception to this rule; as I will explain further below (§ 2.1), there are good grounds to assume that this ode was first performed as a part of a religious festival of *Theoxenia*, celebrating the guest-friendship of Castor and Pollux with the ruling house of Theron, the victorious tyrant of Acragas.

Moreover, studies by, e.g., Crotty, Kurke, Mackie and Currie have shed much light on the *broader* social and cultural sphere in which Pindar's epinician poetry may have been operative.[15] Kurke, for example, has argued for a conceptualization of the victory ode as a form of negotiation between the returning athlete and his heterogeneous community, identifying its original performance as a communal drama that served to re-integrate the victor (having isolated himself by his achievement) within three concentric circles: his individual 'house' (*oikos*), his fellow aristocrats, and the wider civic community of his city (*polis*). According to Kurke, the inherently uneasy social balance between these different interest groups required a sophisticated rhetorical strategy. Along these lines, she has analyzed Pindaric poetry as evoking multiple patterns of meaning, each pointing to a different segment of its public audience. With specific regard to *Olympian* 3, it may be very interesting to investigate how Kurke's 'sociological poetics' may have been operative within their supposed Theoxenian context. I will further elaborate upon this below (especially in § 7).

1.3 Unity in Pindar's *Olympian* 3

In Pindaric scholarship, thematic unity in Pindar's *Olympian* 3 is known as a difficult case. Within the wide range of conceptions of unity in Pindar's victory odes, a moderate position has been taken up by B.A. van Groningen.[16] With regard to *Olympian* 3, however, his conclusion is rather straightforward; according to Van Groningen, unity in *Olympian* 3 has been only formally established, without its central myth being fully integrated into the ode's celebratory frame. Of course, Van Groningen acknowledges that the victor's garland, referred to in line 13 as his 'adornment of olive' (κόσμον ἐλαίας), provides a link with the myth's main subject of Heracles' introduction of the olive tree to Zeus' precinct at Olympia; as Van Groningen points out, this link is formalized by means of the relative τάν (13). Moreover, Van Groningen admits that many motifs from the poem's opening section (1-14) are also referred to in the poem's final section (34-45), thus embedding the myth within a structure of ring-composition.

In the course of this myth, however, Van Groningen believes that the narrator somehow gets carried away by his subject, focusing on the beauty of olive trees instead of on the victor's garland: "Le poète (...) n'oublie pas évidemment que ce sont les lauriers-là qui fournissent les couronnes (...), mais c'est avant tout leur beauté majestueuse, beauté d'un autre monde, qui a inspiré le mythe."[17] Moreover, Van Groningen notes that the narrator completely seems to lose sight of trees and garlands after his return to the present in line 34. Therefore, he concludes that the poem has become diffuse. Despite their formal interconnectedness, a thematic connection between the ode's myth ("la vision") and its

[15] K. Crotty, *Song and Action. The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore, 1982; Kurke 1991; L. Kurke, "The Economy of Kudos", in: C. Dougherty & L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 131-163; H. Mackie, *Graceful Errors. Pindar and the Performance of Praise*, Ann Arbor, 2003; B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford, 2005.

[16] B.A. van Groningen, *La composition litteraire archaique grecque*, Amsterdam, 2nd edition, 1960, pp. 324-386.

[17] van Groningen 1960, p. 352

festive context ("la realité") would not have been achieved: "L'ode ne constitue pas une unité: la réalité et la vision subsistent indépendemment l'une de l'autre: le fil qui les retient est purement extérieur; il n'y a qu'enchaînement; il n'y a pas d'intégration."[18]

In discourse analytic terms, this may be rephrased as follows: whereas Van Groningen acknowledges Pindar's *Olympian* 3 to be (to a certain degree) *cohesive*, he does not regard it as *coherent*, as its myth and its celebratory frame would be thematically unrelated to each other. Moreover, Van Groningen seems to believe that the poem lacks a clear 'focus', while noting that with regard to the neglect of the "motif principal" of trees and garlands in the ode's concluding section (34-45), the poem reflects a "processus créateur dans l'âme de son auteur", fleeing from one theme to another.[19] Apparently, Van Groningen takes the poet's self-professed manner of associative composition at face value, without considering the possibility of passages like *P.* 10.53-54 (ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων- ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον) to be part of a poetic fiction.[20] Van Groningen's anti-unitarian conclusion on *Olympian* 3 is fully endorsed by W.J. Verdenius, who considers the poem to lack a "clear compositional strategy".[21]

A. Köhnken, however, has opposed Van Groningen's view, drawing attention to a recurrent motif by which myth and actuality would be thematically integrated after all.[22] This motif consists of references to horses and chariots,[23] and appropriately so, since the ode celebrates a victory in an Olympic chariot race.[24] Moreover, Köhnken points to the status of the Tyndarids, who play a prominent role in the ode (Τυνδαρίδαις, 1; Τυνδαριδᾶν, 39), as patrons of horsemanship.[25] One could, however, still maintain with Van Groningen that there is no thematic connection between chariots, horses and the Tyndarids on the one hand and the myth's main story of Heracles' introduction of the olive tree in Olympia on the other. According to Köhnken, the link between the two is provided in two ways. Firstly, he speculates that Pindar connects Heracles with the Tyndarids by inventing a joint patronage, not attested elsewhere, of the Tyndarids and Heracles of the Olympic Games (τοῖς γὰρ (...) ἀγῶνα νέμειν, 36). Moreover, Köhnken points to the fact that whereas it is stated in lines 17-18 that Heracles intends the olive trees to supply the precinct of Zeus in Olympia with shadowy foliage (Διὸς αἴτει πανδόκῳ- ἄλσει σκιαρόν (...) φύτευμα), it is, as it appears in lines 33-34, more in particular the Olympic race course that the hero has in mind (δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου- ἵππων). The ode's central narrative would thus be gradually diverging from a *general* story about the foliage of the olive tree towards a *specific* focus on the tree's thematic connection with the victory celebrated in the ode. In lines 33-34, Köhnken considers the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle to fall into place: "This is the point where Hyperborean olives, Heracles and horse-

---

[18] van Groningen 1960, p. 352

[19] van Groningen 1960, p. 352

[20] For a defense of Pindar's 'associative mode' of composition being a poetic fiction, see esp. C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, Salem, 1981, p. 5 ff.; A.M. Miller, "Pindaric Mimesis. The Associative Mode" *CJ* 89, 1993, pp. 21-54; Pfeijffer 1999, p. 34-37.

[21] Verdenius 1987, p. 4

[22] A. Köhnken, "Mythical Chronology and Thematic Coherence in Pindar's Third Olympian Ode", *HSCP* 87, 1983, pp. 49-63

[23] Köhnken 1983, p. 63: "The key theme of horses and chariots runs through the ode."

[24] The instances referred to by Köhnken are ἀκαμαντοπόδων/ ἵππων (3-4), χρυσάρματος (19), ἱπποσόα (26), δρόμου ἵππων (33),ὁιμφαρμάτου διφρηλασίας (37) and εὐίππων (39).

[25] Köhnken 1983, p. 60; in *N.* 10.49-51, *P*.1.66 and *P.* 5.9, the Tyndarids are also associated with horsemanship.

racing, the victor's discipline, finally come together". Concluding his argument, Köhnken thus states that Pindar's *Olympian* 3 "is clearly a perfectly coherent whole".[26]

In my opinion, however, Köhnken's analysis does not sufficiently validate its conclusion, as it seems rather implausible to suppose, as Köhnken does, that Pindar tells the story of Heracles' exploits only as a device to focus gradually on the Olympic racecourse. Moreover, Köhnken's examination is strictly one of *form* instead of form and *function*. As a cohesive device, the recurrent motif of horses and chariots is shown by Köhnken to contribute to the ode's formal *cohesion*; his examination of the ode does not, however, yield a possible interpretation of the poem as a *coherent* act of praise, performed while officially celebrating the victor's Olympic success. Therefore, Van Groningen's conclusion is not falsified; with Köhnken's analysis alone, the thread that holds myth and actuality together could still be argued to be superficial.

In what follows, I shall re-evaluate the issue of unity in *Olympian* 3 while focusing on three problems in particular. First (§ 2), I shall investigate what can be inferred from the available sources about the context of the poem's original performance. Subsequently (§ 3-6), I shall examine the ode's central myth and the way in which this myth is structurally embedded in the rest of the poem. As a last part (§ 7) of my analysis, it will be explored whether there are plausible ways in which the mythical story may be interpreted as meaningfully integrated into its celebratory frame, being a part of a coherent whole within the ceremonial context of the ode's original performance.

2. Context of original performance: 1-9, 36-41

Pindar's *Olympian* 2 and *Olympian* 3 both celebrate the victory of Theron of Acragas in the Olympic four-horse chariot race. Various hypotheses have been advanced about the way the odes relate to each other. Farnell, for instance, believes that the performance of *Olympian* 3 must have been prior to that of *Olympian* 2. While making this point, Farnell argues that O. 2. 97-98 (τὸ λαλαγῆσαι θέλον κρυφὸν τιθέμεν ἐσλῶν καλοῖς- ἔργοις) refers to "interruptions that disturbed the performance of the Third Olympian".[27] Moreover, Farnell regards *Olympian* 2, which gives a Pythagorean view of the afterlife, as a poem that would be "too intimate" and "too cryptic" to be addressed to a civic audience.[28] Therefore, Farnell believes that the second Olympian was performed for Theron and a select circle around him only. Conversely, he regards Pindar's *Olympian* 3 as "far less complicated", and thus better suited for a performance in public.[29]

On similar theories about the connection between Pindar's tenth and eleventh Olympian odes, Elroy Bundy has expressed himself quite clearly: "With the truth or falsehood of these theories it is useless to concern oneself, for not a shred of evidence can be found in either ode to support either of them, or any other view of the relation between the two odes."[30] With regard to the relation between the second and third Olympian odes, the same can be argued. Nothing can be ascertained about the concrete context of the second

---

[26] Köhnken 1983, p. 63
[27] L. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, London, 1932, p. 23
[28] Farnell 1932, p. 12
[29] For the same view, see also J. van Leeuwen, *Pindarus' tweede Olympische ode*, Assen, 1964, p. 5.
[30] Bundy 1962, p. 1

Olympian's performance, since the alleged difficulty of the ode cannot be accepted as an argument to consider the ode to have had a select audience only. Moreover, Farnell's analysis of *O.* 2. 97-98 as a reference to the performance of *Olympian* 3 does not take into account that passages like *O.* 2. 97-98, in which the poet alludes to the envious talk among his fellow citizens, are strictly conventional. In fact, the phrase under discussion is a typical example of what Bundy has called the σιγά motif: tactfully, the poet breaks off his praise to shield the victor against the envy (*phthonos*) of his fellow-citizens.[31] In what follows, however, I shall argue that Farnell is probably right in considering *Olympian* 3 as having been composed for a celebration in public.

2.1 Theoxenia

Traditionally, Pindar's third Olympian ode has been thought of as having been performed originally within the civic context[32] of *Theoxenia*, celebrating the advent of the Dioscuri at Acragas; in all manuscripts, the words θεοξένια or εἰς θεοξένια appear in the title. In 1961, however, the idea that the third Olympian was first performed at such a festival was opposed by Hermann Fränkel, who argued that the reference to Theoxenia in the title would be the result of a scholiast's misinterpretation of καί νυν (...) ἐς ταύταν ἑορτάν (...) νίσεται in line 34 as a reference to festivities in Acragas.[33] In their 1971 Teubner edition, in which the title's explicit reference to Theoxenia (εἰς θεοξένια) is bracketed, Snell and Maehler have followed Fränkel in this. Indeed, the reasons to take ταύταν ἑορτάν as referring to the games at Olympia instead are compelling; a close analysis of the ode's annular composition (see below, § 3) provides the decisive argument.

In my view, however, Fränkel's analysis of line 34 does not in any way discredit the ode's supposed Theoxenian context.[34] In fact, the poem's opening lines strongly indicate that such a context may be taken for granted after all:[35]

> 1 Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἁδεῖν
> καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ' Ἑλένᾳ
> κλεινὰν Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων εὔχομαι,
> Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν
> ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων
> ἵππων ἄωτον.[36]

---

[31] Bundy 1962, pp. 73-76, with numerous examples. For the σιγά motif, see also P. Bulman, *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley 1992, p. 82.

[32] On the public nature of this festival, see e.g. J.A. de Waele, *Acragas Graeca. Die historische Topographie des griechischen Akragas auf Sizilien*, Den Haag, 1971, pp. 203-204; F.M. Deneken, *De Theoxeniis*, Berlin, 1881, p. 13; D. Gill, "Trapezomata. A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice", *HTR* 67, 1974, pp. 117-137.

[33] H. Fränkel, "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3", *Hermes* 89, 1961, pp. 394-397

[34] Cf., e.g., Verdenius 1987 p. 32, Köhnken 1983, p. 59, S.C. Shelmerdine, "Pindaric Praise and the Third Olympian", *HCSP* 91, 1987, p. 76; M.A. Pavlou, "Pindar Olympian 3. Mapping Akragas on the Periphery of the Earth", *CQ* 60, 2010, p. 313.

[35] All Pindaric texts in this paper are taken from Snell and Maehler's 1971 Teubner edition; my own literal prose translations can be found in accompanying footnotes.

[36] 'I pray to please the hospitable Tyndarids and Helen with beautiful locks, while I reward renowned Acragas with my gift, raising a hymn in celebration of his Olympic victory, the finest offering for horses with untiring feet.'

On this passage, Emmet Robbins has rightly argued that the reference to Helen (Ἑλένᾳ, 1) can best be understood within the context of Theoxenia,[37] as Helen's attendance could thus be explained from the fact that Helen was generally thought to accompany her brothers at the festival.[38] In fact, Robbins' explanation seems to be the exclusive way in which the poet's mention of Helen can be interpreted as making sense, for it becomes clear in what follows that Helen did not assist Theron in gaining his Olympian victory:

> (...). ἐμὲ δ' ὦν πᾶ
> θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν Ἐμμενίδαις
> Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδος εὐίππων διδόν-
> των Τυνδαριδᾶν, ὅτι πλείσταισι βροτῶν
> 40   ξεινίαις αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαις,
> εὐσεβεῖ γνώμᾳ φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς.[39]

In these lines, it becomes clear that Castor and Pollux, but not Helen, is to be thanked for Theron's Olympian victory. Nevertheless, of course, the poet starts off his song by expressing the wish that Helen, who was also thought to be present at the festival, may enjoy his poem too. In the clause introduced by ὅτι (39), then, the twins' benevolence towards Theron and his clan (Ἐμμενίδαις Θήρωνί τε, 39) is motivated by their pious accomplishment of sacred rites that welcome the Tyndarids in Acragas; the explicit reference to 'numerous hospitable tables' (πλείσταισι (...) ξεινίαις (...) τραπέζαις, 39-40) makes it clear enough that Theoxenia are meant. The present tense ἐποίχονται should be taken as habitual; it seems that the festival was periodically celebrated to honour the presence of Castor and Pollux. [40]

But why, then, does the poet describe the Tyndarids as φιλοξείνοις (1)? It has been maintained by various scholars that the adjective refers to hospitality of Castor and Pollux as hosts of other gods at the occasion of their own festival.[41] This interpretation, however, is unlikely because the opening line (Τυνδαρίδαις (...) φιλοξείνοις) is clearly linked to lines 39-40 (Τυνδαριδᾶν, 39; ξεινίαις, 40), in which the Tyndarids are strictly presented as guests; moreover, the whole idea of the Tyndarids acting as hosts of other deities is absent in Pindar's odes. Therefore, Shelmerdine has proposed to take φιλοξείνοις as

---

[37] E. Robbins, "Intimations of Immortality", in: D. Gerber, (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy. Studies in Honour of Leonrad Woodbury*, Chicago, 1984, p. 220. See also Verdenius 1987, p. 6.

[38] See, e.g., D. Flückiger-Guggenheim, *Göttliche Gäste. Die Einkehr von Göttern und Heroen in der griechischen Mythologie*, Bern, 1984, p. 63; cf., also, Eur. *Hel.* 1066-1069.

[39] 'Somehow, then, my heart urges me to declare that to the Emmenids and Theron, glory has come as a gift from Tyndareos' sons with splendid horses, because of all mortals, they honour them with the most numerous hospitable tables, preserving the rites of the blessed with pious mind.'

[40] Cf. Σ Ol. IIIa (Drachmann 1903, p. 105): θεοξενίων ἑορταὶ παρ' Ἕλλησιν οὕτως ἐπιτελοῦνται κατά τινας ὡρισμένας ἡμέρας, ὡς αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιδημούντων ταῖς πόλεσιν. In my view, πλείσταισι (...) τραπέζαις (39) should not be understood as 'most numerous (...) feasts', as William Race does in his translation for the Loeb series; instead, πλείσταισι (...) τραπέζαις (39) makes much more sense when taken as a reference to the magnificence of the Emmenids' magnificent offerings, which are said to surpass those of all other Theoxenia. Cf. Σ Ol. III71b (Drachmann 1903, 124): (πλείσταισι:) πεπληρωμέναις.

[41] B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar. The Olympian & Pythian Odes*, New York, 1890, p. 155; Farnell 1932, p. 24; C.P. Segal, "God and Man in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes", *HSCP* 68, 1964, pp. 211-267

simply characterizing the Dioscuri as 'lovers of strangers'.[42] In opposition to this interpretation, however, the adjective is only attested in referring to hospitable behaviour on the part of hosts.[43] In my view, φιλοξείνοις should instead be taken as a reference to the Tyndarids' hospitality at *Olympia*, where they bestowed Olympic victory on Theron in the chariot race. The Tyndarids' role as ἐναγώνιοι θεοί is mentioned in lines 36-38:[44]

> τοῖς γὰρ ἐπέτραπεν Οὔλυμπόνδ᾽ ἰὼν
> θαητὸν ἀγῶνα νέμειν
> ἀνδρῶν τ᾽ ἀρετᾶς πέρι καὶ ῥιμφαρμάτου
> διφρηλασίας.[45]

The main idea, I think, of calling the Tyndarids φιλοξείνοις is the expression of hospitality's reciprocity. Whereas Theron and his Emmenid clan frequently welcome the Tyndarids in Acragas while bestowing them with magnificent offerings, the twins have now given Theron the most splendid gift one can think of: victory in the Olympian games. By celebrating Theoxenia, the cycle may be endlessly repeated: by piously upholding the sacred rites, Theron's and the Emmenids' glorious fame (κῦδος, 39) might be endurably preserved. One of the poet's tasks is to secure this cycle's endurance; therefore, he prays to please (ἁδεῖν (...) εὔχομαι, 1-2) the attending deities.

2.2 Symposium

Typically, Theoxenia welcoming Castor and Pollux took the form of a civic banquet.[46] The reference to ξεινίαις (...) τραπέζαις (39-40) indicates that this has also been the case in Acragas. As I shall argue further below, in fact, an Acragantine banquet welcoming the Dioscuri may be referred to in the following passage (4-9):

> (...). Μοῖσα δ᾽ οὕτω ποι παρέ-
> στα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπον
> 5   Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ
> ἀγλαόκωμον· ἐπεὶ χαίταισι μὲν
> ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι
> πράσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος,
> φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν

---

[42] Shelmerdine 1987, p. 73

[43] See, e.g., Hom. *Od.* 6.121, 8.576, Pi. *N.* 1.20, I. 2.24, Aesch. *Cho.* 656.

[44] As Pindar zooms in from the general ἀνδρῶν (..) ἀρετᾶς to the more specific ῥιμφαρμάτου διφρηλασίας and Castor and Pollux are nowhere else mentioned to preside over the Games, it is likely that Pindar refers specifically to the Tyndarids' supervision of the chariot race. This is in accordance with the report of Pausanias of the location of the temple of the Dioscuri near the starting point of the track of the chariot race (Paus. 5.45.5); for a detailed analysis on the Dioscuri's cult in Elis, see L.R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, Oxford, 1921, pp. 207-209.

[45] 'For to them he entrusted, on his way to Olympus, to watch over the splendid contest of men's excellence and swift-carted chariot driving.'

[46] See, e.g., Gill 1974, pp. 122-123. On public banquets as a binding element in Greek communities, see, e.g., P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques*, Rome, 1992 and F. van den Eijnde, *Cult and Society in Early Athens*, Utrecht, 2010, p. 45 ff.

καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν
Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόν-
τως, ἅ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν· (...).[47]

In lines 6-7, it is claimed that 'garlands, bound upon hair' (χαίταισι (...) ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι) are urging the poet to live up to his 'divinely inspired debt' (θεόδματον χρέος).[48] Whose 'crowns' are specifically referred to? Verdenius sees no problem here, as he thinks that the use of the plural is "merely emphatic", with στέφανοι (6) referring to the victory garland won by Theron (Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ, 9) only. But the few parallels for such a plural that Verdenius and others adduce are not convincing.[49]

Of course, Theron's crown is of prime importance; his excellence in the games, embodied in the victory wreath, has to be properly matched in words. But Theron may not have been the only one wearing a garland; within the supposed context of a civic banquet welcoming the Dioscuri in Acragas, all other partakers in the festivities are likely to be adorned with garlands too.[50] A context of banqueting, in fact, may be also reflected in the description of the 'voice' (φωνάν, 5) to be adjusted to 'Dorian rhythm' (Δωρίῳ (...) πεδίλῳ, 5) as one of 'splendid celebration' (ἀγλαόκωμον, 5), with the indirect reference to a *kômos* being drawn from the sphere of the symposium.[51] The image of 'mixing' (ἐναρμόξαι, 5; συμμεῖξαι, 9) as well as the reference to various musical instruments (φόμιγγα, 8; αὐλῶν, 8), moreover, may also be interpreted as reflecting a context of festive banqueting. Therefore, I believe στέφανοι (6) to refer not only to Theron's garland, but to garlands worn by the symposiasts in general, with all partakers in the festivities eagerly awaiting the poet to unfold his song.

3. Transitions: 9-13; 34-35

In line 9, then, the focus of the poem is abruptly shifted to Olympia. By means of the postponement of ἅ τε Πίσα (9), with Πίσα metonymically denoting the games, the subject of the games can now be easily elaborated upon with the help of the relative τᾶς

---

[47] '(...). And so, I think, the Muse has taken her stand beside me, as I have found a newly shining way to fit a voice of splendid celebration to Dorian measure. For garlands, bound upon hair, exact me to pay this divinely inspired debt, to mix the lyre with varied tones, the voice of flutes and the setting of words for Ainesidamos' son in the right measure; and Pisa too exacts me to sing; (...).'

[48] The poet's 'debt' (χρέος, 7) is said to be 'divinely inspired' (θεόδματον, 7) for two reasons: firstly, Theron's victory in the chariot race has been granted to him by the Dioscuri (cf. lines 38-41); secondly, Pindar derives his poetic ability itself from the divine (on divine inspiration in Pindar see, e.g.,Verdenius 1983, pp. 41-44, with further references).

[49] See Verdenius 1987, p. 15, referring to P. 10. 26, where στεφάνων is not emphatic but denotes crowns in general; P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare*, Louvain & Paris, 1993, p. 54 points at a "pluriel emphatique" in I. 1. 13 Γηρυόνα (...) κύνες. This example, however, is not convincing; see, e.g., Race's note in his Loeb edition, *ad loc*.

[50] Cf. F. Schwenn, *Der junge Pindar*, Greifswald, 1940, p. 248; for the wearing of garlands on sacred occasions in general, see, e.g., W. Burkert, *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, Cambridge Mass., 1985, p. 56, with further references.

[51] For the reference to a *kômos* in Pindar being tightly connected with the context of a symposium, see *esp*. M. Heath, "Receiving the Komos. The Context and Performance of Epinician", *AJP* 109, 1988, pp. 180-195; see also Crotty 1982, p. 83, , Kurke 1991, pp. 137-139 and Pfeijffer 1999, pp. 500-502.

(9). From the convention of introducing mythical digressions by the use of such a relative, the audience may have anticipated a myth;[52] initially, however, this anticipation is not fulfilled, since what follows could be described as a generic transitional passage that serves as a *diminuendo*[53] leading up to ἐλαίας (13), the most prominent subject of the myth (13-34) being the olive tree:

> (...) ἅ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν· τᾶς ἄπο
> 10 θεόμοροι νίσοντ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί,
> ᾧ τινι κραίνων ἐφετμὰς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας
> ἀτρεκὴς Ἑλλανοδίκας γλεφάρων Αἰ-
> τωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν
> ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλῃ
> γλαυκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας, τάν ποτε (...).[54]

Analysis of the ode's annular composition informs us that lines 9-10 (ἅ τε Πίσα (...) τᾶς ἄπο (...) νίσονται) open a myth-external frame that is completed in line 34:

> (...) καί νυν ἐς ταύταν ἑορ-
> ταν ἵλαος ἀντιθέοισιν νίσεται
> 35 συν βαθυζώνου διδύμοις παισὶ Λήδας.[55]

With νίσεται (34) mirroring νίσονται (9), it is indicated that ταύταν ἑορτάν (34) refers back to Πίσα in line 9. Therefore, Fränkel (see above, § 2.1) is right in taking ταύταν ἑορτάν (34) as a reference to the games in Olympia and not to the festival in Acragas.

In this passage, the conclusion of the myth is signalled by καί νυν (...) νίσεται (34). Although enclitic νυν in Pindar has retained relatively much of its temporal value[56] it is used here and elsewhere in the victory odes primarily as a discourse particle that marks the closure of a digression and the resumption of a theme that has been temporarily lost sight of.[57]

---

[52] Cf. Bundy 1962, p. 8; for relative pronouns introducing mythical digressions see esp. E. des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare*, Paris, 1947, pp. 48-50.

[53] The term *diminuendo* (leading up to a climax) is borrowed from Bundy 1962, p. 66.

[54] 'And Pisa bids too exacts me to sing; from there come heaven favoured songs to men, in honour of whom the strict Aetolian, fulfilling Heracles' ancient mandates, places the grey-coloured adornment of the olive tree on his hair above the brows, that once (...).'

[55] '(...) so, now, he graciously comes to that festival with the godlike twins, sons of deep-girdled Leda.'

[56] See esp. C.J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen, 1957, p. 65.

[57] Too much has been made of the temporal value of νυν by Mackie 2003, p. 63, who treats νυν like a full adverb of time, equivalent to νῦν. In Pindar's victory odes, enclitic νυν occurs eleven times, usually preceded by καί (*O.* 3.34, 7.13, 10.78, *P.*3. 66, 4.42, 9.71, 11.7, *N.* 6. 8). Examples in which the particle has indeed retained much of its temporal value include *O.* 10.78, *P.* 3. 66 and *P.* 11.44. Pragmatically, however, the particle functions primarily as a so-called 'pop-particle', marking the point where "a speaker returns to the embedding sequence"; see, e.g., S.R. Slings, "Adversative relators between PUSH and POP", in: A. Rijksbaron, A. (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam, pp. 101-129; *P.* 4.42, in which καί νυν ἐν τᾷδε νάσῳ picks up ματρόπολιν Θήραν (20) is probably the clearest example. A special use, moreover, could be identified in νυν as a marker of climactic elements (e.g., *N.* 6.8, *O.* 7.13; cf. Bundy 1962, p. 5). An underlying value is given by C.J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'τε épique'. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam, 1971, pp. 842-843, who writes the following on Homeric νυν : "La particule (...) signale que le fait exprimé par la phrase a la même

4. Hyperboreans: 13-18

In line 13, the ode is hinged to a mythical past by the characteristic use of the relative τάν + ποτε + aorist;[58] in line 17, the imperfect αἴτει (17) is the unequivocal sign that we have left the sphere of the present:[59]

> (...) κόσμον ἐλαίας, τάν ποτε
> Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν
> παγᾶν ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας,
> 15 μνᾶμα τῶν Οὐλυμπίᾳ κάλλιστον ἀέθλων,
> δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων πείσαις Ἀπόλ-
> λωνος θεράποντα λόγῳ·
> πιστὰ φρονέων Διὸς αἴτει πανδόκῳ
> ἄλσει σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα
> ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις στέφανόν τ' ἀρετᾶν.[60]

With τάν ποτε (...) ἔνεικεν Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας (13-14), we learn that Heracles, Amphitryon's son, has brought the olive tree to Olympia from the shadowy springs of the Ister (Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν, 14), where Pindar locates the land of the Hyperboreans.

4.1 The Hyperborean abode

In *Olympian* 3, some hints are given about the nature of this people and their abode. Firstly, we learn that the place where the Hyperboreans dwell is shadowy (σκιαρᾶν, 14). This should be thought of as portraying the Hyperborean life as enjoyable; as we will see in lines 23-24 (ἀλλ' οὐ καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλεν χῶρος (...) τούτων ἔδοξεν γυμνὸς αὐτῷ κᾶπος ὀξείαις ὑπακουέμεν αὐγαῖς ἀελίου), the Hyperborean shadow, provided by the olive trees, is sharply contrasted with the piercing rays of the sun in Olympia, where such trees are lacking. Secondly, the Hyperboreans are depicted as a sacred people living in service of Apollo (δᾶμον Ὑπερβορέων (...) Ἀπόλλωνος θεράποντα, 16). Thirdly, etymology (ὕπερ - Βορέοι) is adduced in locating the Hyperborean abode beyond the northern end of the world, unaffected by the winds of cold Boreas (πνοιαῖς ὄπιθεν Βορέα ψυχροῦ, 31-32). Thus, the place where the Hyperboreans dwell is

---

importance qu'un fait actuel." Cf. also, more recently, P.J. Finglass, "νῦν and νυν in Pindar", *Mnemosyne* 60, 2007, p. 269 ff., with the appropriate reading of *O*. 3.34 at page 271.

[58] For the form of transitions to mythical narrative, see, e.g., W.J. Slater, "Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle", *CA* 2, 1983, pp. 117-132; on Pindaric ποτε, see esp. D.C. Young, "Pindar's Pythians 2 and 3. Inscriptional ποτέ and the 'poetic epistle", *HSCP* 87, 1983, pp. 31-48 and Hummel 1993, p. 246, who remarks that "La présence de l'adverbe ποτε signale une anteriorité lointaine".

[59] For the imperfect being indispensable as a narrative's 'time anchor', providing it with a temporal reference point in the past, see, e.g., A. Rijksbaron, "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect", in: A. Rijksbaron et al. (eds.), *In the footsteps of Raphael Kühner*, Amsterdam), 1988, p. 247.

[60] '(...) the olive tree, which once, from Ister's shadowy springs, Amphitryon's son brought back as finest memorial of Olympia's games, having persuaded the Hyperborean people, servants of Apollo, with his speech: in sincerity of heart he requested for Zeus' all-welcoming grove a plant providing shade to all men, and a crown for deeds of excellence.'

characterized as utopian; [61] as Verdenius notes,[62] the sense of detachment is reminiscent of Homer's description of the dwelling of the gods on mount Olympus in *Od.* 6. 43-46: οὔτ᾽ ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ᾽ ὄμβρῳ/ δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ᾽ αἴθρη/ πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ᾽ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη/ τῷ ἔνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἤματα πάντα.

4.2 Dendrophoria

Does Pindar draw on tradition when he tells of the olive tree's Hyperborean descent and its introduction in Olympia by Heracles or is the content of this myth a product of Pindaric invention? For the story of Heracles winning the olive tree for Olympia from the land of the Hyperboreans, there is no earlier or synchronic account. Therefore, many scholars seem to have rightly concluded that the myth probably shows Pindar's "mythopoeic fancy" at work.[63] This conclusion is reached also by E. Krummen in her *Pyrsos Hymnon*.[64] Krummen, however, draws extensive attention to mythical elements which Pindar may have used to organize his myth. Of particular importance, I think, for my argument is the theme of *dendrophoria*, the ritual 'bringing of trees' to sanctuaries.

As Krummen shows, stories of *dendrophoria* make up a complex of myths in which the following elements can generally be discerned:[65]

I   A tree or twig is obtained from a remote and inaccessible area.

II Usually, animals turn out to have led the way.

III In the region where the tree or twig is obtained, the treebearer(s) perform(s) an act of purification.

IV The tree-bearer's triumphant return marks the beginning of a period of prosperity at the site of his arrival.

One of the myths mentioned by Krummen that contains these elements is the story (told by Plutarch, *Mor.* 293c) ritually re-enacted in the Delphic festival of the S(t)epteria. Preceding the Pythian games, youths ran away after burning a wooden structure, with the fire representing the Python's defeat. Their journey went to the distant (I) abode of Tempe

---

[61] In *Pythian* 10, the Hyperborean state of detachment and bliss is depicted in more detail; unaffected by strictly judging Nemesis, the Hyperboreans would live an eternal life without hardship or toil (νόσοι δ᾽ οὔτε γῆρας οὐλομένην κέκραται/ ἱερᾷ γενεᾷ· πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχᾶν ἄτερ/ οἰκέοισι φυγόντες/ ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν, 41-45); their abode is inaccessible for mortals (ναυσὶ δ᾽ οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν <κεν> εὕροις ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν, 29-30). Apollo is the Hyperboreans' frequent guest (ὧν θαλίαις ἔμπεδον/ εὐφαμίαις τε μάλιστ᾽ Ἀπόλλων/ χαίρει, 34-36). For Apollo among the Hyperboreans, cf. also Pi. *Pae.* 8. 63-64, Alc. 307 LP and Bacchyl. 3. 57-59; for an analysis of *Pythian* 10 and the utopian life of the Hyperboreans, see esp. A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, Berlin, 1971, pp. 154-187.

[62] Verdenius 1987, p. 31

[63] Farnell 1932, p. 27: "We may imagine Pindar's mythopoeic fancy at work"; other scholars reaching the same conclusion include Wilamowitz 1922, p. 238, Köhnken 1983, p. 55 and Verdenius 1987, p. 26. The sources gathered by E. Robbins, "Heracles, the Hyperboreans and the Hind", *Phoenix* 36, 1982, pp. 299-302 to prove the thesis that "the story is not original with Pindar" are not convincing.

[64] E. Krummen, *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation*, Berlin & New York, 1991, p. 236

[65] These elements are adapted form Krummen 1991, p. 240, with slight modifications.

in Thessalia, to which Apollo was once led during his chase of this animal (II). After the Python's defeat, the god used the foliage of the laurel tree in purifying himself. In Tempe, the youths from Delphi performed purification rites as well (III); thus purified, they took branches of laurel to Delphi to serve as a garland for victors, just as Apollo had done when he founded the Pythian games. With the youths' triumphant return, the games could begin (IV).[66] The myth of Heracles fetching the olive tree from the land of the Hyperboreans follows the same pattern. All elements mentioned by Krummen are at least implicitly referred to in the text; with the exception of the guiding role of animals (II), which will be hinted at in the remainder of the myth (see below, § 6.2), these elements have already been mentioned or suggested in the myth's first five lines (13-18).

Firstly, the olive tree descends from the remote area of the Hyperboreans (I); secondly, Heracles' behaviour is characterized as remarkably[67] peaceful; instead of taking the tree by force, Heracles poses a sincere request (πιστὰ φρονέων (...) αἴτει, 17), in which he uses a religious argument (Διὸς (...) πανδόκῳ ἄλσει, 17-18). As we will see below (§ 6.4), the hero's pious conduct may be thought of as acquitting him of previous behaviour (III). Thirdly, Heracles intends the olive tree to be a source of shadow for all men (σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις, 18), thus facilitating prosperous human life in Olympia (IV), providing protection against the piercing rays of the sun (ἔδοξεν γυμνὸς (...) κᾶπος ὀξείαις ὑπακουέμεν αὐγαῖς ἀελίου, 24). From comparable stories of *dendrophoria*, we know that they were periodically re-enacted in a ritual; a re-enactment of this kind, in fact, is possibly hinted at in line 34 (ἐς ταύταν ἑορτὰν (...) νίσεται), in which we will learn of Heracles' periodical visits to Olympia to attend the games.

5. Institution of the Games: 19-26

How should Heracles' sudden need for shadowy foliage and a victory wreath be explained? To elucidate this, the ode is moved in line 19 to a level of time that precedes Heracles' visit to the Hyperboreans; the location is now Olympia:

> ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ, πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἁγι-
> σθέντων, διχόμηνις ὅλον χρυσάρματος
> 20 ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα,
> καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἁγνὰν κρίσιν
> καὶ πενταετηρίδ᾽ ἁμᾷ
> θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς Ἀλφεοῦ·
> ἀλλ᾽ οὐ καλὰ δένδρε᾽ ἔθαλλεν
> χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος.
> τούτων ἔδοξεν γυμνὸς αὐτῷ κᾶπος ὀ-
> ξείαις ὑπακουέμεν αὐγαῖς ἀλίου.
> 25 δὴ τότ᾽ ἐς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὥρμα
> Ἰστρίαν νιν· (...).[68]

---

[66] For this festival, see, e.g., also Burkert 1985, p. 100; other festivals referred to by Krummen include a Theban festival of *Daphnephoria*, with a procession bringing a laurel to the temple of Apollo Ismenios.

[67] For the usual Heraclean violence, cf., e.g., Heracles' bloodshed while founding the Olympian games in *O*. 10. 24-59. See also Segal 1964, p. 229 and Shelmerdine 1987, p. 73 (with further references).

[68] 'For already had the altars been dedicated to his father, and month-dividing Moon in golden chariot had

In line 19, the explanation of Heracles' request is set in motion by ἤδη γὰρ (19).[69] First of all, it is mentioned that Zeus' altars have been consecrated and ready for use; in fact, it is about time for everything to be ready, for the full moon has already shone (ἤδη αὐτῷ (...) ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα, 19-20); apparently, the institution of the mandate that the games should begin after the second or third full moon following the summer solstice[70] has coincided with Heracles' official founding of the games, which has also taken place already (μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἁγνὰν κρίσιν (...) θῆκε, 21-22). The problem, however, is the lack in Olympia of shadowy trees (ἀλλ' οὐ καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλεν χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος, 23); with the games approaching, it has occurred to Heracles that the sun's sharp rays (ὀξείαις (...) αὐγαῖς ἁλίου, 24) are a serious threat to his project. For mortals, unmitigated contact with divine powers can be totally devastating.[71] Such unchannelled contact is here represented by the piercing rays of the sun, which make any form of human life in Olympia impossible.

In line 25, then, δὴ τότε picks up ἤδη γάρ (19), both referring to the point in time that instantly[72] follows ἔδοξεν (24). As the hero now realizes the problem, his urge to undertake a journey to solve it is perfectly clear; the evident nature of this sequence is stressed by the particle δή. With the reference of δὴ τότε to ἤδη γάρ, the account of the games' institution is solidly forged into a unit.[73] Heracles' need for shadowy foliage has now been made sufficiently clear. Two elements of the story, however, remain to be clarified. Firstly: in lines 25-26 (ἐς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὦρμα Ἰστρίαν νιν) we learn that the hero's heart urges him to fetch the olive tree. But how could he have known about the olive tree and its shadowy foliage? And, secondly: the abode of the Hyperboreans is extremely inaccessible; in *Pythian* 10, for example, even Perseus needs the assistance of Athena (ἁγεῖτο δ' Ἀθάνα, P. 10. 45) to find the way to the place where the Hyper-

---

shone evening's full eye. A sacred judgement of great games he had established, together with a four-year festival, on Alpheos' holy banks; But the land of Pelops, in the vales of Kronos' hill, was not blossoming with beautiful trees. Exempt of these, the garden seemed to him subjected to the piercing rays of sun. It was then that his heart urged him to travel to the Istrian land; (...).'

[69] On γάρ as a so-called push-particle, setting digressions in motion, see Slings 1997, p. 100; on the use of γάρ introducing embedded narratives, see I.J.F. de Jong, "Γάρ *Introducing Embedded Narratives*", in: A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam, 1997, pp. 101-129.

[70] The Olympic Games were held after every second or third full moon after the summer solstice. See, e.g., M.I. Finley & H.W. Pleket, *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*, London, 1976, p. 26.

[71] The story of Tantalus in *Olympian* 1 (ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι/ μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρῳ δ' ἕλεν/ ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἅν τοι πατὴρ ὕπερ/ κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον, 55-57) is a clear example.

[72] For the use of the imperfect characterizing a state of affairs as *immediately* following another state of affairs, see A. Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, Amsterdam, 3rd edition, 2002, pp. 17-18.

[73] Within this unit, moreover, ὀξείαις (...) αὐγαῖς ἁλίου (24) could be argued to correlate with ὅλον χρυσάρματος ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν (...) Μήνα (19-20) to form an internal ring; the relation between the sun's sharp rays and the moon's full eye is, I think, complementary. Whereas the rays of the sun form an obstacle for human activity, the full moon reminds Heracles that the games are about to begin; together, sun and moon express Olympia's desperate need for 'beautiful trees' (καλὰ δένδρεα, 23). In this way, the use of the epithet χρυσάρματος (19) (with parallels only in Pindar's P. 5.9, I. 6.19 and Bacchyl. 13.157), describing the moon as 'riding in golden', can be explained functionally as enhancing the ring's structure; for the association of gold with the sun, see D.E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One. A Commentary*, Toronto, 1982, p. 10 on O. 1.1.

boreans dwell. In *Olympian* 3, however, Heracles seems to have no trouble to find this way by himself.

6. Chase of the Hind: 26-34

A close reading of lines 26-34 may illuminate all this. The passage describes Heracles' chase of the Cerynean hind:

> 25   (...) ἐς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὥρμα
> Ἰστρίαν νιν· ἔνθα Λατοῦς ἱπποσόα θυγάτηρ
> δέξατ' ἐλθόντ' Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν
> καὶ πολυγνάμπτων μυχῶν,
> εὖτέ νιν ἀγγελίαις
> Εὐρυσθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν
> χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον
> θήλειαν ἄξονθ', ἄν ποτε Ταϋγέτα
> 30   ἀντιθεῖσ' Ὀρθωσίας ἔγραψεν ἱεράν.
> τὰν μεθέπων ἴδε καὶ κείναν χθόνα
> πνοιαῖς ὄπιθεν Βορέα
> ψυχροῦ· τόθι δένδρεα θάμβαινε σταθείς.
> τῶν νιν γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν
> δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου
> ἵππων φυτεῦσαι.[74]

The passage here quoted has led to heated scholarly debates. The main controversy concerns the number of expeditions that Heracles undertakes to the Hyperboreans. Whereas some[75] believe that Heracles' chase of the hind should be understood as preceding his journey to fetch the olive tree, others[76] consider the hero to bring the hind back to Eurystheus

---

[74] '(...) his heart urged him to travel to the Istrian land; there Leto's horse-driving daughter had received him on his arrival from Arkadia's ridges and meandering glens, when on behalf of Eurystheus' commands he was forced by his father's compulsion to bring back the hind with golden horns, that Taygete had once inscribed as a holy offering to Orthosia. Pursuing her, he had also seen that distant land behind the blows of cold Boreas; there he stood and wondered at the trees. For them, a sweet desire took hold of him to plant them around the turning point point of the horses' race course, twelve times rounded.'

[75] A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt*, Leipzig, 1821, p. 139; A. de Jongh, *Carmina Olympia*, Utrecht, 1865, p. 330; J. Th. Kakridis, "Die Pelopssage bei Pindar", Ph. 85, 1930, pp. 475; van Groningen 1960, p. 352; R. Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*, Den Haag & Paris, 1974, p. 61; A. Jaufmann, "Interpretation einer Pindarode", *Jahresberichte des Bismarck-Gymnasiums Karslruhe*, 1977-1978, p. 35; Robbins 1982, p. 298; Köhnken 1983, p. 54; Verdenius 1987, p. 27; Shelmerdine 1987, p. 74; L. van den Berge, "Mythical Chronology in the Odes of Pindar. The cases of *Pythian* 10 and *Olympian* 3", in: R.J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds.), *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 34-41; Pavlou 2010, p. 313

[76] Th. Mommsen, *Pindarus. Zur Geschichte des Dichters und der Parteikämpfe seiner Zeit*, Kiel, 1852, p. 14; M.C. van der Kolf, *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractaverit quidque in eis mutarit*, Rotterdam, 1923, p. 39; Wilamowitz 1922, p. 238; L. Illig, *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, Borna & Leipzig, 1932, p. 58 and 66; Segal 1964, p. 235; G. Devereux, "The Exploitation of Ambiguity in Pindarus' O.3.27", *RhM* 109, 1966, p. 295; J. Duchemin, "Pindare et la Sicile. Réflexions sur quelques thèmes mythiques", in: M. Thiry (ed.), *Hommages à*

and the olive tree to Zeus' precinct in Olympia on the same trip. In what follows, I will briefly go into this issue (§ 6.1). Perhaps more importantly, I think the question should be dealt with as to why the poet has fashioned his story in such an intricate manner. This last issue will be addressed in § 6.2.

6.1 One or two journeys?

Already in his *Zur Form der Pindarischen Erzählung*, Leonhard Illig expressed his weariness with his opponents' point of view: "Es ist (...) falsch, wenn immer wieder behauptet wird, Pindar unterscheide zwei Züge ins Hyperboreerland, nämlich den Jagdzüg, auf dem er die Bäume kennen lerne, und dann einen zweiten Züg, auf dem er sie dann geholt habe."[77] To ground his thesis of one trip, Illig gives an interesting explanation that is fully endorsed by S.L. Radt.[78] In explaining the contrast between the hero's own free will and Eurystheus' orders, Illig argues that Heracles' journey is doubly motivated, both internally (θυμὸς ὥρμα) and externally (ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυσθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα, 28) explaining his expedition. In Illig's view, the same goes for θάμβαινε (32) and αἴτει (17), that would refer to the same event, giving both its psychological motivation (θάμβαινε, 32) as well as its immediate externalization in the form of the hero's peaceful request (αἴτει, 17).[79]

As Robbins has rightly remarked, however, a heavy price must be paid for Illig's interpretation of one trip.[80] One of the problems is the explicit reference to Arkadia as the starting point of Heracles' chase of the hind (ἐλθόντ' Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν καὶ πολυγνάμπτων μυχῶν, 27). This was already pointed out by A. de Jongh in 1865: "Differentiam itinerum Poeta eo ostendit, quod in cervae venatione Herculem (…) exceptum esse dicat, venientem ex Arcadia: nunc vero veniebat ex Elide."[81] To explain this inconsistency, Illig claims that Pindar would have fused two stories into one, without bothering to match the details. This theory of an imperfect fusion has been endorsed by Segal on the grounds that an interpretation of two journeys would make "havoc of Pindar's tenses".[82] Segal does not believe that the aorist indicative δέξατο expresses anteriority with regard to the hero's institution of the games on the ground that the account of the founding is also primarily told in the aorist tense. Thus, as Segal argues, δέξατο would not be capable of moving the narrative chronologically backward to a level of time that precedes this founding.

As Robbins indicates, however, the pluperfect (required by Segal) is virtually absent in Pindar.[83] Instead, anteriority is usually expressed in Pindar (and elsewhere in ancient Greek) by means of the aorist tense, with the context supplying a reference point in time.[84] In fact,

---

M. Delcourt, Bruxelles, 1970, p. 81; S.L. Radt, "Review of R. Hamilton, Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar", *Mnemosyne* 32, 1979, p. 400

[77]   Illig 1932, p. 58
[78]   Radt 1979, p. 400
[79]   Illig 1932, p. 66
[80]   Robbins 1982, p. 296
[81]   de Jongh 1865, p. 330
[82]   Segal 1964, p. 265
[83]   See Robbins 1982, p. 296, who counts O. 6.54 as the only certain example.
[84]   For the aorist expressing completedness (and, therefore, anteriority) with regard to a reference point in time provided by the context, see, e.g., C.J. Ruijgh, "L'emploi inceptif du theme du présent du verbe grec", *Mnemosyne* 38, 1985, pp. 3-12 and Rijksbaron 2002, pp. 1-3. For other views, see, e.g., J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über*

the report of Heracles' descent from Arkadia (ἐλθόντ' Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν καὶ πολυγνάμπτων μυχῶν, 27) instead of Elis is exactly what facilitates the ode's recipient to properly construct such a reference point. Thus, it is clear that the hero's chase of the hind has concerned an earlier trip; the audience may have understood that by means of the conventional combination of a relative device (ἔνθα, 26) + aorist indicative,[85] the story has been shifted even further into the past with regard to a point in time that is marked by τότε (...) ὥρμα (25). In this way, a third level of time is introduced;[86] this level precedes both Heracles' visit to the Hyperboreans (17-18) and the hero's institution of the games in Olympia (19-26). During his expedition to the Hyperboreans within this third level of time, Heracles is constrained by Eurystheus' cruel commands (ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυσθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα, 28), sharply contrasting with the hero's own initiative (θυμὸς ὥρμα, 25; γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν, 33) to travel to the Hyperborean abode to fetch the olive tree.

In lines 33-34, the ode returns to Heracles' founding of the Olympic games. Hamilton has described this transition as rather brusque: "The first part of the sentence (31-32) definitely refers to the trip on which he first saw the olive (...) and the second (33-34) seems to but could not since the race course had not been built yet. A marvelous confusion..."[87] Whether there *is*, in fact, any confusion remains to be seen, as the poem's structural organization may help the recipient to differentiate between the various levels in time. With τόθι (...) γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν (32-33) chiastically correlating with θυμὸς ὥρμα (...) νιν· ἔνθα (25-26), the account of Heracles' chase of the hind is provided with a solid external frame. Thus, the ring-composition serves as an indication that the relative τῶν (33) does not elaborate on the hero's hunting expedition,[88] but shifts the story forward in time instead, bringing us back to Heracles' need for shadowy foliage when founding the games.

6.2 Transgression

Within an interpretation of two separate journeys, the account of the hero's earlier trip to the Hyperboreans while chasing the hind makes clear how Heracles could know about the olive trees. But how could Heracles find his way to the Hyperboreans without any divine guidance? As Krummen has described (see above § 4.2), one of the thematic elements in stories of *dendrophoria* is (unwilling) guidance by animals. Apollo, for example, finds his laurel in pursuit of the Python. Something similar happens in Pindar's version of Heracles' chase of the hind, as was already pointed out by Krummen herself: "Die Hirschkuh ist 'Weg' und Führung."[89] In my view, there is little doubt that Krummen's interpretation of the hind as the hero's guide to the Hyperboreans is right. But what is the role of Artemis, who is said to have 'received' (δέξατο, 27) Heracles on his arrival? Krummen argues for a friendly reception; in her capacity as a "Göttin des Draussen", the goddess would have

---

Syntax, Band I, Basel, 1926, p. 152, E. Schwyzer & A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, Band II, München 1950, pp. 253-254 and Hummel 1993, p. 245. See van den Berge 2007, pp. 29-41 for a more detailed account of relative tense in Pindar.

[85] On ἔνθα used as a relative device to shift a story to the past, see Hummel 1993, p. 320.

[86] A temporal reference point in the past for this third level of time is provided by ἔντυε (28); for the function of the imperfect as a narrative's 'time-anchor', see Rijksbaron 1988, p. 247.

[87] R. Hamilton, *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*, Den Haag & Paris, 1974, p. 61.

[88] Cf., e.g. Robbins 1982, p. 298.

[89] Krummen 1991, p. 242

willingly offered the hero her service on his errand.[90] Artemis' helpfulness described by Krummen, however, is extremely illogical. For why would the goddess have wanted to cooperate in the capture of her votive offering (ἔλαφον (...) ἄν ποτε Ταϋγέτα (...) Ὀρθωσίας ἔγραψεν ἱεράν, 28-30), thus being Heracles' accomplice in the robbery of her own property?

Apollodorus' version of the chase (*Bibl.* 2.5.3), our only alternative written source of the story, is more explicit about the encounter. Having killed the hind, Heracles is the object of Artemis' severe anger; according to Apollodorus, the hero is only forgiven when he has thoroughly explained his situation, putting the full blame for his behaviour on Eurystheus. The evidence from vase paintings is inconclusive; some vases, however, depict the hero in what seems to be a fight with a divinity.[91] Therefore, Devereux has argued that δέξατο (27) should be interpreted as ambiguously describing Heracles' reception by Artemis as either friendly or hostile.[92] For this, Devereux has been attacked by various scholars, of whom only Robbins, Verdenius and Shelmerdine argue their case.[93] The main point of Devereux' opponents is that Pindar nowhere else uses δέχομαι in a hostile sense. In my view, however, this argument is invalid, since in Pindar's odes the verb occurs almost always (but not in the passage under discussion) in the context of 'welcoming' the *kômos* or 'winning' the victory wreath and so forth.[94] In other authors, a hostile sense of δέχομαι is not unusual; with regard to Homer's *Iliad*, for example, passages in which the verb is used in the context of hunting like 4.107 and 12.147 may be of special interest.[95]

Therefore, I think that Devereux' ambiguous reading of δέξατο may well be accepted. In this way, any transgressive behaviour on Heracles' part is effectively obscured but not completely suppressed. Like in Apollodorus' version of the story (see above, § 6.3), moreover, the moral responsability for any misbehaviour is consigned to Eurystheus, whose cruel commands the hero was forced to obey (ἀγγελίαις ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα, 28). Moreover, any misconduct on the hero's part could even be ascribed to Heracles' divine father, who was, after all, the one whose oath (deceitfully taken from him by Hera) had made Eurystheus so powerful.[96] In this way, we can begin to understand why the poet has shaped his story in such an exceedingly complex fashion. By starting off at Heracles' peaceful visit to the Hyperboreans on his way to fetch the olive tree, friendship and divine benevolence are effectively foregrounded. In accordance with Krummen's structural analsysis of stories of *dendrophoria*, however, it can be understood that we may see Heracles' uncommonly pious behaviour also in the context of ritual purification from earlier transgressions.

---

[90] Krummen 1991, pp. 242-243

[91] For a discussion of the painted sources of the story, see Devereux 1966: 294-295.

[92] Devereux 1966, pp. 289-298

[93] Robbins 1982, pp. 301-302; Verdenius 1987, pp. 27-28; Shelmerdine 1987, p. 74

[94] For numerous examples, see Slater 1969, pp. 125-126; on the use of δέχομαι in the context of reception of the *kômos* see also Heath 1988, p. 180, who considers the verb as "almost a technical term".

[95] For further examples, see, e.g., LSJ II.2

[96] See, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 19.95-133.

7. Mythical relevance

In natural language use, transitions leading up to and concluding a story are usually accompanied by extensive phases of orientation and evalution, in which the narrative's relevance with regard to its context is explicitly emphasized.[97] Explicit information about a story's relevance with regard to its embedding frame is frequently found in poetry as well.[98] In the odes of Pindar, however, such explicitness is almost invariably absent. The scarcity of any *explicit* thematic connections has led scholars like Wilamowitz to believe that Pindar's odes consist of "unverbundene Szenen", compiled by a poet who would be unable to organize his material in a proper way.[99] As a relic from a prelogical past, Pindar would have lacked the capacity to structure his odes in a logical way. In recent decades, however, scholars have increasingly described Pindar's implicitness as part of a conscious poetical strategy, intentionally involving its recipients actively in the performance by finding out for themselves how things are meant to cohere.[100]

Nonetheless, the relevance of a textual unit (mythical or otherwise) is not something that can, in any way, be objectively ascertained. As has been argued by, e.g., Sperber and Wilson, such an objective code model, in which a speaker's or author's encoded message can be decoded by a recipient using an identical key, should be regarded as incomplete.[101] Understanding language, of course, always involves an element of decoding; with regard to what is *implicated*, however, meaning can only be inferred on a subjective basis, yielding *different* interpretations by *different* recipients. For the inferences of individual recipients pretty much about anything is conceivable; as a result of a greater processing effort on the part of an interpreter, a richer web of connotations and inferred meanings is always possible.

In what follows, therefore, I shall not attempt to give a full account of imaginable inferences, which would (apart from being impossible) result in *hyperexegesis*. Instead, I shall focus on four clusters of inferences only, because they can, I think, be inferred to a valuable extent of meaning at a reasonable cost of processing effort. A first cluster relates to the theme of public benefaction. Secondly, a spatial metaphor may be taken into account, by means of which Theron is both praised and admonished at the same time. Thirdly, the persona of the poet comes into play; fourthly, I shall argue for a cluster of analogies that center around a theme of harmony and friendship.

7.1 Public benefaction

As we have seen above (§ 2.2), the garlands (στέφανοι) in line 7 that exact the poet to deliver his song should not be taken as referring to Theron's garland only, but also to garlands worn by the participants in a civic festival of Theoxenia more in general. The garland on Theron's head symbolizes his excellence in the games, but it may also provide him with the 'shadow' that protects him from harmful aspects of unmitigated divine forces;

---

[97] Cf., e.g., W. Labov, *Language in the Inner City*, Philadelphia, 1972, pp. 356-372.
[98] Homer's narrative about Niobe in Il. 24.601-619 (νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου/ καὶ γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου, 601-602; ἥ δ' ἄρα σίτου μνήσατο (...) ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶι μεδώμεθα (...) σίτου, 613-619) is a clear example.
[99] Wilamowitz 1922, p. 458
[100] Cf., e.g., Pfeijffer 1999, p. 23 ff.
[101] Sperber & Wilson 1995, pp. 2-9

both functions of the olive tree's foliage are specifically mentioned in Heracles' request for the tree (σκιαρόν τε φύτευμα (...) στέφανόν τ᾽ ἀρετᾶν, 18) that he poses to the Hyperboreans. In this way, a clear parallel is established between Heracles and Theron. Whereas the olive tree is brought to Olympia by Heracles, it is Theron who takes it from Olympia to Acragas. The Hyperborean endowment of protective shadow is emphatically referred to as a provision for men to share (ξυνὸν ἀνθρώποις, 18); in like manner, Theron's athletic achievement (embodied in the victory wreath) may be suggested to benefit not only himself, but the entire garlanded *koinônia* of Acragantine citizens as well.

Like Heracles, Theron succeeds in bringing home the life-fostering foliage of the olive tree from a distant region. Both these regions are touched by the divine; the Hyperboreans live their utopian life in service of Apollo, whereas Olympia is presented as the source of divine songs (τᾶς ἄπο- θεόμοροι νίσοντ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί, 9). With regard to this parallelism, the recurrent use of νίσομαι in line 34 (καί νυν ἐς ταύταν ἑορτὰν (...) νίσεται) may be viewed as significant;[102] whereas the first use of the verb refers to Theron's 'coming' from Olympia to Acragas, the second use of the verb describes a 'coming' of Heracles to Olympia.

7.2 Ne plus ultra

As has been widely acknowledged since Jane Harrison's work on Greek religion, victors in sacred games were thought to return home with some sort of divine and talismanic power that they did not possess before. This power could, of course, be beneficial to their native *polis*, but it could also be seen as a threat. On the one hand, there is always the danger that the victor, captured by *hybris*, goes too far and transgresses his mortal boundaries. On the other hand, *phtonos* on the part of the victor's fellow citizens may constitute a threat to the community's internal social harmony. Therefore, it is one of the encomiast's most central tasks to oppose both *hybris* and *phthonos* before it could even arise, without, of course, in any way invalidating his poem as an act of praise. This, I think, is exactly what the poet does in the priamel that concludes the ode:

> εἰ δ᾽ ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ
> χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος,
> νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν
> Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται
> οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος
> σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ᾽ ἐστι σοφοῖς ἄβατον
> 45 κἀσόφοις. οὔ νιν διώξω· κεινὸς εἴην.[103]

Like Heracles at the Hyperboreans, Theron has been guided by divine powers in arriving at the highest glory. Being bound to the realm of mortals, however, he cannot go any further. Thus, by means of what is sometimes called the *'ne plus ultra motif'*,[104] the victor is praised

---

[102] Cf., e.g., Robbins 1984, p. 22.
[103] 'If water is pre-eminent, and gold most revered among possessions, then Theron reaches the farthest point of sufficiency; by his deeds of excellence he grasps Heracles' pillars from his house. Beyond that wise men nor unwise must tread. I shall not pursue it; I would be foolish.'
[104] See, e.g., Pfeijffer 1999, pp. 225-226.

and warned at the same time; the poet protects him from both *hybris* and *phthonos*, while still acknowledging his great achievement.[105] In their chase of eternal glory, mortals can sometimes go too far; the reference to Heracles' transgressive behaviour while chasing the hind (see above, § 6.2) reminds us of this. In his conclusion of the ode (44-45), therefore, the poet gives the good example and applies his warnings also to himself. To go any further would be foolish; now that he has bestowed Theron with the highest praise for mortals, he brings his poem to a sudden end.[106]

7.3 Intermediation

The poet's warnings remind us of the utter destruction that the gods can bring about to human life. Ultimately, however, the scale in *Olympian* 3 clearly tips towards the positive, life-promoting nature of divine forces. In order to be profitable for humans, however, these forces need to be properly channelled. While instituting the games, Heracles provides Olympia with fostering shade, protecting the place against the piercing rays of the sun. In this way, he serves as an intermediary, transposing the Hyperborean state of bliss at least partially by bringing the olive tree to Olympia.[107] His introduction of this utopian tree to the site of the games is explicitly pervaded with a spirit of harmony. The hero's transgressive behaviour while chasing the hind is only subduedly referred to, while also being properly accounted for by ascribing it to the cruel commands of Eurystheus. In this way, Heracles' encounter with the Hyperboreans is effectively conducted into a sphere of friendship instead of enmity.

   Like Heracles, the poet can also be regarded as a negotiating intermediary between divine and human spheres. Similar to the foliage of the olive tree, the poet's song may be more than just a vehicle of unmitigated praise; instead, it can be considered to have a protective purpose as well, channelling divine powers in the right directions. Whereas Heracles transposes the olive tree from a divine to a human realm, the poet does the same with his poetry; with the Muse on his side (Μοῖσα (...) παρέστα, 4), his songs are characterized as 'divine' (θεόμοροι (...) ἀοιδαί, 9), while also 'travelling towards men' (νίσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, 9). As in the case of Heracles, moreover, the poet's motivation to convey his divinely inspired gift is presented as twofold. Heracles is firstly forced by necessity (ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα, 29) to undertake an expedition to the Hyperboreans; subsequently, he undertakes this journey by his own free will (θυμὸς ὥρμα, 25; γλυκὺς ἵμερος ἔσχεν, 33). In the course of the ode, the poet progresses towards a strictly internal motivation as well. Initially, his song is presented as his payment of a debt (χρέος, 7);[108] consequently, however, Heracles' 'urging heart' (θυμὸς ὥρμα, 25) is mirrored by the poet's own urge (θυμὸς ὀτρύνει, 38) to sing his song of praise.

---

[105] For the poet's protection of the victor aginst *phthonos* in Pindar, see esp. Bulman 1992: 1-36. For a close examination of the near/far dialectic in Pindar, see esp. T.K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind. A Study of Logical Structures in Early Greek Poetry*, Leiden, 1985, pp. 11-27, with an analysis of the *ne plus ultra* motif in *Olympian* 3 on pages 12-18.

[106] See esp. I.L. Pfeijffer, *First Person Futures in Pindar*, Stuttgart, 1999, pp. 31-32.

[107] The habitual νίσεται, in fact, suggests that the hero continues to do so. As we have seen (§4.2), a periodical re-enactment of the hero's *dendrophoria* may here be hinted at, with Heracles thus still continuing to transpose the Hyperborean state of bliss to Olympia.

[108] For an insightful discussion of the so-called χρέος motif in Pindar, see esp. Kurke 1991, pp. 85-107.

7.4 Friendship and harmony

In his concluding priamel (see above, § 7.2) the poet piously ascribes Theron's victory to the beneficience of the Dioscuri (Ἐμμενίδαις- Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδος εὐίππων διδόντων Τυνδαριδᾶν, 38-39). In this way, Theron and his clan of Emmenids as privileged by the gods, while, of course, also acknowledging that humans are not capable of obtaining Olympian glory entirely on their own. The reason for the divine benevolence position is the Emmenids' pious upholding of Theoxenia in honour of Castor and Pollux (ὅτι πλείσταισι βροτῶν- ξεινίαις αὐτοὺς ἐποίχονται τραπέζαις, 39-40). The Emmenid clan includes Theron's brother Xenocrates, of whom chariot victories are celebrated in *Pythian* 6 and *Isthmian* 2; his athletic achievements are also referred to in *Olympian* 2 (ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεόν (...) κοιναὶ Χάριτες ἄνθεα τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων- ἄγαγον, 49-51). The harmonious bond of *xenia* between Theron and his clan and Castor and Pollux is reciprocal; in return for the Emmenids' hospitality at their glorious festival, the Tyndarids, who preside over the Olympic games, bestow them with their Olympian victory.

   A parallel, I think, may thus be inferred between the *Emmenids*, of whom Theron and Xenocrates are most prominent, and Castor and Pollux, twice referred to in Olympian 3 as *Tyndarids*. Both (on the one hand) Theron and Xenocrates and (on the other hand) Castor and Pollux excel, of course, in matters of horsemanship, whether hiring jockeys or riding themselves; moreover, both preside over sacred festivals. As Robbins notes,[109] a parallelism between the Emmenids and the Tyndarid twins may implicitly present the bond between Theron and Xenocrates as harmonious. Such harmony would be in contrast with the situation of Acragas' rival city of Syracuse, in which Hieron's relation with his brother Polyzelus is known to have been openly hostile.[110]

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, it should first be stated that Köhnken is right in regarding Pindar's Olympian 3 as a cohesive whole. Köhnken's identification of a recurring motif of horses and chariots is entirely right. In addition, however, one could point at a number of other motifs as well, of which 'travelling' (νίσονται, 9; πορεύεν, 25; ἐλθόντα, 27; μεθέπων, 31; νίσεται, 34; Οὐλυμπονδ' ἰών, 36; διώξω, 45), 'guest-friendship' (φιλοξείνοις, 1; πανδόκῳ, 17; δέξατο, 27; ξεινίαις, 40) 'divine benevolence' (Μοῖσα (...) παρέστα, 4; θεόδματον, 6; θεόμοροι νίσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί, 10; διδόντων Τυνδαριδᾶν, 39) and 'banqueting' (ἀγλαόκωμον, 6; στέφανοι, 6; συμμεῖξαι, 9; ἑορτά, 34; τραπέζαις, 40) seem to be of prime importance. Moreover, it has been made clear, I hope, that multiple ring-composition is used as a structuring device. Firstly, the myth is provided with an external frame (Πίσα (...) τᾶς ἄπο (...) νίσονται, 9; καί νυν ἐς ταύταν ἑορτὰν (...) νίσεται, 34), embedding the myth within the ode; secondly, as I have pointed in §6.1, ring-composition contributes to the recipient's proper

---

[109] Robbins 1984, p. 224.
[110] See, e.g., de Waele 1971, pp. 109-115. In the course of 476, Polyzalus would have taken refuge with Theron (Diod. Sic. 11.48).

understanding of the relative chronology of the mythical events, helping the ode's hearer or reader to designate two separate journeys of Herakles to the Hyperboreans.

By means of a strictly text-immanent analysis of the ode's cohesion alone, however, Van Groningen's conclusion of myth and actuality being only formally connected cannot be falsified. While investigating the poem against the background of its original festive context, however, I would argue that *Olympian* 3 should be considered as a rhetorically coherent act of praise. Paradoxically, this coherence consists of a multiplicity of meaning that may have been operative on many levels at the same time. The ode may not only have depicted Theron as a magnificent victor, but also as a benefactor of his entire *polis*. In the context of Theron's re-integration into his community, the poem may be viewed as effectively shielding its laudandus against both *hybris* and *phthonos*, while also glorifying him.