The Poet's Pentathlon:
Genre in Pindar's First *Isthmian*

Leslie Kurke

INDAR'S FIRST *Isthmian* is a poem of praise by indirection: at each point where we anticipate straightforward praise of the victor, the poet swerves off to another topic.[1] This veering manner produces anything but the conventional epinician Bundy saw in the poem[2] and explains why, in his interpretation, most of the text is taken as "foil," to be worked through but ultimately dismissed.[3] Thus, why does Pindar begin by alluding to a paean he owes to the people of Ceos? According to Bundy (36–41), reference to this commission simply acts as "foil" to enhance the prestige of the "business at hand"—the epinician for the Theban Herodotus. But, as Most objects (57), this explanation in no way justifies the content of the foil: why should the poet choose to mention another poetic commission so explicitly at the opening of his epinician?

Next the poet appears to begin the victory announcement at line 9:

(χορεύων) . . . καὶ τὰν ἁλιερκέα ᾽Ισθμοῦ
δειράδ᾽· ἐπεὶ στεφάνους
ἐξ ὤπασεν Κάδμου στρατῷ ἐξ ἀέθλων,
καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος.

---

[1] The following works will be cited by author's name alone: A. B. DRACHMANN, ed., *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina* I–III (Leipzig 1903); E. L. BUNDY, "Studia Pindarica," *CPCP* 18 (1962) 1–92; R. HAMILTON, *Epinikion, General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (The Hague 1974); G. W. MOST, *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean* (Göttingen 1985); W. J. SLATER, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969); E. THUMMER, ed., *Pindar, Die Isthmischen Gedichte* I–II (Heidelberg 1969); L. Woodbury, "The Victor's Virtues: Pindar, *Isth.* 1.32 ff.," *TAPA* 111 (1981) 237–56. Citations from the epinicia are taken from B. Snell and H. Maehler, edd., *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*[2] I (Leipzig 1980).

[2] That Bundy considered it a conventional epinician is clear from his statement of purpose (36): "Here, then, in examining a second ode, Isthmian 1, on the assumption that it is an enkomion and adheres to the rules that govern other pieces of the kind, I shall seek to discover its design, and the place of each several topic in the linear development of the whole."

[3] On the problems inherent in Bundy's notion of "linear unity," see D. C. Young, "Pindaric Criticism," in *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (*Wege der Forschung* 134 [Darmstadt 1970]) 87f, and Most 32f.

But instead of completing the victory announcement,[4] Pindar digresses with a reference to Heracles (12f, introduced by the conventional relative pronoun):[5]

ἐν ᾇ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν
παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρῖξαν κύνες.

The occurrence of any mythical material in this position is problematic; as Bundy acknowledges, we expect the naming of the victor here.[6]

Problematic too is the specific labor of Heracles Pindar chooses to mention. Why the "hounds of Geryon"? Bundy's assertion (43f) that this labor, because it occurred in Gades, "symbolizes the limit of human achievement" introduced here in comparison to the six Isthmian crowns, does not stand up to close examination. Every parallel he cites for this motif specifically mentions Heracles' sailing to the ends of the earth, or the Pillars he set up there, or both. Without any geographic marker it is impossible to read the motif of human limitation into the mythic reference here. This brief section remains unexplained.

When the poet breaks off at line 14, we again anticipate the naming and praise of the victor we have expected since line 9. As Thummer notes, the pattern of ἀλλ' ἐγώ with a present participle and future main verb of praising picks up the syntax of lines 6–10 (ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος . . . χορεύων), and is itself repeated at lines 32–34 (ἐγώ δὲ . . . περιστέλλων . . . γαρύσομαι) and 52–54 (ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε . . . ἀμειβομένοις . . . κελαδῆσαι).[7] Each of these passages is a self-referential 'break-off formula', by which the poet leads us to expect that he will finally get down to the proper 'business' of the epinician—

---

[4] *Cf.* Hamilton 15, who notes that the two invariable elements of the victory announcement (what he calls the "Naming Complex") are (1) the site of the victory and (2) the victor's name. Here, we are given the first but not the second.

[5] On the convention of using a relative pronoun to introduce the myth see E. Des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare* (Paris 1947) 48–50; Thummer I 131; and D. C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian 7: Myth and Exempla* (Leiden 1971) 35 with n.115.

[6] Bundy senses that this move is somewhat unconventional, for he can offer no better explanation for the mythic interlude than "the use of (comparative) irrelevance as foil" (43): "here, the laudator has every intention of introducing Herodotos, for whom lines 1–13 are foil, and no intention of wandering off into the legendary glories of Thebes. Yet he cannot introduce Herodotos at this point without ruining the effect of the implied series: not Dalos, not Thebes; not Apollo, not the Isthmos; but Herodotos." Bundy's implication that the poet is rejecting the Isthmus as a topic in favor of the victor is also misleading; as more recent formal studies have shown (see Hamilton 15), the victory announcement conventionally embraces both the site of the victory and the name of the victor.

[7] Thummer II 12, 15, 20, 30; *cf.* Most 52.

the praise of the victor. And after each of these formulae the poet to some extent frustrates our expectations, swerving aside from such straightforward praise of the victor to some indirect means. Here at line 14, for example, the victor and his event are finally named (ʿHροδότῳ . . . ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ) but only allotted a complex participial clause before the poet is off again, singing a hymn to Castor and Iolaus. Pindar justifies this move as praise of Herodotus' charioteering, "for those men were born the best charioteers of the heroes in Lacedaemon and in Thebes." But, as Most has emphasized, the inset hymn that follows (18–32) does not dwell on the chariot exploits of the two heroes, as one might expect given the poet's avowed purpose of glorifying Herodotus by the mythic parallel:[8] instead, the hymn lingers over the heroes' successes in running and throwing spears, stones, and discus (23–25).

After the conventional hymnic closure, χαίρετ' at 32, the poet turns again to a new topic. Again we anticipate the standard, direct praise of the victor, and again we are disappointed. After a buildup of two lines, Pindar finally mentions the victor, in a prominent position directly following the main verb in 34. But it becomes clear almost immediately that Herodotus is not himself the object of the verb γαρύσομαι (32–34):

> χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δὲ Ποσειδάωνι ᾿Ισθμῷ τε ζαθέᾳ
> ᾿Ογχηστίαισίν τ' ἀϊόνεσσιν περιστέλλων ἀοιδὰν
> γαρύσομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν
>   ᾿Ασωποδώρου πατρὸς αἶσαν.

Pindar goes on to describe the "lot" of the victor's father, returning to the victor himself at 39f:

> νῦν δ' αὖτις ἀρχαίας ἐπέβασε Πότμος
> συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας.

A linking gnome then leads to a generalizing εἰ clause that explains why the victor deserves the poet's unstinting praise (41–45). Pindar heightens the buildup to that praise by adding that it is "an easy gift for one who is wise in exchange for all sorts of toils" (45f). But the

---

[8] Most (50–52, 56f) poses the problem more convincingly than he solves it (56): "It was Pindar's desire for symmetry that led him to create a catalogue of the events in which Castor and Iolaus won victories to balance the catalogue of games in which Herodotus had been successful." Most himself acknowledges that strict symmetry would have required two catalogues of games, but he offers two reasons for Pindar's avoiding this: pedantry and ποικιλία (57). One cannot help feeling that this purely formal explanation is somewhat arbitrary; if variation of symmetry were the poet's only concern, he could just as easily have narrated the mythic exploits of the heroes.

poet goes on to fill out the triad not with praise of Herodotus, but rather, as Woodbury has observed (251, *cf.* 252), with the "praise of praise itself . . . as the highest profit."

ἄμμι δ(έ) at 52 marks another transition to a new topic, and at this point we are certain that the victory catalogue must follow. Woodbury (252) lucidly describes the strength (and source) of our expectations: "the occasion is the celebration of a victory, the genre is epinician, and the victories, for which we have been preparing since 43, must be given due prominence, and a list of them accordingly follows." Indeed, that 52–62 constitute the victory catalogue is clear from ἀρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον (54) and ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις (57), but from *nothing else* until we reach lines 60–62. At that point, Pindar breaks off the catalogue with the plea that it is impossible to enumerate all the equestrian victories Hermes Agonios has bestowed on Herodotus. Thus, although the position in the ode and our own expectations make it clear that, from 52 on, we have a victory catalogue, it is an anomalous catalogue: it appears to be a list of gods and heroes and their cult centers, whom the poet "addresses" or "greets" (προσειπεῖν) with no direct mention of the victor until line 61. To be sure, there are other catalogues in which the patron gods and heroes of the various games are highlighted, but in all these it is explicitly said that the god or hero "bestows" or "witnesses" the victor's achievement.[9]

Furthermore, the direct address to heroes or mythical figures without explicit connection to the victories celebrated is completely unparalleled in the odes. Bundy, after asserting that the catalogue in *Isthmian* 1 is "completely conventional," himself admits (69f), "Other than this [I.1.55–59], I find no more than two passages in which the god or hero honored by the games is addressed in a catalogue: P.6.50 (τίν) and P.8.62 (τύ). . . ." Of Bundy's two parallels, the address to Poseidon in *Pythian* 6 is not part of a victory catalogue,[10] while the

---

[9] *Cf. Ol.* 6.72–81, 7.80–87, 9.98f, 13.107–12, *Pyth.* 8.61–66, 9.79f, *Nem.* 5.44, 6.39–46, *Isthm.* 2.12–29. In these cases the poet establishes a direct link between the divinity or the place and the victor. What is so striking about the catalogue of *Isthmian* 1 is that the victor does not appear until the breakoff formula, where we find the conventional "Hermes gave victory to Herodotus." For a useful summary of various types of victory catalogues see Thummer I 29f, but note that the catalogue of *Isthmian* 1 fits into none of his categories.

[10] The address occurs in the last four lines of the poem (50–53):

> τίν τ', Ἐλέλιχθον, ἄρχεις ὃς ἱππιᾶν ἐσόδων,
> μάλα ἁδόντι νόῳ, Ποσειδᾶν, προσέχεται.
> γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν
> μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

Thrasybulus' devotion to Poseidon has nothing to do with the victory catalogue, but together with the last two lines explicates the poet's claim that the young man "guides

address to Apollo in *Pythian* 8 introduces mention of Aristomenes' victories (61–66):

τὺ δ', ῾Εκαταβόλε, πάνδοκον
ναὸν εὐκλέα διανέμων
Πυθῶνος ἐν γυάλοις,
τὸ μὲν μέγιστον τόθι χαρμάτων
ὤπασας, οἴκοι δὲ πρόσθεν ἁρπαλέαν δόσιν
πενταεθλίου σὺν ἑορταῖς ὑμαῖς ἐπάγαγες·[11]

All this suggests that, although we finally get a victory catalogue, even this conventional portion of the ode exemplifies the technique of praise by indirection we have noted throughout the poem.

I have gone through the poem in this way in order to point out the problems glossed over by Bundy in asserting the ode's complete conventionality. The exploration of the formal conventions and parameters of the epinician initiated by Bundy is extremely valuable, but we should not allow our quest for conventionality to blind us to what is crucially unconventional. Indeed, once we are familiar with the conventions of the victory ode, we find that *Isthmian* 1 controverts our expectations at every turn. And the question of expectations is ultimately the question of genre; as Woodbury observes (252), "the occasion is the celebration of a victory, the genre is epinician," *therefore* we expect a victory catalogue. It seems that in playing with our expectations, the poet is in some sense playing with genre.[12]

If we look at what Pindar tells us about his own poetic activity within the poem, we find that he is quite explicitly playing with occasions and thus with genres.[13] He opens with a reference to a paean he is

---

wealth with intelligence" (46). That is, he spends his money on hospitality and raising horses.

[11] For *Pythian* 8 Bundy can only claim that Apollo is addressed *within* a victory catalogue by maintaining that the catalogue extends from line 36 to line 84 with "two interruptions" (Bundy 69). But what Bundy terms an interruption in the catalogue (39–55) is actually the myth of the poem, introduced quite conventionally by the relative τόν in 39 (on this section as myth see Hamilton 60). Thus the address to Apollo provides a partial parallel to the celebration of Poseidon that opens the victory catalogue of *Isthmian* 1 (but note that Poseidon's bestowal of victory is not explicit: it is only alluded to in εὐεργέταν ἁρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον). This leaves us without a single parallel for direct address within a victory catalogue. Thummer II 31f acknowledges that the choice of verbs and the use of apostrophe here are not found elsewhere; he attributes these anomalies to the poet's striving for variety of expression.

[12] Bundy himself ended his study of *Isthmian* 1 with the assertion, "The study of Pindar must become a study of genre" (92). We need only add that unconventionality within one genre may represent the trace of another.

[13] On the importance of occasion for genre in the archaic period, see C. Calame, "Réfléxions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque," *QUCC* 17 (1974) 118, 124f, 127, and J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic*

working on for the men of Ceos, and after requesting Delos, the subject of the paean, to "yield," he asserts confidently (6–10):

ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος,
καὶ τὸν ἀκερσεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων
ἐν Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτᾳ σὺν ποντίοις
ἀνδράσιν, καὶ τὰν ἁλιερκέα ᾿Ισθμοῦ
δειράδ᾿·

The poet will yoke the τέλος of the two χάριτες—the two gifts of song commissioned for two different occasions[14] —in a single ode for Herodotus. As Bundy notes, the "yoking" is accomplished by the very words; the poet need say no more to evoke the paean or to incorporate it within his epinician.[15] Pindar uses yoking imagery again when he introduces another distinct genre, the carefully articulated inset hymn to Castor and Iolaus (14–16):

ἀλλ᾿ ἐγὼ ῾Ηροδότῳ τεύχων τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ γέρας,
ἀνία τ᾿ ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ᾿ ἐθέλω
ἢ Καστορείῳ ἢ ᾿Ιολάοι᾿ ἐναρμόξαι μιν ὕμνῳ.

ἐναρμόξαι picks up the image of ζεύξω; appropriately, given the victor's own charioteering and the heroes' equestrian proclivities, the poet will "fit him into a Castoreion or a hymn of Iolaos."[16]

Tradition (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1985) 5. On the centrality of performance, see Herington 3–99.

[14] For χάρις (in the plural) designating the poet's song, see Slater *s.v.* χάρις 1.b.β.

[15] Bundy makes the observation about the Castor/Iolaus hymn, but the point applies also to the paean (45): "The use of the future indicative and of ἐθέλω with the infinitive, in which a promise is regarded as fulfilled the moment it is uttered, is a conventional mannerism of hymnal poetry." See also Bundy 21 on *Ol.* 11.14: "The laudator's use of the future indicative in the first person . . . is, in fact, a conventional element of the enkomiastic style. It never points beyond the ode itself, and its promise is often fulfilled by the mere pronunciation of the word."

[16] Most notes ζεύξω and ἐναρμόξαι and on the basis of this imagery develops the thesis that the whole of *Isthmian* 1 is organized as a "yoking" of the divine and the human (the poem falling neatly into a divine and a human half, each with two parts that correspond to each other [Most 57–59]). This is an elegant solution, but there are problems. First, Most appears to take σὺν θεοῖς in line 6 with ζεύξω (*i.e.* "I will yoke the end of both graces together with the gods" [57]), whereas the evidence of Pindaric usage makes it much more likely that it is an independent phrase, *i.e.* "With the help of the gods I will yoke . . . " (see *Ol.* 8.14, *Nem.* 8.17, *Isthm.* 4.5; the opposite is ἄνευ θεοῦ, as at *Ol.* 9.103). Second, in order to make a neat scheme, Most argues that the entire second half of the poem is "occupied with men and what happens to them." This interpretation does not take into account the anomalous catalogue of 52–63. In fact, just the opposite; Most is forced to gloss over the preponderance of divinities that makes the catalogue so odd (53): "When in this second half of the poem gods or heroes are mentioned by name (Poseidon 32 and 52, Amphitryon 55, Minyas 56, Demeter 57, Protesilaos 58, [Hermes 60]), it is only because it is at their games that

But I would suggest that this is not the only image Pindar offers us for his poetic activity in the first half of the ode. In the middle of his inset Castor or Iolaus hymn, after pointedly describing the heroes' *non-chariot* victories, the poet pauses to observe (26f),

οὐ γὰρ ἦν πενταέλθιον, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ
ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος.

Why does Pindar insert this antiquarian detail here? Commentators ignore this line or dismiss it as a "pedantic footnote" (Most 57). But I would take τέλος here as a deliberate echo of the poet's boast at line 6. There he had claimed that he could yoke the τέλος of two different genres for the exceptional praise of the victor. Here, in the midst of his third genre, each one appropriate to a different occasion, the poet seems to set himself up against the athletes of old, demonstrating his poetic prowess by the number of different genres or occasional songs he can embrace within the ambit of an epinician. Thus I am suggesting that the reason for the poet's focusing on the heroes' non-chariot victories is at least partly to introduce the theme of the pentathlon for his own poetic endeavor.[17] Then, "there was no pentathlon, but the τέλος lay upon each event." Now, the laudator seems to be signalling, he himself has embarked on a poetic pentathlon—a 'pentathlon of genres' in praise of the victor.

If this is the case, can we detect here traces of any other genres or occasional poems? Indeed, a multiplicity of embedded genres may solve the problems of irrelevance and indirection noted for different sections of the ode.[18] Consider first lines 12f, where the words καλ-λίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος cause the poet to veer to a miniature myth of Heracles where we expect the naming of the victor. The linking of the epithet καλλίνικον with the mythical adventures of Heracles may remind us of the *kallinikos* strain of Archilochus. Pindar mentions this song explicitly at the opening of *Olympian* 9, conjuring it up in

---

Herodotus has won his victories." This will not do as an explanation, for we know from other odes that Pindar could have constructed a catalogue without specifically naming all these patron divinities.

[17] For parallels for the poet representing his poetic activity as athletic competition, see M. Lefkowitz, "The Poet as Athlete," *StIt* SER. III 2 (1984) 5–12.

[18] R. P. Martin, "Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes," *TAPA* 114 (1984) 29–48, is essential to my thinking on 'embedded genres', as well as the occasional nature of genre in archaic Greek poetry. Martin's use of Todorov's concept of 'genres of discourse' defined by their social context (30f) differs significantly from conventional treatments of genre. Thus, by a more traditional conception, both paean and Castoreion might be categorized as hymns, whereas I consider them different genres because they would have been composed for and performed at different occasions.

order to reject it in favor of the highly-wrought, personalized epinician he provides the victor (1–4):

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος
φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδώς
ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι
κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἑταίροις.

The scholia to these lines tell us that Archilochus, when he came to Olympia, composed a hymn for Heracles and that its refrain was

τήνελλα καλλίνικε χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις,
αὐτός τε καὶ Ἰόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύο.
τήνελλα καλλίνικε χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις.[19]

This song (or at least its refrain) appears to have been sung for all athletic victors at the immediate celebration of victory.[20]

There is also evidence to suggest that Archilochus' *kallinikos* song may have included the exploits of Heracles.[21] In a famous passage of Euripides' *Heracles*, the hero bitterly takes leave of his labors (575, 578–82):

χαιρόντων πόνοι·

. . .

ἢ τί φήσομεν καλὸν
ὕδρᾳ μὲν ἐλθεῖν ἐς μάχην λέοντί τε

---

[19] Drachmann I 266.

[20] According to the scholiast, κεκράγηκεν οὖν ἐπὶ πάντων νικηφόρων παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης ἐπᾴδεσθαι τὸ κόμμα (Drachmann I 267). His assertion is supported not only by *Olympian* 9, but also by *Nem*. 3.17f, καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίῳ Νεμέᾳ τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει. The evidence of Attic tragedy and comedy shows the familiarity and universal application of Archilochus' song. The dramatists transfer it from the sphere of athletic victories to that of successes in myth or fantasy, but it remains the emblem of the immediate celebration of victory. See Eur. *HF* 179f (Heracles, together with the gods, celebrates the defeat of the giants; see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides, Herakles* [Berlin 1895] *ad loc.*); *El.* 862–65 (the Chorus urges Electra to celebrate Orestes' killing of Aegisthus); *Phoen.* 1728–31 (Oedipus celebrates his victory over the Sphinx); Ar. *Av.* 1764 (Chorus hails Pisthetaerus as king of the universe); *Ach.* 1227f (Dicaeopolis gloats over Lamachus' wounding and celebrates his own *komos*).

[21] On this point the scholia to *Ol.* 9 are confused. They chronicle scholarly dispute about whether Archilochus' song is an epinician or a hymn (Drachmann I 268), and whether Pindar's epithet *triploos* means that the song had three strophes, or that the refrain was thrice repeated (Drachmann I 268f). This confusion suggests that there was little evidence available to the Hellenistic scholars beyond the refrain of Archilochus' song and the literary references to it, so we cannot expect them to be of much help on the content of the *kallinikos* song. For an independent argument that Archilochus' song included narration of the exploits of Heracles, see M. Simpson, "Pindar's *Ninth Olympian*," *GRBS* 10 (1969) 113–24.

Εὐρυσθέως πομπαῖσι, τῶν δ᾽ ἐμῶν τέκνων
οὐκ ἐκπονήσω θάνατον· οὐκ ἄρ᾽ Ἡρακλῆς
ὁ καλλίνικος ὡς πάροιθε λέξομαι.

The most obvious meaning in context is that Heracles would no longer be considered "the victorious one," should he allow his children to be murdered by the tyrant Lycus. But these words also link the title Ἡρακλῆς ὁ καλλίνικος with a recollection of the hero's labors (note especially φήσομεν, λέξομαι) in what may be an allusion to Archilochus' well-known song.

Later in the play, the chorus affirms its continued commitment to celebratory song (673f, 680–86):

οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας
    Μούσαις συγκαταμειγνύς,

. . .

    ἔτι τὰν Ἡρακλέους
    καλλίνικον ἀείδω
παρά τε Βρόμιον οἰνοδόταν
παρά τε χέλυος ἑπτατόνου
    μολπὰν καὶ Λίβυν αὐλόν·
    οὔπω καταπαύσομεν
Μούσας, αἵ μ᾽ ἐχόρευσαν.

With ἔτι and οὔπω, the Chorus implies that it has been singing and will continue to sing "the *kallinikos* song of Heracles." In fact the choral ode that precedes this affirmation (*HF* 348–50) is an extended hymn (ὑμνῆσαι, 355) describing the twelve labors of Heracles. I suggest that we should take this chorus as Euripides' own version of the *kallinikos* song, recognizable to his audience as an adaptation of the Archilochean original.[22] And we should note that in Euripides' version Heracles' confrontation with Geryon figures as the eleventh of

---

[22] Wilamowitz's observations (*supra* n.20: 80–82) on the formal structure of this chorus may be significant in this context. He notes that the form (three strophes and antistrophes, separated by a rhythmic refrain, or *ephymnion*) was probably not invented by Euripides, for exactly the same formal pattern underlies the "feierliches segenslied für Argos" in Aeschylus' *Supp.* (630–709) and the "danklied" for the fall of Troy sung by the Chorus at *Ag.* 367–488. Lines of a similar metrical shape occur in the third stasimon of Euripides' *Bacchae* (877–81, 897–901). Wilamowitz 81, H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente* (Würzburg 1933) 2, and E. R. Dodds, *Euripides, Bacchae* (Oxford 1960) xxxviii, 183, agree that the rhythmic refrain marks a kind of cult hymn, a category that could include Archilochus' 'hymn' to Heracles. Note that Aristarchus, quoted by the Pindar scholia (Drachmann I 269), contended that the *kallinikos* song was *tristrophos*; and that all the parallels from tragedy are celebratory songs.

the twelve labors (*HF* 422–24).[23] Thus it seems possible to take
Isthmian 1.12f as a brief allusion to Archilochus' *kallinikos* song.

This would explain the placement of these lines immediately after
the actual crowning at the Isthmus, for this is exactly the context in
which the *kallinikos* song would have been sung for the victor. Such
an allusion might also explain the particular details Pindar chooses to
narrate. It seems that he has drawn one vignette from the beginning of
Heracles' saga (his birth) and another from the end (the cattle of
Geryon, a relatively late labor), perhaps drawing together the two
ends of Archilochus' song to evoke the whole.[24] Finally, the possibility
of an allusion here would make the poet's break-off formula at 14ff
more pointed. With ἐγὼ δέ the poet turns away from a simple, spon-
taneous celebration of victory and immediately mentions the victor,
'Ηροδότῳ, for the fault of the *kallinikos* song, as Pindar expresses it in
Olympian 9, is its generic quality. It applies to every victor in every
context. In contrast, Pindar emphasizes the making of his own song
(τεύχων) and its special aptness for Herodotus' victory (ἁνία τ' ἀλλο-
τρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ'). The poet has simply allowed a few notes of
the *kallinikos* song to sound, effecting a momentary mimesis of the
immediate victory celebration within his epinician.[25]

Can we find still other genres in Pindar's 'pentathlon'? If we look
closely at the texture of the language, we note several anomalies in
lines 47–49:

> μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκύς,
> μηλοβότᾳ τ' ἀρότᾳ τ' ὀρνιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὃν πόντος τράφει.
> γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῆ τέταται·

The notion of praise as wage and the priamel form are certainly at
home in epinician, but the content of the priamel—the specific occu-
pations described, the threat of famine, to be fended off from the
belly—have no parallels in the corpus of epinicia. Fraenkel notes the
uniqueness of theme and diction here, when he asserts, "We virtually
never hear in Pindar of men working hard for their daily bread or of
working for a living at all." He is immediately forced to qualify this
statement, "The one exception, I think, is *Isthm.* 1,47ff., where the

---

[23] The literary evidence suggests that, even before the canon of twelve labors was
fixed, Geryon was established as an adversary of Heracles: see Hes. *Theog.* 287–94
and Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*.

[24] Note also the double use of pronouns to introduce the two mythic episodes in 12f
(ἐν ᾇ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον 'Αλκμήνα τέκεν παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρίξαν κύνες).
Could the second pronoun reflect the embedding of a song within a song?

[25] For a parallel to this imitation of the events at the actual moment of victory, see
F. J. Nisetich, "*Olympian* 1.8–11: An Epinician Metaphor," *HSCP* 79 (1975) 55–68.

tone is contemptuous, as the coarse expression γαστήρ shows."[26] Fraenkel is quite right to perceive a different level of diction in these lines. It is possible, however, to interpret this 'coarseness' of diction as evidence of a different genre, rather than as the expression of the poet's contempt. The works of men and the fending off of starvation are crucially the concerns of didactic epic, as exemplified by Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[27]

Indeed, there is more in this passage that seems to have been drawn from a didactic tradition. Woodbury has recently discussed at some length the gnomic transition ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει (40). He notes that the idea of acquiring forethought from experience runs counter to the traditional Greek wisdom, παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω (Hes. *Op.* 218).[28] But his gloss for this gnome as it applies to the victor sounds surprisingly Hesiodic: "It is νόος that generates προμάθεια by directing attention to the goal of κέρδος" (243). In this context, it is worth quoting at length from Hesiod's advice to his brother Perses (*Op.* 293–302, 306–13):

> οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος, ὃς αὐτῷ πάντα νοήσει
> φρασσάμενος τά κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ᾖσιν ἀμείνω·
> ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ κἀκεῖνος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται·
> ὃς δέ κε μήτ' αὐτῷ νοέῃ μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων
> ἐν θυμῷ βάλληται, ὃ δ' αὖτ' ἀρχήιος ἀνήρ.
> ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἡμετέρης μεμνημένος αἰὲν ἐφετμῆς
> ἐργάζευ, Πέρση, δῖον γένος, ὄφρα σε Λιμὸς
> ἐχθαίρῃ, φιλέῃ δέ σ' ἐυστέφανος Δημήτηρ
> αἰδοίη, βιότου δὲ τεὴν πιμπλῇσι καλιήν·
> Λιμὸς γάρ τοι πάμπαν ἀεργῷ σύμφορος ἀνδρί·
>
> . . .
>
>   σοὶ δ' ἔργα φίλ' ἔστω μέτρια κοσμεῖν,
> ὥς κέ τοι ὡραίου βιότου πλήθωσι καλιαί.
> ἐξ ἔργων δ' ἄνδρες πολύμηλοί τ' ἀφνειοί τε
> καὶ τ' ἐργαζόμενος πολὺ φίλτερος ἀθανάτοισιν.

---

[26] H. Fraenkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, tr. M. Hadas and J. Willis (New York 1973) 490 with n.8.

[27] The evidence of diction is most telling for λιμός, which occurs seven times in the *Works and Days* (230, 243, 299, 302, 363, 404, 647), and plowing, referred to nine times (384, 405, 432, 439, 450, 458, 460, 467, 616). The theme of the demands of the belly occurs more frequently in the *Odyssey* (7.216–18, 15.343–45, 17.223–28, 473, 18.53f, 357–364), but it can be argued that these are the occasions on which characters are using the discourse of didactic poetry (see G. Nagy, "Hesiod," in *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* [New York 1982] 62).

[28] Woodbury 242. Note how Pindar's gnome to some extent mirrors the structure of Hesiod's: ὁ πονήσαις ~ παθών, καὶ προμάθειαν ~ νήπιος, φέρει ~ ἔγνω.

ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δέ τ' ὄνειδος.
εἰ δέ κεν ἐργάζῃ, τάχα σε ζηλώσει ἀεργὸς
πλουτεῦντα· πλούτῳ δ' ἀρετὴ καὶ κῦδος ὀπηδεῖ.[29]

The main themes in this passage relevant for *Isthmian* 1 are (1) the gnomic opening endorsing forethought or at least compliance with another's good advice (292–98), (2) the injunction to work (299, 306) (3) in order to fend off λιμός (299f, 302) and ultimately (4) to acquire a surplus and possess wealth "on which ἀρετή and κῦδος attend" (300f, 307–13).

If we consider *Isthm.* 1.40–51 in the light of Hesiod's lines, we note striking resemblances of theme and diction:

ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει·
εἰ δ' ἀρετᾷ κατάκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν,
ἀμφότερον δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις,
χρή νιν εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον
μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν
γνώμαις. ἐπεὶ κούφα δόσις ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ
ἀντὶ μόχθων παντοδαπῶν ἔπος εἰπόντ'
          ἀγαθὸν ξυνὸν ὀρθῶσαι καλόν.
μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκύς,
μηλοβότᾳ τ' ἀρότᾳ τ' ὀρνιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὃν πόντος τράφει.
γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῆ τέταται·
ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν,
εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν
          καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον.

In this passage, Pindar appears to have adapted a number of elements of didactic poetry to suit the epinician context. As Woodbury cogently argues (241–44), the gnome of line 40 points forward as well as back, praising the foresight of the victor that inspires him to "spend himself utterly" for the ultimate achievement of the "highest profit." Thus the victor is like Hesiod's πανάριστος, who "understands all things for himself," and the gnome represents a positive, epinician version of Hesiod's repeated injunctions to Perses to "pay attention" and "remember" the advice the poet gives him. And, allowing for the frame of epinician, that advice is very similar: as Hesiod urges his

---

[29] I have omitted line 310, following Solmsen and West. I am not suggesting that Pindar's lines are a direct quotation or allusion to Hesiod: rather that both share traditional diction and themes which are generically marked for advice or didactic poetry. I select this passage because it seems to reflect many of the same themes in the same sequence as Pindar's lines. Other Hesiodic passages might be cited—for example, *Op.* 362f, 381f, 403f.

brother to "work, and pile work upon work" if he desires wealth (*Op.* 299 or 381f), Pindar conjures the victor to "expend himself utterly" to earn the payment of a "lordly boast." Pindar then repeats the advice in lines 46–51 (as Hesiod does in 293–313) in Hesiodic terms. We can recognize Hesiod's progression from work as a means of survival (299, 302) to the accumulation of wealth with its attendant κῦδος and ἀρετή (307–13) in modified form in Pindar's version. Whereas Hesiod's model is a continuum, the epinician poet sets up a contrast between labor which merely fends off starvation (47–49) and the winning of κῦδος and a glorious reputation (50f).

The epinician poet has a specific purpose in adapting Hesiodic diction here: beginning with the gnome of line 40, this is the most explicitly didactic section of the poem,[30] and it endorses a model of behavior which we might describe as anti-Hesiodic. Hesiod's frequently reiterated goal in the *Works and Days* is the stockpiling of grain, of livelihood, and of wealth (*e.g. Op.* 21–24, 301, 307f, 341, 376f, 632, 689f). But what is crucially required for athletic victory, as Pindar emphasizes (41f), is lavish public expenditure. In order to encourage his aristocratic audience to engage in such expenditure, Pindar has appropriated and transformed Hesiodic categories of work and profit. Thus, the poet's climactic assertion that public praise is "the highest profit" (51) is paradoxical in Hesiodic terms, for that praise is bought by unstinting, unrecompensed expenditure.

It is for this reason that Pindar has transformed Hesiod's continuum into a contrast. Since Hesiod's aim is literal profit, the same work which "fends off starvation" will ultimately win wealth. For the epinician poet, there is a qualitative difference between those activities which guarantee a man his livelihood and those which earn him "the highest profit" of universal praise. We can read Pindar's extended meditation on expenditure and its rewards as a recasting of the Hesiodic dictum that "ἀρετή and κῦδος attend upon wealth" (*Op.* 313). By his adaptation of the didactic tradition, Pindar attempts to per-

---

[30] P. W. Rose, "The Myth of Pindar's First *Nemean*: Sportsmen, Poetry, and *Paideia*," *HSCP* 78 (1974) 145–75, rightly emphasizes the paideutic element in Pindar's odes. Rose points out that Pindar has to appeal to a broad aristocratic audience (149f), and many of his observations on the didactic function of the myth could be extended to other elements of epinician. He notes, for example, "the consistent generalizing cast of Pindar's language" (154) as a strategy for making the victor's achievements emblematic of aristocratic excellence in the broadest terms. So here, by the use of gnomic statements and two generalizing conditions, Pindar praises Herodotus' past effort and expenditure, spurs him on to future achievement, and holds up his behavior as a model for his entire social group.

suade his audience that, on the contrary, wealth properly used should attend upon ἀρετή (41f) and κῦδος (50).[31]

Finally, the conceit of a 'pentathlon of genres' may help explain the peculiarities noted in the ode's victory catalogue. After another strongly marked transition (ἄμμι δ', 52), Pindar asserts that it is "fitting to celebrate in song" Poseidon and to "address" or "greet by name" a series of heroes and cult places (52–59):

> ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε Κρόνου σεισίχθον' υἱὸν
> γείτον' ἀμειβομένοις εὐεργέταν
> ἁρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον κελαδῆσαι,
> καὶ σέθεν, Ἀμφιτρύων,
> παῖδας προσειπεῖν τὸν Μινύα τε μυχὸν
> καὶ τὸ Δάματρος κλυτὸν ἄλσος Ἐλευσῖνα
> καὶ Εὔβοιαν ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις·
> Πρωτεσίλα, τὸ τεὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν
> ἐν Φυλάκᾳ τέμενος συμβάλλομαι.

We should look carefully at the verbs by which the poet characterizes his own activities here, for they may give us a clue to the context appropriate to these lines. κελαδέω appears nowhere else in the epinicia in a victory catalogue. Where the verb does appear, the objects for "celebration in song" are divided between deities and the victor or his victory in a general way.[32] Whenever the object of the verb is a god, the context seems to be hymnal in its narrow sense. Thus in three of the four Pindaric uses of κελαδέω with a god as object, the verb occurs relatively early in the poem, honoring the god at whose festival the victory was won (Ol. 1.9, 2.2) or celebrated (Pyth. 11.10). Ol. 6.88 is the poet's injunction to Aeneas to celebrate Hera Parthenia when he arrives in Syracuse. This injunction introduces a whole string of gods and cult places native to Syracuse, whom the poet's representative or Hieron honors. This combined list of gods and cult places is very similar to the victory catalogue of Isthmian 1, but its purpose is purely celebratory—both of the local gods and of Hieron's piety.[33]

---

[31] It is not possible here to consider at length Pindar's economics or his *paideia*. I have discussed these topics in my thesis, *Pindar's OIKONOMIA: the House as Organizing Metaphor in the Odes of Pindar* (Princeton 1988) 125–209, and with specific reference to *Isthmian* 1, 186–90.

[32] κελαδέω with gods or heroes as objects: Ol. 1.9, 2.2, 6.88, Pyth. 11.10, Isthm. 5.46–48 (so also Bacchyl. 14.19–22, 16.10–12). κελαδέω with victor/victory as the object (generally referring to the whole poem): Ol. 10.79, 11.14, Pyth. 1.58, 2.63, Nem. 3.66, 4.16, 9.54, Isthm. 8.62. Of celebration in general: Pyth. 2.15 (cf. the remarks of Most: 74, 97f).

[33] We need to be very clear on these distinctions: Pindar frequently celebrates the

προσειπεῖν appears nowhere else in Pindar, but we find a striking parallel for the diction here in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. Agamemnon's first words in the play are addressed in thanks to the gods of Argos (810–13):

πρῶτον μὲν ῎Αργος καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους
δίκῃ προσειπεῖν, τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταιτίους
νόστου δικαίων θ' ὧν ἐπραξάμην πόλιν
Πριάμου·

These lines in fact provide a surprisingly close parallel for *Isthmian* 1.52–56: not only does Agamemnon "greet" or "address" the local gods and the place, but he asserts that it is "right" to do so, just as Pindar does (δίκῃ προσειπεῖν~ἔοικε . . . προσειπεῖν). It is 'right' in the context of Agamemnon's victory and safe return.[34] A similar address to the gods occurs in Euripides' *Heracles*, when Amphitryon bids Heracles, newly returned from the underworld (599f):

παρελθὼν νῦν πρόσειπέ θ' ἑστίαν
καὶ δὸς πατρῴοις δώμασιν σὸν ὄμμ' ἰδεῖν.

Heracles approves of Amphitryon's suggestion and repeats the formula (607–09):

χρόνῳ δ' ἀνελθὼν ἐξ ἀνηλίων μυχῶν
῎Αιδου Κόρης <τ'> ἔνερθεν, οὐκ ἀτιμάσω
θεοὺς προσειπεῖν πρῶτα τοὺς κατὰ στέγας.

These two parallels reflect very clearly the context appropriate for such an address to the gods and the place: one's safe return home after long absence.[35] Considering *Isthmian* 1.52–59 in the light of these parallels, we notice, first, that the poet has gone to some trouble to identify Poseidon as "neighbor"[36] and, second, that he then immediately addresses Amphitryon and his "children," epichoric heroes of

---

god at whose games the victor won (on two occasions with the verb κελαδέω), but that celebration *nowhere else* occurs in the victory catalogue. The purpose of the victory catalogue, generally speaking, is not to glorify the gods, but to honor and commemorate the achievements of the victor and his family.

[34] Whatever we think of Agamemnon's μεταιτίους, insofar as it acknowledges divine help, it is equivalent to εὐεργέταν at *Isthm.* 1.53.

[35] See G. W. Bond, *Euripides, Heracles* (Oxford 1981) *ad loc.* For other parallels see Aesch. *Ag.* 514 (with E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* [Oxford 1950] *ad loc.*); Eur. *Phoen.* 633; Ar. *Ach.* 266, *Pax* 557.

[36] As Thummer observes (II 31), it seems probable that Pindar is here thanking Poseidon of *Onchestus* (as "neighbor" to Thebes) for the *Isthmian* victory. It is not immediately apparent why he should wish to do so until we recognize the convention within which the poet is working. Thus Pindar's use of γείτον' here parallels Aeschylus' θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους.

Thebes.[37] The poet's next 'address' is to the "hollow of Minyas" (*i.e.* Orchomenus)—another neighbor to Thebes. From Orchomenus, the poet must move on to sites more distant geographically, but with mention of Poseidon of Onchestus and the heroes of Thebes and Orchomenus he has already established a strong sense of place. Thus, it appears that Pindar has framed his victory catalogue to evoke the victor's own prayer of thanksgiving on his return to Thebes.[38] By this evocation, the poem enacts the victor's trajectory home from the games, for it moves from the victor's immediate celebration of the *kallinikos* song (12f) to his homecoming prayer of thanksgiving to the local gods and heroes (52–56).

By this point, the poet has completed his 'pentathlon of genres'. He has sounded a few notes in turn of paean, *kallinikos* song, Castoreion, didactic poetry, and homecoming invocation.[39] But it is not enough to show how Pindar has appropriated each of these genres to praise the victor. We must ask the more basic question, why has he chosen this format at all? Again it may help to consider the images the poet himself offers for his poetic activity. Within the poem, he uses the image of "yoking" two different occasions (thus poet as charioteer) and poetry as payment or profit—and perhaps (implicitly) the image of the poem as pentathlon. What these three images share is that they match exactly the victor's own expenditures of πόνοι and δαπάναι, as the poet himself characterizes them (41–45):

εἰ δ' ἀρετᾷ κατάκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν,
ἀμφότερον δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις,

[37] Thummer (II 31) takes this reference to Amphitryon's children loosely as a designation of his "Nachkommen" in general, since we know that Iolaus and the sons of Heracles enjoyed heroic cult and athletic contests in Thebes (see *Ol.* 9.98f, *Pyth.* 9.79f, and *Isthm.* 3/4.79–86). As a parallel for the address to local heroes, see *Ag.* 516–19, where the returning herald "addresses" (προσαυδᾷ, 514) not only the gods, but also "the heroes who sent us forth" (ἥρως τε τοὺς πέμψαντας, 516).

[38] We should perhaps not discount the possibility (favored by Woodbury, 240, and Most, 54) that Herodotus' father Asopodorus is identical with the medizing cavalry officer of Herodotus 9.69. As Most points out, this would make the entire gnomic sequence (40–51) applicable to father as well as to son (note especially πολεμίζων, 50). If this is the case, the address to local gods and heroes can *also* be read from the point of view of Asopodorus, newly rescued from "shipwreck" and settled at Orchomenus. This ambiguity of reference might then explain Pindar's unparalleled failure to name the victor within the victory catalogue.

[39] That Pindar refers to and manipulates genres self-consciously is well known; see L. Woodbury, "Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13," *TAPA* 99 (1968) 533–42, and Most 122–27, 130, 218. Other examples of generic self-consciousness are *Ol.* 9.1–4 (reference to *kallinikos*), *Ol.* 13.18f (reference to dithyramb), *Pyth.* 6.20–22 (allusion to *Hypothekai*), *Isthm.* 6.66–68 (allusion to Hesiod's *Works and Days*), and the remarkable fragment 128c S./M., which lists five different genres in the space of ten lines.

χρή νιν εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον
μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν
γνώμαις.

On these lines Bundy observes (58), "ἀγάνορα κόμπον is a 'lordly' vaunt to match 'lordly' deeds. The epithet obeys that common enkomiastic imperative 'to match the deed in words.'" We can go further and suggest that 'praise to match' is not merely the motif embodied by these lines, but the very foundation of the poem, programmatic for its form and content.

To match the victor's skill in driving his own chariot (15), the poet himself becomes a charioteer, expertly maneuvering his song from genre to genre. The pattern we noted of indirection or veering from the expected topic throughout the poem is the mark of the adept charioteer, and the words with which Pindar characterizes the victor's event towards the end of the poem apply equally to his own poetic activity: the poem itself travels ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις (57). The poet's 'pentathlon of genres,' his ability to include and guide to a single τέλος so many compositions for different occasions, matches the πόνοι the victor has endured in athletic training and competition. And finally the monetary image: the poet matches the victor's lavish expenditures with the abundance of poetic riches he lays out for him, demonstrating his poetic εὐπορία by the number of different genres he draws from his store to glorify the victor. This image gives added point to the poem's final lines (67f):

εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, ψυχὰν 'Αίδᾳ τελέων
οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἄνευθεν.

No more than the victor does the poet hoard his wealth "within"—rather, he expends it, publicly, brilliantly—and he can be as confident as the victor that he will earn undying δόξα by this poetic *tour de force*.[40]

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
July, 1988

---

[40] This reading suggests that we should add the end of *Isthmian* 1 to the passages in which the poet links his own *kleos* to that of his patron at the close of a poem. It would thus be analogous to the end of Ibycus fr.282a *PMG*, Bacchyl. 3, and Pindar's own *Olympian* 1.