Pindar's "Hymn to Cybele" (fr. 80 SM): Meter, Form, and Syncretism

Joel B. Lidov

P INDAR REFERS in several places to the Magna Mater, the mother of the gods, but only in the three words of fr. 80 SM does he associate her with a proper name: δέσπ]οιν[αν] Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[έρα]. This has given the fragment a special interest as part of the evidence for Pindar's religiosity or the history of cult, in particular for syncretism in Thebes;[1] the recent assumption that the fragment begins a hymn to Cybele has lent weight to its apparent significance. A careful scrutiny of what is possible for these words will draw attention to some unappreciated features of both Pindaric metrics and the formal character of lyric invocations. It is unlikely that these words begin a hymn, or are even evidence for one, least of all a Theban one; taken together, this and other passages from

---

[1] "[D]er Dithyrambos auf die große Mutter [=fr. 80, see next note] ein bedeutsames Zeichen für die beginnende Zersetzung der griechischen Religion durch die Einflüsse des Auslands": R. Wünsch, "Hymnos," *RE* 9.1 (1916) 161. The biographical aspect implicates this fragment in the controversies surrounding *Pyth.* 3.77ff, with Σ and the ancient biographical tradition, and brings in as well the *Hymn to Pan* (fr. 95 SM), *Dith.* 2 (fr. 70b SM), and other passages; all discussions of this fragment have begun with at least some assumptions drawn from these. One should be aware that scholars (except Slater, below) frequently use 'Cybele' when referring to passages in which Pindar has Μάτηρ (Μεγάλα); this begs some questions and creates confusion. I shall return to the other texts at the end.

I am indebted to Dirk Obbink, who brought the problems of this fragment to my attention, for allowing me the use of the draft of the relevant portion of his forthcoming edition of the second part of the *De pietate* and for his advice on all matters relating to the text of Philodemus; and to him and Jacob Stern for their comments on the whole. An earlier version was read at the 1993 meetings of the American Philological Association.

Pindar usually discussed in this connection suggest more by the evidence they do not supply for Thebes than by what they do.[2]

The source of the fragment is the *De pietate* of Philodemus, who quotes the words in a summary of the opinions of a number of poetic authorities about the origins of the gods (P.Hercul. 247 fr. 6, col. 1+N 247 VI left side, lines 17ff; p.19 G):

Πίν-
[δαρος] δ' [ἐκ] Κυβέ-
[λης μ]ητρὸς ἐν τῷ·
δέσπ]οιν[αν] Κυβέ-
[λαν] ματ[έρα]

It is preserved only in the copies executed by draughtsmen as the successive layers of the carbonized Herculaneum rolls were unpeeled. The restoration above is the text established by Albert Henrichs. Previous editors, not doubting that the context must have continued after ἐν τῷ, had drifted farther and farther from the remaining traces and spaces. Henrichs re-examined the *disegni* and then supplied the cult title.[3] With this

---

[2] The following will be cited by author and abbreviations: A. HENRICHS, "Toward a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise *On Piety*," *GRBS* 13 (1972: hereafter 'Henrichs, *GRBS*') 67–98, and "Despoina Kybele: Ein Beitrag zur religiösen Namenkunde," *HSCP* 80 (1976: 'Henrichs, *HSCP*'); E. M. LANE, ed., *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren* (=*Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 131 [Leiden 1996]); L. Luigi LEHNUS, "Nota al fr. 80 di Pindaro," *ZPE* 10 (1973: 'Lehnus, *ZPE*') 275ff, and *L'Inno a Pan di Pindaro* (=*Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' antichità* 64 [Milan 1979: 'Lehnus, *Pan*']); A. SCHACHTER, *Cults of Boiotia*, I: *Acheloos to Hera*, II: *Herakles to Poseidon* (=*BICS* Suppl. 38.1-2 [London 1981, 1986]); W. J. SLATER, "Pindar's House," *GRBS* 12 (1971) 141–52; M. J. H. VAN DER WEIDEN, *The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Amsterdam 1991). Pindar is cited after Snell–Maehler.

[3] *GRBS* 84ff; his supplement is supported by his study of the title in *HSCP*. Henrichs traces the history of the attempts to restore the wording, which began with Bergk's assumption that Philodemus was quoting from a dithyramb known then only from a quotation in Strabo (fr. 79 SM), but which is now know to be part of *Dith.* 2 (though neither Snell-Maehler nor Bowra [fr. 77] have removed fr. 80 from its old position at the end of the book of Dithyrambs, and van der Weiden follows this convention by including it in his edition; Turyn placed it with the poems of uncertain genre [fr. 148]). For a brief history of the Herculaneum documents and an explanation of the most recent progress in reconstructing the treatises of Philodemus, see R. Janko, "Reconstructing Philodemus' *On Poems*," in D. Obbink, ed., *Philodemus on Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (New York 1995) 70–73, and, more fully, Obbink's "Introduction" to his edition *Philodemus on Piety, Part 1, Critical text with commentary* (Oxford 1996) 24–80.

text as his basis, Luigi Lehnus argued, in a brief note (*ZPE*), that these words belong to the beginning of a hymn; the name would thus appear correctly at the start, an attribute of power appears suitably in the initial invocation; and the *indirect apostrophe* in the accusative is a frequent hymnic formula. He concluded that Philodemus preferred these words to other citations of the Mother because, as the actual opening words, they serve as a title to refer to the whole poem. His conclusion was embraced by Henrichs, who argues that only Thebes or Athens could have been the site for the cult;[4] and, of course, Lehnus assumes it in his study of Pindar's rôle in the cult of Pan (*Pan*). The possibility of the hymn is preferred by van der Weiden and is given prominence by Maehler in the latest Teubner edition of the fragments.[5]

Before turning to the formal criteria relied on by Lehnus, I want to take up the first question that we must ask of any poetic fragment: what is its meter? In Pindar's metrics, one often has the feeling that anything is possible; nonetheless, some things are much more likely, or much more unlikely, than others, and if we are being asked to admit these words to the prominent position of a hymnal exordium, it would be much easier not also to have to mark them as metrically exceptional.

If the words of the fragment are preceded by two syllables, and if the final *alpha* is long 'by position', they do fit within an irregular but still frequent pattern of dactylo-epitrites: $-\cup \underline{\quad\quad} \cup\cup$ $\underline{\quad}\cup\underline{\quad} =$ e_d¹e, with a missing *anceps* between d¹ and e. Obviously, if there are preceding syllables, these are not the initial words. Even with the initial syllables, the fact still remains that this particular pattern is not found at the start of a strophe and that more than half the time there is a caesura or even period end where the missing *anceps* should be, in this case between

---

[4] *GRBS* 98 n.103; at *HSCP* 257, he calls Pindar's composition of a hymn to Cybele an irrefutable fact. But I do not see that the issue of the original provenance of the quotation is relevant to his general argument that Pindar was drawing on the established language of a cult.

[5] van der Weiden 221f; Maehler, *ad loc.*: "aut ad fr. 95 trahendum aut initium est hymni <Εἰς Κυβέλην > (L. Lehnus)." Wilamowitz had placed the fragment in the Hymn to Pan, fr. 95: *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 271 n.3, accepted in Snell's editions. Even before the new text, Slater (151) had observed that this created a difficult-to-explain double reference to her.

Κυβέλαν and ματέρα. Thus, although these words could be dactylo-epitritic, if they are, they are not likely to be initial.[6]

Among aeolic sequences, the words could form a pherecratic colon followed by the first two syllables of an iambic pendant; but such sequences are much more likely to form a final cadence than an opening crescendo, and, in any position, most such extended pherecratic cola in Pindar have a one-syllable basis.[7] This brings us to what is apparently the simplest of interpretations, the one preferred by Henrichs.[8] If the final *alpha* remains a short syllable, these words could form the beginning of a very familiar piece of aeolic verse: an asclepiad, or an even longer form of what we would call, in Snell's terminology, a glyconic with choriambic expansion: $\underline{}--\cup\cup--\cup\cup-\cup-$. Aeolic cola of this type are well established in the work of Sappho and Alcaeus.[9] The familiarity, however, is deceptive. After the Lesbians, choriambic expansion is extremely rare until Sophocles. It is all but absent from the works of Pindar. Given the potential confusion between various forms of aeolic with choriambic expansion and verse forms involving a 'choriambic dimeter', one must generalize cautiously. But however a line such as *Nem.* 6 ep. 5, $--\cup\cup--\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$, is to be analyzed, it represents a variation adapted to its context, and is not evidence that a colon

---

[6] For the list of occurrences see Snell's survey of meters, which is printed unchanged as an appendix to Maehler's Teubner edition: *Pindar* II: *Fragmenta* (1989) 182. The sequence does appear at the beginning of two periods (*Pyth.* 1 str. 2 and *Nem.* 8 ep. 6; *cf. Ol.* 13 ep. 3, *Isthm.* 5 str. 6), but I count ten instances in which there is period end after d^1 (*Ol.* 11 str. 3, 12 str. 4, ep. 6; *Pyth.* 3 str. 4, 4 ep. 6; *Nem.* 8 str. 2; *Isthm.* 1 ep. 4, 5 str. 2, 6 str. 2, 6). Van der Weiden (222) adds the parallels of *Nem.* 8, which begins $---\cup\cup-$ (=D with substitution in Snell, $\_\_d^1$ in Maehler) and of the same sequence within fr. 221 (where there is no responsion to confirm it or clarify the structure; van der Weiden's "fr. 221 [str. 2]" is misleading). As this pattern is so exceptional, and in both instances is followed by an *anceps*, these do not increase the likelihood that fr. 80 is an initial dactylo-epitritic sequence. Van der Weiden also cites instances of d^1D, but that pattern is not relevant here.

[7] Pindar uses the full pherecratean by itself as an independent period, even an initial one (*Pyth.* 10 str. 1), but a disyllabic base is not likely to be spondaic (Snell's schemes allow this, but see M. L. West, *Greek Metre* [Oxford 1982] 61; exceptions occur: *Pyth.* 10.25) and an extended pherecratean is not likely to have a disyllabic base (*cf. Ol.* 1 str. 4 with str. 6).

[8] *GRBS* 85f with n.55. I am grateful for this opportunity, however delayed, to provide a better comment on the meter than the one Professor Henrichs acknowledged there.

[9] See E.-M. Voigt's metrical survey in *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam 1971): Sappho C3f–k, Alc. C3c–h. Sappho 103V is an index of first lines in a meter with choriambic expansion.

with choriambic expansion is part of Pindar's normal reper-
toire.[10] A better example might be found in fr. 106, where the
rhythm seems to be based on the glyconic; in the fifth line
apparently we find *gl pher* [c]. But as this too exemplifies Pindar's
normal practice of developing the metrical form of a given ode
by variation through expansion and compression, it cannot
justify the use of an asclepiad in the Lesbian fashion as an
unexceptional form of opening.[11]

Two poems do provide a parallel for this metrical phrase in
their initial lines. In the case of *Ol.* 5, the parallel is perfect. It
begins:

Ὑψηλᾶν ἀρετᾶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκὺν,
$———\cup\cup——\cup\cup—\cup—\cup—$ =gl[c] cr.

The opening sequence is metrically identical to fr. 80. And in
Ol. 4, each of the first three lines contains one instance of $—\cup\cup—$
$—\cup\cup—$.[12] Both these poems are written for the same patron,
Psaumis of Camarina, a city in the orbit of Gela and Syracuse.
But *Ol.* 5 is a troubled parallel: its status in the Pindaric corpus is
uncertain, it is marked by an unusual degree of puzzling local
detail, and more than one unusual quality of its meter has been
noted.[13] Even if we assume Pindar's authorship of *Pyth.* 5, to-
gether these two parallels still do not suggest that this rhythm is
a normal part of his repertoire, but that he used it for a special

---

[10] See Snell's alternate analysis in the Teubner edition and West's comments
(*supra* n.7: 65, 67); the ode modulates between aeolic and dactylic. Similarly,
fr. 52d str. 8 (of 8) and ep. 3 are, in context, choriambic retardations of a
continuous sequence of double-short (easily seen in Dale's notation:
...dd'd'dddds and -d'ddddds).

[11] West (*supra* n.7: 64) cites fr. 106.5 as an example of Pindar's methods; *cf.*
B. Snell, *Griechische Metrik*[4] (Göttingen 1982) 54–57. Snell's neat schematiza-
tion of the aeolic types and the familiarity of the various asclepiads from
Horace have perhaps helped to obscure the historical discontinuity in the use
of choriambic expansion. West notes its rarity in Pindar. Ibyc. 1 ep. 5 (of 5) is
an exception: $—\cup\cup——\cup\cup—\cup—$, but that appears to be more an *ad hoc* clausular
variant than an independent utilization of a pre-existing type.

[12] The first instance is analyzed by Snell as the juncture of two choriambic
dimeters, the second and third as pher[c].

[13] The authenticity remains an unsettled question. See E. von Leutsch, "Ist
die fünfte olympische Ode von Pindar?" *Philologus* 1 (1846) 116–27, esp. 124f;
R. Hamilton, "Olympian Five: A Reconsideration," *AJP* 93 (1972) 324–29; W.
Mader, *die Psaumis-Oden Pindars (O. 4 und 5): Eine Kommentar* (=*Comm
Aenipont* 29 [Innsbruck 1990]). The metrical objections center on the combi-
nation of the unusual meter with the "Lesbian style of composition," *i.e.* the
simple development of the three-line strophe, reminiscent of the construction
of the alcaic stanza, and on the repeated use of the ithyphallic colon at period-
ends.

circumstance associated with Camarina. This gives room to wonder whether the relationship of the supposed hymn to these epinicians may be more than metrical, for the associations of Cybele with the Greek West are strong. The earliest known Greek inscription naming Cybele is from western Locris.[14] And what is probably the most notorious reference to the Magna Mater in Pindar, *Pyth.* 3.77ff, occurs in a poem for a Syracusan.

We are well beyond the bounds where anything can be said with certainty, but given the cluster of metrical links (note that fr. 106 is from a poem to Hieron, and that the expanded pherecratean in it occurs in a description of Sicily), it may be most economical to conclude that if these words do start a Hymn to Cybele, the song was commissioned for a western patron.

With this restriction, then, the metrical argument allows the claim made for the fragment. The formal argument speaks more strongly against it. The three words are in the accusative, which Lehnus calls an indirect apostrophe. An opening in an oblique case is typical of the 'rhapsodic' style rather than the 'cultic'.[15] The direct form, the invocation of a god in the vocative, is the most ordinary way to begin a prayer; the standard example is Sappho 1, Ποικιλόθρον ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα, and another is the parody of a hymn to Cybele at Ar. *Av.* 887, δέσποινα Κυβέλη, στροῦθε, μῆτερ Κλεοκρίτου. All the examples of exordia with epithets of power that Lehnus lists (*Pan* 276 n.5) as parallels for fr. 80 are in the vocative case. An accusative beginning depends, of course, on a verb that describes the activity of the prayer, as in the rhapsodic *Hymn to Hermes*, which combines a direct invocation of the Muse with an indirect invocation of the god (4.1): Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει, Μοῦσα, Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν. The Muse need not participate, as in the hymn by Lasus of Hermione: Δάματρα μέλπω Κόραν τε Κλυμένοι' ἄλοχον (*PMG* 702.1). Parallels for Lasus' initial accusative can be found in two epigraphical examples that are probably fourth century: *PMG* 936, a hymn to Pan from Epidaurus,

---

[14] M. Guarducci, "Cibele in un epigrafe arcaica di Locri Epizefri," *Klio* 52 (1970) 131–38, dating it to no later than the early sixth century and proposing Ionia as the source of the cult in Magna Graeca; J. de La Genière, "De la Phrygie à Locres Épizéphyrienne: les chemins de Cybèle," *MEFRA* 97 (1985) 693–718, argues that figurines found in the Pelopponesus are evidence of an earlier cult in peninsular Greece; for a summary of evidence and the subsequent discussion, see G. Sfameni Gasparro, "Per la storia del culto di Cibele in Occidente: il santuario rupestre di Akrai," in Lane 51–55.

[15] See W. H. Race, "How Greek Poems Begin," in F. M. Dunn, ed., *Beginnings in Classical Literature* (=*YCS* 29 [Cambridge 1992]) 20, 28.

Πᾶνα τὸν Νυμφαγέταν
Ναΐδων μέλημ᾽ ἀείδω
χρυσέων χορῶν ἄγαλμα

and, as restored, *PMG* 934, a paean,

[Παῖανα κλυτό]μητιν ἀείσατε
[κοῦροι Λατοΐδαν ῾Εκ]ατον.

But Lasus' invocation is unusual among the fifth-century lyric forms. Normally, the accusative is postponed by at least one major word, most often in the genitive. Thus Bacchylides begins an epinician (3.1ff):

ἀριστοκάρπου Σικελίας κρέουσαν
Δάματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε Κουραν
ὕμνει, γλυκύδωρε Κλεοῖ.

Closer to our fragment in subject is the scolion *PMG* 885:

Πλούτου μητέρ᾽ ᾽Ολυμπίαν ἀείδω
Δήμητρα στεφανηφόροις ἐν ὥραις
σέ τε παῖ Διός.

When Pindar begins with the invocation of a god, as he often does, even in the epinicians, he uses the vocative form, but he does use the accusative to invoke a city as his theme in *Nem.* 10:

Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κορᾶν, Χάριτες,
῎Αργος ῞Ηρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ὑμνεῖτε·

Note again that the first word is in the genitive. There odes in which the very first word is in the accusative (*e.g. Ol.* 10, 13; *Nem.* 7), but their form is not hymnic. The closest parallel to a pure accusative hymnic opening in Pindar may be the beginning of his first Hymn, fr. 29.1–7, a hymn to Zeus:

᾽Ισμηνὸν ἢ χρυσαλάκατον Μελίαν
ἢ Κάδμον ἢ Σπαρτῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἀνδρῶν
ἢ τὰν κυανάμπυκα Θήβαν
    ἢ τὸ πάντολμον σθένος ῾Ηρακλέος
ἢ τὰν Διωνύσου πολυγαθέα τιμὰν
    ἢ γάμον λευκωλένου ᾽Αρμονίας
ὑμνήσομεν;

These six disjunct accusative phrases appear to form a series of discarded foils in an introductory priamel—a parallel that hardly suggests that fr. 80 is the introduction of a hymn to Cybele.

If δέσποιναν Κυβέλαν ματέρα is quoted from the beginning of a hymn to Cybele, these words are most probably not the very first words, and the word or words omitted would be significant.[16] But there is reason to suspect that these words are not even part of the beginning phrase of a hymn. A careful look at the examples of initial accusatives already cited will show that in none do we find the deity invoked with three accusative nouns or attributes in a row, as here. If we look at examples of vocative invocations (not all necessarily initial) we see that the number of nouns or epithets can be quite extended. Three in a row occur quite frequently. Four are easily found: Pind. Nem. 3.1 (Ὦ πότνια Μοῖσα, μᾶτερ ἀμετέρα, λίσσομαι), fr. 57 (Δωδωναῖε μεγασθενές ἀριστότεχνα πάτερ), PMG 884 (scolion: Παλλᾶς Τριτογένει' ἄνασσ' 'Αθηνᾶ), or the parody from Ar. Αv. already quoted. Pind. fr. 195 works in five: Εὐάρματε χρυσοχίτων ἱερώτατον ἄγαλμα, Θήβα.[17] But in none of the examples of the indirect invocation, in which the god is named in the accusative, does the description of the god—i.e., the list of attributes or names typically found in the opening of prayers or hymns, and which can be found as part of a vocative series— extend the invocation to more than two words before some other part of the sentence intervenes, something that gives the phrase a rhetorical or syntactic shape. Most frequently, a genitive interrupts a potential series of three or more accusatives;[18] in the scolion PMG 885 the verb; in Bacchyl. 3 an apparent series of three actually refers to two different deities.

Negative arguments based on fragmentary material are always suspect, of course, but the pattern here compels attention. We have many examples of invocations in both forms, and many examples of multiple vocatives, but no lyric examples of more than two accusatives. It seems unlikely that this is accidental. It makes sense rhetorically. Three of anything create a rhetorical unit; the vocative invocations of three words or more constitute a self-contained crescendo, and when that crescendo is over, another can begin. The accusatives are by definition subordinate to a larger structure. But three accusatives, trumpeting

---

[16] Snell's initial θεῶν would be the obvious choice, but Philodemus would hardly have dropped it from his quotation.

[17] As does the presumably parodic invocation by the comic poet Chariclides (fr. 1K): δέσποιν' 'Εκάτη τριοδῖτι, τρίμορφε, πριπρόσωπε, τρίγλαις κηλευμένα, quoted by Henrichs, HSCP 260 n.20.

[18] E.g. Sappho 103.3V (from the index of first lines):]τα παῖδα Κρονίδα τὰν ἰόκ[ολπ]ον [.

the divine name at the start of the poem, would stand out as an independent phrase, and thereby confuse the poet's structural choice: if he had not wanted to make them part of another structure, he could have used the more common vocative. The effect is possible, but it does not belong to lyric, which, (however long the sentence, and however displaced—from our point of view—the word order) builds its crescendos from relatively independent sequences of distinct images or ideas. An actual hexameter rhapsodic hymn offers the more expansive structure that can subordinate such a ringing initial phrase to a larger development. There is an artful example at the beginning of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*:

> Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνὴν θεὰν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν
> αὐτὴν ἠδὲ θύγατρα τανύσφυρον ἣν Ἀϊδωνεὺς
> ἥρπαξεν, δῶκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.

Here the four accusatives invoking Demeter give way in the next line, with a brief summary resumption in the pronoun, to the theme of her daughter and Hades (the latter separated by the summarizing relative clause with enjambement distributing the emphasis), and then to the final crescendo, the involvement of βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς. After that, the poet narrates the story from its beginning.

The consequences of treating fr. 80 as the beginning of a hymn are remarkable. It would display a metrical form associated with a Sicilian victor, but otherwise quite untypical of Pindar, and it would use this meter to express in lyric a rhetorical structure otherwise found only in the hexameter tradition. I find this difficult to accept as a probable conclusion. One way out of the difficulty, of course, would be a different supplement, with the vocative.[19] I think it is important first to question whether we are compelled to seek a solution that saves this fragment as an incipit, or even whether we should prefer one if it is possible.

If, as Lehnus proposes (*ZPE*), these words are cited as a title, to stand for the whole poem, they must be the opening words. He notes that there were other, non-initial, passages available to Philodemus from Pindar (*viz.*, *Pyth.* 3.78; fr. 70b.9=*Dith.* 2.9, fr. 95.3). Further, the form of the citation here, an introduction of

---

[19] A vocative would allow the opening [δέσπ]οιν[' ὦ] Κυβέ[λα, σὲ] ματ[έρα], which could be continued to produce *gl* +(ˆ)*pher*, which Pindar uses as periods elsewhere. I owe this example to Professor Janko (personal communication), who provided it only to illustrate the form, not the letter-spaces.

direct speech by ἐν τῷ, is unique in the *De pietate*, where
Philodemus generally prefers paraphrase, and introduces direct
quotation with a *verbum dicendi*; the use of the words as a title
would explain the anomaly. But Cybele is named in none of the
other Pindar passages cited; they refer to the Mêter (Megala).
Philodemus' context requires the name Cybele, in distinction
to Tithys, Rhea, and Hera—the three mother gods named
previously. And the problem with this explanation for ἐν τῷ is
that it overdetermines the quotation: the words that are quoted
as the 'title' to identify a whole poem are also the words
Philodemus needs for his argument at this point. It is otiose to
suppose that he referring to the poem in its entirety, when he is
in fact already quoting the relevant portion. But if we un-
derstand ἐν τῷ to be drawing attention to the actual words of
the text as evidence (equivalent to 'when he uses the phrase'),
we can understand that he (or his source) is distinguishing it
from another possible citation that supplies a different name for
a mother, for Pindar also uses the phrase Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν
καὶ Γαῖα μάτηρ in the context of a divine birth (*Ol.* 7.38).[20]
Nothing in Philodemus' citation, therefore, supplies a compel-
ling reason for treating fr. 80 as the first words of a hymn to
Cybele.

In fact, even if Philodemus is quoting the initial words of a
song, it does not stand to reason that they must come from a
poem for Cybele. The corpus of Pindar's surviving work does
not support even a probable connection between the subject of
a song and its opening invocation, whether vocative or accusa-
tive. Many of Pindar's poems begin with their theme, as do, of
course, the great majority of the hymns from antiquity that
received a less full literary development than his, but it is
equally part of his style to delay the introduction of the topic.
Gods frequently appear as part of the postponement. Many of
the epinicians, hymns to men, begin with hymnic openings to

---

[20] The line is ironic for emphasis: it is Athena's motherless birth that Gaea
observes. The personification justifies the treatment of Γαῖα as a proper name.
That name is missing from what we have of Philodemus' list, but is a possible
reading in the first line of P.Hercul. 1610 fr. 3 (=N 1610 III, p.61 G), which
immediately precedes N 247 VI. This if the first extant line of the passage in
which the Pindar citation appears (*cf.* Henrichs, *GRBS* 77ff). In the third line
the list of poetic sources apparently diverts to those who credited the
preceding divinities (whoever they were) with giving birth to σύμπαντα; it
then returns in N 247 VI 6ff to the other candidates for parents of the gods.

gods or divine power before they mention their human subject.[21] Fragments 37 (Πότνια θεσμοφόρε) and 95.1 (ʾΩ Πάν) are quoted as beginnings, but so is fr. 29=*Hymn* 1, whose opening priamel was cited above.[22] The vocative invocation ὦ Κύπρου δέσποινα comes from somewhere in the poem that begins (apparently) with the vocative Πολύξεναι νεάνιδες (fr. 128). At *Pae.* 9 (fr. 52k) we find the vocative ᾿Ακτὶς ἀελίου ... ὦ μᾶτερ in lines 1f and λιτανεύω, ᾿Εκαβόλε in line 38. A dithyramb, fr. 75, has the vocative ᾿Ολύμπιοι ... θεοί at the *ends* of lines 1 and 2 (cited as the start); the subject is introduced in accusatives in a prepositional phrase and relative clause in lines 9f: ἐπὶ τὸν κισσοδαῆ θεόν, τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν ᾿Εριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν. Conversely, if Pindar did write a song for Cybele, there is no reason to suppose that it began with an invocation of her by name.

Within a poem, Pindar has a variety of motives for naming a divinity; a reference to Cybele (even with an epithet of power) need not have come from a hymn dedicated to her. Gods can be invoked in the direct speech of a character in a myth (*e.g. Ol.* 1.75, *Nem.* 10.76, *Isthm.* 6.42; *cf.* Bacchyl. 17.52). Prayers or descriptions of prayer can occur anywhere in a poem. In the epinicians these are usually in the vocative (*Ol.* 6.23, δέσποτα ποντόμεδον; *Pyth.* 1.67, Ζεῦ τέλει’), but *Pyth.* 11 ends with a compressed, indirect hymn to Iolaus and the Tyndaridae, each first named in the accusative. Pindar often includes descriptions of worship: the Hyperboreans in *Pyth.* 10 and the Delphian maidens in the sixth *Paean* are described as worshipers of Apollo. *Pyth.* 3.77ff—the passage most relevant to a discussion of fr. 80—is a description of worship:

ἀλλ’ ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω
Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι παρ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμά
σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχιαι.

---

[21] *Ol.* 8, 12; *Pyth.* 1 (the lyre), 6 (an indirect invocation), 8, 11; *Nem.* 7, 8, 11; *Isthm.* 5. At *Ol.* 3 the introductory divine names in the dative postpone the theme, in the accusative, to line 2. I omit those addressing a toponymic deity, for praise of the place may be part of the theme.

[22] Lehnus (*ZPE*) offers fr. 36, ᾿Αμμων ᾿Ολύμπου δέσποτα, as evidence for the divine name in the exordium, but that example begs the question. The words are from the scholia to *Pyth.* 9; the existence of a hymn to Ammon is attested by Pausanias; the citation of these words as that hymn's beginning belongs to the editors.

Accusatives can also occur in a narrative. Fr. 30.1ff, the first lines of a strophe from somewhere in *Hymn* 1, to Zeus, provide a good parallel:

πρῶτον μὲν εὔβουλον Θέμιν οὐρανίαν
χρυσέαισιν ἵπποις Ὠκεανοῦ παρὰ παγᾶν
Μοῖραι ... ἆγον.

Cf. Pae. 4.40f, "τρέω τοι πόλεμον Διὸς Ἐννοσίδαν τε βαρύκτυπον;" *Dith.* 4.37ff, χρυσόρραπιν ὦρσεν Ἑρμᾶν ... καὶ πολίοχον Γλαυκῶπιδα. If *Pyth.* 3.77ff had been preserved only as a fragment, who would have guessed that they came from a poem for Hieron?

I think we can say that in fr. 80, just as in the words cited above from fr. 30, the weight of the accusative series implies that the reference is not trivial (there are not many examples of three in a row in any position). But in the works of Pindar, we cannot assume that a god who is notably mentioned must have either begun the poem or been its primary subject.

A final parallel—with four accusatives and involving the subject of the ode—will provide another example of how the words might fit within a poem. At the end of the first triad of *Ol.* 1.22–25, Pindar describes the horse Pherenicus' victory:

κράτει δὲ προσέμειξε δεσπόταν, III
Συρακόσιον ἱπποχάρμαν βασιλῆα· λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος
ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίᾳ·
τοῦ μεγασθενὴς ἐράσσατο Γαιάοχος.

The metrical division reinforces the climactic position of the phrase in the exordium and then makes it the start of a new development, which is itself adapted from hymnic style.[23] This suggests that we might print fr. 80 thus:

δέσπ]οιν[αν] Κυβέ[λαν] (II ?)
ματ[έρα]

This would fit easily into the pattern, e_d¹le (in context, of course, ματέρα could be elided as well as long by position: *e.g.* ματέρ᾽ ἃ κτλ.). We would then have a poem of an unknown

---

[23] The first line of strophe β′ imitates a *Du-Stil* invocation: Συρακοσίων ἱπποχάρμα βασιλεῦ, λάμπει δέ τοι, and is followed in the hymnic style by a relative pronoun introducing a narrative. Fr. 109.3f offers another striking example of a climactic use of the accusative series: στάσιν ἀπὸ πραπίδος ἐπίκοτον ἀνελών, πενίας δότειραν, ἐχθρὰν κουροτρόφον. Another motive for their use is geographic description: frr. 52b.25, 82, 107.4f. *Cf.* the three genitives of *Ol.* 4.7. These examples are not meant to be exhaustive.

type with a significant—but, for us, entirely mysterious—mention of Cybele. A hymn to her is no more probable than anything else.

Whatever the poem was, however, it is unlikely that it was written on behalf of the Thebans. Let us look at the passages adduced by the proponents of a "mother-goddess" in Thebes or in Pindar's life. In addition to this fragment, they are: *Pyth.* 3.77ff (already quoted), which connects the Μάτηρ (σεμνά but not Μεγάλα) with a noctural celebration by κοῦραι, with Pan (the "with Pan" is insolubly ambiguous);[24] two fragments addressed to Pan as her follower: 95.3, Ματρὸς μεγάλας ὀπαδέ, and 96, ὄν τε μεγάλας θεοῦ κύνα παντοδαπόν καλέοισιν 'Ολύμπιοι (the testimonia do not reliably associate these with the city); *Dith.* 2.6–9, for the Thebans, envisioning the celebration of the rites of Dionysus by the Οὐρανίδαι: σεμνᾷ μὲν κατάρχει Ματέρι πὰρ μεγάλᾳ ῥόμβοι τυπάνων; and *Isthm.* 7.3ff, asking Theba if she most delights in the time when she exalted χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον Δαμάτερος ... Διόνυσον (I omit references to Demeter and Persephone in an unquestionably Sicilian context).

At issue is not whether there had been a diffusion of religious practice from Anatolia to peninsular Greece, but whether Pindar's descriptions of a mother-goddess or her worship are so specifically Anatolian in character as to justify supposing that Pindar would have used an obviously foreign name for her. As part of deciding whether any of Pindar's references to the Magna Mater refer to Cybele—something taken for granted for subsequent centuries—we must also determine whether she is

---

[24] This passage gave rise to a biographical tradition (kept alive by the tour guide who welcomed Pausanias seven hundred years later) that associated Pindar with the foundation of a cult for the Magna Mater; moderns have embellished it: Wilamowitz explained (*supra* n.4: 270) that Hieron provided the funds for the Theban establishment. The fantasy was exploded by Slater, although Lehnus (*Pan* 18–43), in a detailed reexamination of the biographical notices, still argued for some historicity. But Mary Lefkowitz has exposed the general methods of ancient biography in her *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore 1981), esp. 57–66 on Pindar, and *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"* (Oxford 1991) 72–88, 147–60; the matter is summed up by Schachter, "The whole case for a 'special relationship' between Pindar and Meter rests on the assumption that at *Pythian* 3.77ff., Pindar is speaking *propria voce;* all later references depend on this interpretation of the passage.... It seems, on the whole, to be a Hellenistic invention" (I 166 n.1; more forcefully, II 140). Note that the question of whether the πρόθυρον is in Thebes or Syracuse (as Slater was arguing) is formally separate from the problem of the biography, although they are usually discussed simultaneously.

separate from the Demeter Thesmophoros worshiped on the Theban acropolis or whether Demeter too must be included in any possible syncretism.[25] Three pieces of evidence clearly link the Magna Mater and Pan; the connection would have been comprehensible in Sicily but was also possible for Thebes.[26] She is associated with the symbols of Anatolian rites only once, in *Dith.* 2—and there no differently from the other gods—in which she is accommodating Dionysus, for a Theban audience.[27] Similarly, Demeter is associated with such rites in the context of the reception of Dionysus to Thebes: the novelty may be the point (if χαλκοκρότου is not taken as a condensed mythological reference, it may simply describe war spoils deposited at her shrine). Neither *Dith.* 2 nor *Isthm.* 7 offers any reason to consider either goddess Anatolian independently of

---

[25] In determining the identity or difference of these divinities for Pindar and his audience, it is important to keep separate the early (pre-Euripidean) evidence, later evidence, and later comments on earlier evidence (such as Strabo's introduction to *Dith.* 2.8–11), as well as Ionian, western, and peninsular provenances, and to note explicitly which names are used. van der Weiden's completely uncritical collection of sources (68) cannot justify his assertion that the Magna Mater of *Dith.* 2 is identical to Cybele. For a catalogue and succinct appraisal of all the evidence regarding the cults of Demeter and Mêter (including Cybele) in Thebes, see Schachter I 165–68, II 141. The three reliefs that might offer evidence for a cult of Cybele are probably later: see M. J. Vermaseren, *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque* II: *Graecia atque Insulae* (=*EPRO* 50 [Leiden 1982]) 127f. Slater notes (145 n.18) that "Kybele is not attested as the name for Pindar's deity by any ancient authority; it is an invention of the moderns"; he hesitates to draw any connections among the divinities, but sees a syncretism of Demeter and the Magna Mater. The reality of the *Hymn* is taken for granted by Henrichs, who insists on the full syncretism and on a Theban locale for the cults (*HSCP* 256f, with detailed objections to Slater's skepticism at n.10). Lehnus (*Pan* 13–17), who is willing to situate the celebration of *Pyth.* 3 at Syracuse, separates Demeter and Cybele. For the Athenian evidence (the earliest), see M. J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult,* tr. A. M. H. Lemmers (London 1977) 32–35; L. Roller, "Reflections on The Mother of the Gods in Attic Tragedy" (Lane 305–21), who begins with an overview of the archaeological data.

[26] See Schachter II 139. Lehnus proposes (*Pan* 17) that the passage in *Pyth.* 3 refers to a cult practice any audience in the Greek world could understand in local terms.

[27] The juxtaposition with Οὐρανίδαι suggests that the Mother here is to be identified with the Gaea of the mythic tradition, as at *Ol.* 7.38 (quoted earlier). Naiades, Zeus, Ares, and Athena come next, all making noise. Artemis drives yoked lions. On the cult of Gaea/Rhea in Thebes, see G. Arrigoni, "Alla ricerca dell *Mater* tebana e dei *veteres di* (a proposito della metamorphosi di Atalanta ed Ippomene)," *Scripta Philologa* 3 (1982) 7–70, esp. 26–30.

Dionysus.[28] The noctural rites ascribed to the Mater in *Pyth*. 3
give her as much in common with Demeter and initiation cults
(the κοῦραι are additionally suggestive)[29] as with an Anatolian
goddess. In sum, the evidence points to an established cult of
the Great Mother and Pan, and a possibility of assimilating her
to Demeter;[30] for Thebans, either figure can be significantly
connected to their native son Dionysus. Farther than that we
should not go. Pindar was a professional composer of cult and
celebratory song who worked on commission throughout the
Greek world. Composing for an audience among whom the
mother-goddess Cybele was recognized (he wrote *Ol*. 10–11
for the western Locrians), he could have learned the correct
language of her cult. But there is no reason to expect him to
have used the name associated with a Phrygian origin for a
Theban audience who appear to have had their own concep-
tions. This may seem a basically skeptical, if not negative,
conclusion, but if correct it has the positive effect of indicating

[28] The scholarly literature, when it cites these two passages, tends to ignore
the presence of Dionysus, or treats him as an attribute of Demeter or the
Magna Mater, even though the emphasis in both places is on him. See *e.g.*
Henrich's discussion of both passages (*HSCP* 256f) and Roller (*supra* n.23:
306 n.2, 303 n.26). Lehnus (*Pan* 14f nn.38f) recognizes the possible influence of
myth and is more qualified in his treatment of *Isthm*. 7. B. Moreux ("Dèmèter
et Dionysos dans la septième *Isthmique* de Pindare," *REG* 83 [1970] 1–14)
does not, but still provides a full survey of the possible interpretations of
χαλκοκρότου; he argues that the presence of the two gods together in *Isthm*. 7
is unjustified on theological or cult grounds, and that therefore the connection
between two divinities must be sought through foreign influence. Nonethe-
less, he concludes (14) that "la cité ... ne pouvait accepter Cybèle que si elle
était assimilée à Dèmèter." Noel Robertson ("The Ancient Mother of the
Gods: A Missing Chapter in the History of Greek Religion," in Lane 239–
304), who argues that the peninsular rites of the Magna Mater are entirely
independent of the Anatolian, takes *Dith*. 2 as a description of *her* festival
(278). van der Weiden (66, relying on references from Euripides) observes,
however, that the details of the celebration in *Dith*. 2 are entirely consistent
with Bacchic rituals.

[29] Lehnus (*Pan* 13–16), rejecting the equivalence of Mater and Demeter as-
sumed by Slater, observes that Demeter is only call *Mêter* in relation to *Korê*;
he does not see that this passage may be an example of that. See now W. J.
Slater, "Pindar's *Pythian* 3: Structure and Purpose," *QUCC* N.S. 29 (1988) 56
n.22, with references to the syncretism of the Sicilian cults. Jacob Stern has
pointed out to me the particular appropriateness of a reference to a girls'
initiation rite that forms a contrast to the negative exemplum of Coronis'
sexual transgression. The participants would be enacting Persephone, hence
the plural.

[30] On the assimilation of Gaea to Demeter in Thebes, see F. Vian, *Les
origines de Thèbes: Cadmos et les Spartes* (Paris 1963) 135–38.

that the frank acknowledgement of the worship of foreign gods was a significant change that occurred rapidly in the decades after Pindar's death.[31]

QUEEN'S COLLEGE AND THE GRADUATE SSCHOOL
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
October, 1996

---

[31] The name Cybele does not occur again in literature before Ar. *Av.* 887 (quoted earlier). Roller (*supra* n.23) argues that the prominence of foreign rites in late fifth-century tragedy reflects a new labelling of established forms of orgiastic worship as part of a debate about their propriety.