

Pindar's House

William J. Slater

THE TWO following passages are linked by their content and their obscurity. *Pyth.* 8.56ff:

χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς | Ἀλκμᾶνα στεφάνοις βάλλωσ
ραίνω δὲ καὶ ὕμνω γείτων ὅτι μοι κτέ.

Pyth. 3.77ff:

ἀλλ' ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω | Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι
παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμὰ
σεμνὰν θεὸν ἐννύχαι.

Both appear to give thanks to a neighbouring deity,¹ and the proximity of this deity is emphasised. Now the scholia on the first passage say sensibly (2.124.13 Dr.) ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ τὸ πρόσωπον μιμουμένου τοῦ νενικηκότος· ταῦτα δὲ εἴρηκεν ὡς ὑπάρχοντος ἡρώου καὶ γειτνιῶντος τῇ τοῦ νικηφόρου οἰκίᾳ . . ., and (2.125.1 Dr.) τῇ Ἀριστομένους οἰκίᾳ παρίδρυτο Ἀλκμᾶνος ἡρώων, and (2.125.4 Dr.) ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ Αἰγινῆταί εἰσιν. This is a deduction from the text, but it is a sensible one. Unfortunately the scholia on *Pyth.* 3 have a very different story to offer us (2.80.9ff Dr.) 137a: λέγεται δὲ Ῥέας ἱερὸν πλησίον τῶν Πινδάρου οἴκων εἶναι (*n.b.* the tense and the verb). 137b: An absurd² story is told on the authority of Aristodemus (*FGrHist* 383 F 13) how Pindar, because of a vision of the Magna Mater while sitting on a mountain with a student, founded a shrine of the Mother and Pan πρὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ. The citizens sent to Delphi to learn the meaning of this vision and were told to found a shrine of the Mother, whereupon they were surprised at Pindar's anticipation

¹ So Heracles is mentioned and thanked as a neighbour of the victor, *Nem.* 7.94.

² I am aware that visions are, since Babylonian times, *de rigueur* in temple foundations, and inscriptions tend to record this (*e.g.* ὁ θεός μοι ἐχρημάτισεν, J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* [Oxford 1925] p.69, 1) as a personal command by the god to the founder. This is, I hope, no reason to believe that such visions are more than polite fiction, no matter what the present fashion may be (T. G. Rosenmeyer, *GRBS* 7 [1966] 331 n.39).

of the oracle and joined him in worship (*n.b.* the difficulty in explaining Pan). 138: There was a shrine of the Mother and Pan near Pindar's house, founded by him (derived from 137b). 139a: fr.95 Sn. is quoted to show that Pan and the Magna Mater occurred jointly. 139b: ἄλλωc

- (i) there was a shrine of the Mother near Pindar's house.
- (ii) the Mother cures madness and so does Dionysus. Pan is introduced either because ὁ Πᾶν πλησίον καθίδρυτο Πινδάρου or because he is a mountain god like the Mother.

The tendency in Pindaric scholarship has been to force the *Pyth.* 3 type of interpretation upon *Pyth.* 8, and so Bowra writes:³ "It is clear that Alcmaeon had a shrine near Pindar's house in Thebes." No such thing is clear or even probable, especially when we realize that this type of explanation⁴ is typical of ancient exegesis, for in *Nem.* 7.1 the scholiast explains the invocation of Eleithyia, οἱ δὲ (*sc.* λέγουσιν) ὅτι ἐν γειτόνων ἦν τῷ Σωγένοι ἱερόν *Εἰλειθυίας*, on which someone, probably Didymus, comments, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἱστορεῖται.

Clearly then there is a better case to be made for applying the exegesis of *Pyth.* 8 to *Pyth.* 3 than *vice versa*. There was apparently no better evidence to be derived from the poems themselves than fr.95, and it says only that in a hymn to Pan⁵ one of his epithets was *Ματρὸς μεγάλας ὀπαδέ*. This information is interesting but (like fr.96, which tells us the same fact) is not relevant to our question, for we know nothing of the circumstances of this poem nor for whom or for what place it was commissioned. Such combinations of deities may be due as much to the poet's fancy as to the influence of local cults.

Support for the Theban shrine thesis comes from archaeology, which claims that a Pan-Meter cult flourished in Boeotia.⁶ The evidence produced for this seems to consist of a Tanagra relief, and a sketch on a Kabeirion vase⁷ interpreted by Kern. Other evidence dates

³ *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 54.

⁴ Cf. also schol. 139b above.

⁵ Kern, *AA* 52 (1937) 468, claims that a scholiast says that this is the song sung by the κοῦραι of *Pyth.* 3: this is not true, and no scholiasts say so.

⁶ *RE Suppl.* 8 (1956) 1003 (Brommer) with litt.; Roscher, *Myth. Lex.* 3.1 (1897–1902) 1363.

⁷ The relief: J. N. Svoronos, *Athener Nationalmuseum*, pp.363ff, no.1421, pl.45. The extensive literature is listed by Kern, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 471 nn.1 and 2, and by O. Walter, *JOAI*

from at least a century later and is not restricted to Boeotia. Wilamowitz' certainty⁸ about the identification of the Tanagra relief was partly due to his reliance on the perhaps overexuberant reconstruction by Svoronos,⁹ and Kern was less certain about the details. What is suspicious here is that the interpretation of both these objects has based itself firmly on the unquestioned evidence of the scholia to *Pyth.* 3, which is as we shall see no evidence at all. This admitted, we could begin to imagine other explanations equally convincing: Demeter, e.g. would be much more at home at this date both in Tanagra and in the Kabeirion temple than the Magna Mater. Again, for Thebes Pindar himself (*Isth.* 7.3) bears witness to a puzzling conjunction of Dionysus and a bronze-rattling Demeter. If, as I shall suggest, the Meter of *Pyth.* 3 is to be sought in Sicily rather than in Thebes, I think a fair assessment of the archaeological evidence would be much more skeptical than hitherto of a Pan-Kybele cult in Boeotia. Nor is it reasonable to demand fifth-century evidence for such cults, any more than for Alcmaeon cults or Theban Demeter-Dionysus cults or any of the other local deities for whom Pindar is our only witness; least of all can we expect evidence from fifth century Syracuse,¹⁰ where the archaeological results are particularly scanty.

An analysis of the passage from *Pyth.* 3 reveals three difficulties that cannot be resolved:

(a) Who is the Meter? Pindar nowhere else mentions the Magna Mater without specification: only Ge is called Meter without some qualification. In fact, Meter is never used of Kybele before Euripides.

(b) *κοῦραι* may be the girls who sing as in *Paean* 6.16, *Λατοῖδαν θαμινὰ Δελφῶν κόραι . . . μελπόμεναι*, though it is absurd to think of Pindar's daughters. On the other hand, the reference may just possibly be to the Nymphs, as a scholiast guesses. This is more difficult

31 (1938) 62 n.43. The relief was first brought into connexion with Pindar by A. Milchoefer, *AthMitt* 3 (1878) 390ff. The dates given vary between fourth and late fifth centuries.

The vase: Kern, *op.cit.* with picture p.470; repeated by M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der gr. Religion* I³ (Munich 1957) 726 with pl.48.2. Kern claims (p.467) that the sketch is ancient, contrary to previous opinion, even if it has nothing to do with the painting on the other side of the vase. It may therefore belong to the fifth century.

⁸ "Es ist verkehrt, eine andere Deutung zu suchen," in *Pindaros* (Berlin 1921) 271 n.4.

⁹ Kern, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 471.

¹⁰ P. Orlandini, *Kokalos* 14/15 (1968/9) 334ff, gives an up-to-date picture. In the same volume p.431, M. Treu laments our ignorance of the Sicilian milieu, since he is trying to localize a Simonidean *ἐγχώριος μῦθος*.

than has been realized,¹¹ because again there is no certain example of *κόραι* being used for nymphs without some specifying epithet.¹² As it stands it means 'daughters'.

(c) The grammatical ambiguity of *σὺν Πανί* cannot be resolved, for there are parallels for both usages. Certainly we naturally construe *κοῦραι καὶ Πάν* like *Isth.* 1.8, *τὸν ἀκερσεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων . . . σὺν ποντίοις ἀνδράσιν*; but *Isth.* 4.72 provides a parallel for *μητέρα καὶ Πάνα: σὺν Ὁρσέα δέ νιν κωμάξομαι*. In the first, we are forced to believe that the *κοῦραι* are semimythical deities, and Pindar would be conjuring up a fantasy like *Dithyramb* 2. In the second case, we should assume that they were human. Neither is impossible, and if the second is factually more comprehensible, that does not make it poetically more likely,¹³ or allow for the possibility of impersonations of deities.

I think we must begin from the obvious. Pindar's audience knew what he was talking about, and the statement must make sense in its context, no matter what it refers to. We may then deduce the following probabilities:

(a) None of the audience could understand a reference to an insignificant new shrine in Thebes (or Kynoskephalai) unless Pindar had read them a prologue dealing with it.

(b) It could in no way be construed as complimentary to the greatest tyrant in the Greek world to learn of this wish of Pindar's. Furthermore if he had not been informed of the reference specifically, he would take it to refer to Demeter or some local mother goddess.

(c) It goes against the spirit of the ode if the chorus, having delivered themselves of a 76 line *recusatio*¹⁴ in which they wish they could have brought Chiron across the ocean but reject this as an impossibility, now say they are prepared to make prayer to an insignificant shrine in Thebes. Indeed the point of the *recusatio* is that they have not come across the ocean, bringing Chiron or not. Witness line 68 *καὶ κεν ἐν ναυκὶν μόνον Ἰονίαν τάμνων θάλασσαν Ἀρέθουσαν ἐπὶ κράναν*, and line 76

¹¹ Walter, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 57 nn.19 and 26, 62 n.42, who believes that they represent the feminine form of Kouretes. His statements have to be carefully verified, as when he claims that Paus. 1.31.3 proves a *gemeinsame Verehrung* of Pan and the Mother of the Gods, or that the followers of the Mother of the Gods are often called *κοῦραι*.

¹² *RE* 17 (1936) 1547; *RE* 15 (1937) 1386, where add now Eur. *Hipp.* 740. None of the passages listed are parallel.

¹³ Cf. the mixture of fact and fantasy at *Ol.* 6.22ff, *Paeon* 6.137ff.

¹⁴ I follow the interpretation of D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1968) 49.

ἐξικόμαν κε βαθὺν πόντον περάσαις. We do not need to refer these words to Pindar sitting at home in Thebes; they fit a Sicilian chorus—*παρ' ἐμὸν πρόθυρον* refers to Hieron's or the chorus' forecourt.

(d) Like Young, I see a reference to the topos of the far (rejected) and the near (τὸ πὰρ ποδί, τὸ πρὸ ποδός, etc., accepted): but what sense does it make to a Syracusan audience that Pelion is rejected for the poet's *πρόθυρον*? The improvement in interpretation is immense if we take *πρόθυρον* of Syracuse, as e.g. fr.169.7 *Κυκλώπειον ἐπὶ πρόθυρον Εὐρυελθέος*=Tiryns, or *Ol. 13.5 Κόρινθον, Ἴσθμίου πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος*, or more locally of a temple or palace. I prefer, then, to refer the “performative utterance”¹⁵ of *ἐθέλω ἐπεύξασθαι* to the chorus and victor¹⁶ and not to Pindar.

Could the reference make sense to a Syracusan audience? In our general ignorance of the circumstances of production and of sufficient archaeological evidence from the early fifth century, it is impossible to give an altogether satisfying answer. But I have two suggestions to make. The first is that the goddess may be Demeter. This is already suggested by the Ambrosian *Vita* 2.6 Dr., where we are told that Pindar wrote the hymn (fr.37 Sn.) beginning¹⁷ *ποτνία θεεμοφόρε χρυσάνιον* for Demeter, and that he founded a shrine of both gods before his house, i.e. of Pan and Demeter. This is probably a mistake for Persephone, if Pausanias 9.23.3 is relevant. The *Vita* here seems to have conflated three separate stories, one about the Magna Mater seen in a vision (whence he founded a shrine of the Magna Mater and Pan), one about Pan seen on the mountains (as a result of which vision he again wrote a poem), and one about Persephone (Demeter?), whom he saw in a dream and so wrote a poem. Though the writer's confusion is readily comprehensible, it is useful to note that Demeter was a variant for the Magna Mater already in ancient times.¹⁸ Of Hieron

¹⁵ K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes Clouds* (Oxford 1968) 109 on line 127 with litt., unfortunately unknown to me when I wrote *CQ* 19 (1969) 86ff. There is incidentally no evidence for W. S. Barrett's statement (*Hippolytus* [Oxford 1964] 366), “Certainly Pindar makes his male choruses use the 1st. singular to mean Pindar and not themselves,” and the places he mentions do not prove this statement. *Ol. 6* can equally well be sung by a Theban chorus. See now M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama* (Helsinki 1970) 33ff.

¹⁶ So succinctly E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1962) 69, whose implications are ignored by Floyd, *GRBS* 6 (1965) 188ff.

¹⁷ Why editors emend to *χρυσανίου* I do not know. We can supply *πόειν λαχοίσα* as easily as *Ἄιδου δάμαρ*.

¹⁸ Kybele is not attested as the name for Pindar's deity by any ancient authority; it is an invention of the moderns.

Pindar himself says (*Ol.* 6.95) *φαινικόπεζαν ἀμφέπει Δάματρα*. We are told that his brother founded temples to her, and that he himself was by heredity attached to her cult.¹⁹ She is addressed as Meter primarily in conjunction with her *κόρη*,²⁰ and probably the Metroon at Athens was originally her shrine. But even by the time of Euripides, conflation of the Eleusinian and Asiatic mother was complete,²¹ and we may assume a similar and earlier conflation in Sicily between the Sicilian mother goddess and the Demeter Thesmophoros cult. Especially interesting is the cult of a mother goddess (and Meteres) together with *παῖδες*—nymphs who appear elsewhere in Sicily and in Syracuse together with Pan.²² Such a combination would explain a *Μήτηρ-κοῦραι* connexion that is otherwise baffling. While the identification remains speculative, I hope that it strikes the reader as no less probable, or improbable, than the dogma of a Theban cult.

A few unbelievers²³ in Pindar's shrine have existed, but outright skepticism has not been expressed, because of later testimony that there existed in the second century a house of Pindar near a shrine of Dindymene in Thebes. We are even told by another authority how this house survived the destruction of Thebes by Alexander (Arrian, *Anab.* 1.9.10): *καὶ τὴν Πινδάρου δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ οἰκίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀπογόνους τοῦ Πινδάρου λέγουσιν ὅτι διεφύλαξεν Ἀλέξανδρος αἰδοῦν τῇ Πινδάρου*. This information is not from Aristoboulos²⁴ but is a *logos* which in the opinion of Arrian²⁵ is doubtful (*ἀδιαφήγητα . . . καὶ οὐ πάντῃ ἄπιστα, ὡς λεγόμενα μόνον*), and this too when he is writing more than three centuries after the event. Plutarch (*Vit.Alex.* 11.6) knows that Alex-

¹⁹ Diod.Sic. 11.26, cf. 14.63.1. K. F. Stroheker, *Dionysius I* (Wiesbaden 1958) 77; M.-P. Loicq-Berger, *Syracuse* (*Coll.Latomus* 87, Brussels 1967) 220ff. Hieron evidently inherited his position from Telines, his ancestor, if we may trust Didymus (schol. *Ol.* 6.158ab; 1.191 Dr.: p.219 Schmidt) who is relying apparently on Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F 96) and Philistos (*FGrHist* 556 F 49). See Hdt. 7.153.3 for the family's devotion to the *χθόνιοι θεοί*; the woman at Hdt. 6.134.1 *ὑποζάκορος τῶν χθονίων θεῶν* is a priestess of Demeter.

²⁰ With a pun *Andoc. Myst.* 124.

²¹ Kannicht on Eur. *Helen* 1300ff; cf. also *Bacchae* 275 *Δημήτηρ θεά· γῆ δ' ἔστιν. ὄνομα δ' ὀππότερον βούλει, κάλει*. But perhaps the conflation is already present at Pind. *Isth.* 7.3.

²² B. Pace, *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica* III (Rome 1945) 485ff with litt. At Athens there is a votive offering to unspecified *κόραι*, J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*² (Cambridge 1922) 289 with picture. For the Sicilian Goddess, *RE* 15 (1932) 1374 (Pfister).

²³ H. U. Instinsky, *Historia* 10 (1961) 248ff, lists unbelievers, mostly historians; skeptical too is Rosenmeyer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 330.

²⁴ J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch's Alexander* (Oxford 1969) lii and 31.

²⁵ *Anab.* proem. 3: Instinsky, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23) 248 n.1.

ander spared Pindar's descendants but does not mention a house, which is rather difficult to explain. Pliny²⁶ (*NH* 7.20 J.–M.), our earliest source for the story, listing anecdotes designed to show the greatness of writers and poets, tells us that Alexander spared the family and Penates of Pindar. We should suspect offhand that this was an elaboration of the fact, given on good authority by Arrian (*Anab.* 1.9.9), that priests and shrines were spared in the sack of Thebes. At any rate, soon afterwards Dio of Prusa (*Or.* 2.33) is able to tell us not only that Alexander spared the house, but that he did it because of the *αἰδώς* he felt toward the memory of Pindar, who had written a eulogy (fr.120+1 Sn.) of his ancestor Alexander I, son of Amyntas. This seems to be a fiction,²⁷ since the terms of Thebes' destruction were spelled out not by Alexander but specifically by the synedrion of his allies (Arrian, *Anab.* 1.9.9: Diod. 17.14.1), who would have no such *αἰδώς*. This literary fiction is exposed by Dio's further elaboration of this alleged merciful act of Alexander's (which has exact parallels in the *vitae*): *διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ Θήβας ὕστερον πορθῶν μόνην κατέλιπε τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐκείνου κελεύσας ἐπιγράψαι. Πινδάρου τοῦ μουσοποίου στέγην μὴ καίετε.*²⁸

These details are built round an original story that Pindar's house was spared, a story which recurs in sources of dubious historical validity in the first and second century. The accompanying story that the descendants of Pindar were spared may or may not be true; certainly Plutarch is to be believed when he tells us that honours were paid the descendants of Pindar in his day at Delphi (*De sera* 13, 557F), but he does not say that any survived. We would be more than justified in suspecting a five hundred year long genealogy at a time when Boeotia had been in decline for three centuries, and when Delphi was going through an archaizing phase.

Why should anyone have invented the story? Probably archaizing mythology alone would account for it, but perhaps Ziehen²⁹ may be right in attributing similar stories to a desire on the part of the romanizing Alexander historians to mitigate the apparent harshness of Alexander.

²⁶ *Idem Pindari vatis familiae penatibusque iussit parci cum Thebas raperet.*

²⁷ Despite Instinsky, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23).

²⁸ With breach of Porson's law and Havet's bridge. Dio knew Thebes, probably at first hand, but his statements are verifiably exaggerated.

²⁹ *RE* 5 A (1934) 1482.

Here we come to the evidence of Pausanias (9.25.3), who claims to have seen after crossing Dirke the ruins of Pindar's house, along with a shrine of Dindymene with a cult statue, which he saw on the one day of the year on which it was open.³⁰ At this time the great part of the ancient city lay in ruins, devastated by wars and pestilence,³¹ and only the fortress wall survived, so that the shrine that Pausanias saw may have been inside the city wall of the classical city, within the western suburbs.

But again we are faced with difficulties in Pausanias' bald statement:

(a) Pindar himself could not have used the name Dindymene; it belongs to a later time. This is important, since it means that Pausanias learnt the name (and presumably the other details) from a local historian or guide, and not from a genuine inscription on the statue. None of our other sources gives this name.

(b) Pausanias makes no mention of Pan, though he describes the statue:³² yet Aristodemus (*FGrHist* 383 F 13) says *Μητρὸς θεῶν καὶ Πανὸς ἄγαλμα*. But the scholiasts at that point show some embarrassment in including Pan in the statuery, resorting apparently to visions on a mountain: indeed 139a shows that Pan as a joint foundation was probably just one explanation of the problem.

(c) The Ambrosian *Vita*³³ says that his house is now the prytaneion. If Pindar's house was where Pausanias indicates, this cannot be true. Therefore there was an alternative location in Thebes; otherwise I cannot account for this statement short of calling it a downright invention.

In short, what Pausanias says does not really fit our other evidence at all well. Our suspicions are only confirmed when we realize that Pausanias is using sources which have much in common not only with the sources of our *vitae* but also with Aristodemus.³⁴ This is made

³⁰ Suspected by Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 270 n.1.

³¹ *RE* 5 A (1934) 1441 with references.

³² The names of the sculptors he gives are otherwise unknown: wild theories in *RE* 3 A (1929) 891 (Lippold).

³³ 1.2.10 Dr.: καὶ οὕτως μόνη ἀπόρρητος ἔμεινεν καὶ ἔστιν τὸ νῦν ἐν Θήβαις πρυτανεῖον.

³⁴ The Boeotian passages contain a large number of passages paralleled in Aelian, so O. Regenbogen, *RE* Suppl. 8 (1956) 1044ff, esp. 1048: Aelian knows our story (*VH* 13.7), cf. *Philos. Imag.* 2.12. But Pausanias used *vitae* too; see Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 8 (1873) 439 and *Reden und Vorträge* II (Berlin 1926) 268 n.1. For his use of Aristodemus in Book Nine, see Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 26 (1891) 222, and most important W. Radtke, *Hermes* 36 (1901) 71.

clear at 9.23.4 where, in describing Pindar's tomb in the hippodrome, he regales us with three stories concerning Pindar's life of which two recur in the *vitae*; these are manifest fabrications, the one referring to bees smearing honey on his lips,³⁵ the other to a marvellous vision. It is possible, though unlikely, that these stories were inscribed on the monument, as they are on the recently discovered Archilocheum on Paros, itself a fine example of the archaizing glorification of a poet by passages taken from his writings and elaborated by means of various *mirabilia*.

In any case, Pausanias' information seems to go back to the sources of all our poetic *vitae*, the peripatetic biographers and their followers, who found their way along with Aristodemus into the standard life of Pindar, whether by Didymus or Plutarch.³⁶ It becomes more than a possibility, then, that Pausanias was deceived not only by his handbooks and *vitae*, but also by local informants who were aware of these, and by inscriptions concocted on precisely such a literary foundation. I should have more hesitation in suggesting this, were it not for the fact that we know that Aristodemus popularized, indeed perhaps concocted fictitious epigrams from first century Thebes.³⁷ What is more likely than that Pausanias was led to believe that this shrine of Dindymene was the one referred to by Pindar, and that one of the many ruined houses in the neighbourhood was therefore that of Pindar? That the house had been spared was a well known story, spared not only by Alexander but also by the Spartan King Pausanias a century earlier.³⁸ Parallels, albeit mythical, were not wanting for sparing

³⁵ A biographic cliché again at Philo. *Imag.* 2.12.1, 4; I. Opelt, *VigChr* 22 (1968) 38ff.

³⁶ Eustathius in his *Vitae* (2.296.12 Dr.) quotes Plutarch for the details of his birth in Kynoskephalai; see F. H. Sandbach, *Plutarch's Moralia* 15 (London/Cambridge [Mass.] 1969) 82–83. For Didymus see G. Arrighetti, *SCO* 16 (1967) 129ff.

³⁷ On this pupil of Aristarchus, see W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der röm. Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 312, and especially Radtke, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.34) 36ff. Especially interesting is Radtke's demonstration why Aristodemus denied the existence in Thebes of the grave of the Niobids which Pausanias nonetheless (9.16.7, 9.17.2) saw; likewise his observation (p.50) that local patriotism could be relied on to produce evidence to suit a legend: ". . . so gab es gewiss für manchen mythologischen Ort in Theben mehrere wohl auch einander widersprechende Versinschriften." Many examples can be added from F. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum* (Giessen 1909–12); Kroll, *NJbb* 29 (1912) 165ff.

³⁸ This last is not merely a mistake for Alexander. It is an elaboration of the Alexander story to explain why the house was still there for Alexander to spare. Eustathius has both Alexander and Pausanias spare the house. We should not forget that Thebes was devastated again in 290 and 146, and probably again before Pausanias saw it.

houses through αἰδώς of their former occupants.³⁹ If Pindar's house and shrine were relocated in the ruined city on the basis of the Alexandrian literary tradition, a corollary would follow that they were spared in the various sacks to which the city had been subjected. One story demanded the other.

As for Aristodemus, the falsity of his explanation (rather say aetiology) is patent from the absurdity of the story itself, even though he knew Thebes at first hand. To suggest that wherever we cannot control the accounts of the *vitae*, "gute Musikertradition" or "persönliche Erinnerung" may be the cause, is unmethodical, to say the least.⁴⁰ The falsehoods of the Alexandrian biographers and their methods were well known⁴¹ before Satyros' *Life of Euripides* turned up to exemplify them. Yet they were cheerfully used by later writers as authorities, among whom were the periegetes of the Flavian period.⁴²

It is pertinent to our investigation to note that temples and shrines were particularly liable to have false histories attached to them, e.g. the Lindian temple chronicle of 99 B.C. with its list of impossible dedications by impossible benefactors, all however documented on the best possible authority by a well known antiquarian.⁴³ It comes, then, as no surprise to learn that the oldest documented forgery of this sort was in the Theban Ismeneion: it was the only one to deceive Herodotus.⁴⁴ The first and second centuries B.C. seem to have been particularly rich in well documented forgeries, so that even the best known *κτηλοκόπας* of all, Polemon, could go astray, while Pausanias himself—

³⁹ Schmid-Stählin, *GGL* I.1 (1929) 549 n.11; A. C. Pearson, *Sophocles' Fragments* I (Cambridge 1917) 86ff; especially interesting is the story of Crates the Cynic, in Diels, *PPF* (Berlin 1901) p.207.

⁴⁰ So Schwenn in *RE* 20 (1950) 1607, following Wilamowitz. A frightening example of such "persönliche Erinnerung" is Athen. 1.16f from the grammarian Apion.

⁴¹ A. Dihle, *Studien zur gr. Biographie* (Göttingen 1956) 106: "... sattsam bekannten Methode, fehlende Einzelnachrichten über Leben und Charakter eines Dichters durch kühne Auslegung geeignet erscheinender Stellen seiner ganzen Werke zu konstruieren, wobei man der Phantasie bekanntlich freiesten Spielraum gewährte." The evidence for honey on Sophocles' lips (*Vita* 22) is a fragment of comedy (Ar. fr.581 K). In *Vita* 12 he founds a shrine next to his house as a result of a vision. The parallel with the Pindaric *vita* does not inspire confidence in either.

⁴² Kroll, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.37) 311, using Aristodemus as example.

⁴³ Timachidas: C. von Blinkenberg, *Die Lindische Tempelchronik* (Bonn 1915).

⁴⁴ H. Volkmann, *Convivium. Festschrift Ziegler* (Stuttgart 1954) 41ff.

no doubt tongue in cheek—could report seeing Helen's egg and many other relics of better days.

Behind such conjectures as placing a shrine near a poet's house lies the ancient biographer's desire to bring out character traits in his subject. Thus we are told of Pindar's and Sophocles' piety but also of Pindar's and Simonides' avarice, not to mention the drunkenness of Anacreon, Aristophanes, Cratinus and Aeschylus.⁴⁵ It is unfortunate for us that these thoroughly unhistorical *vitae* had so much influence on the rhetoricians seeking exempla and the periegetes and historians seeking interesting details.

We can be sure, then, only of the following:

(a) Pindar wrote a hymn to Pan (fr.95 Sn.) in which he called him the attendant of the Magna Mater. He probably wrote in fact several hymns which were collected in the *κεχωρισμένα τῶν παρθενείων*.

(b) He wrote a hymn (fr.80 Sn.) mentioning Kybele, mother of the gods. Whether this is the same as (a) I should doubt, since she was mentioned incidentally at the end of a list of epitheta in fr.95 Sn., and there is no reason to believe that she should be mentioned again. Secondly the Philodemus quotation,⁴⁶ even if correctly supplemented *ἐν τῷ [ὑμνῷ] θεῶν Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[έρα]*, should mean that this was the beginning of the ode, and so cannot refer to the Pan hymn, whose beginning we know.

(c) In *Pyth.* 3 a prayer is made to a nearby Meter who is worshipped in some rite involving Pan and *κοῦραι*.

None of the attempts to combine (a), (b) and (c) has been satisfactory, nor is there any reason to seek a combination in the state of our knowledge,⁴⁷ or to believe those ancients who found one.

In itself the location of the goddess referred to by Pindar is unimportant; but if the story of the commentator is merely a *turpe sine pignore carmen*, two conclusions are possible which are more important. The first is that we have no external evidence for Pindar's religiosity; the second is that we have no personal reminiscence in Pindar at all. The vast literature on Pindar the man and the poet is

⁴⁵ Athen. 428f is not surprisingly from Chamaileon. For the ethical point of such anecdotes, see Kroll, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.37) 68ff; Dihle, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.41) ch.iv and 105ff, esp. 115; "... die enge Verwandtschaft der Biographie mit der Ethik ..."

⁴⁶ *De pietate* 47a17, p.19 Gomperz.

⁴⁷ J. A. Haldane, *Phoenix* 22 (1968) 18ff.

misconceived at base; there is no means by which we can approach the poetry through the poet, just as it is forbidden us by the conventional nature of choral lyric to approach the poet through his poetry.⁴⁸

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

April, 1971

⁴⁸ I am grateful to the University Seminars of Columbia University for an invitation to present the substance of this paper to a meeting of the Seminar for Classical Civilization, and for the criticism that resulted therefrom. Professor Dunbabin and Professor Paul of McMaster have discussed various points with me. I am allowed at the last moment to add a reference to M. Guarducci, *Klio* 52 (1970) 133–38, who deals with an inscription $\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\ \text{Κυβέλας}$ of the VI/VII centuries from Lokri Epizephyrii. Most important are pages 136 n.2 and 138 n.3, which go far to support my general argument. On a possible connection between Chiron, Nymphs, and a Magna Mater at Paestum, see B. Neutsch, *AbhHeidelberg* 1957, I.27.