Xanthou, Maria G.

The anxiety over Pindar's consistent inconsistency in Olympian twelve : E.L. Bundy's critical discourse and modern Pindaric hermeneutics

MARIA G. XANTHOU (ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI)

THE ANXIETY OVER PINDAR'S CONSISTENT INCONSISTENCY IN *OLYMPIAN* TWELVE: E. L. BUNDY'S CRITICAL DISCOURSE AND MODERN PINDARIC HERMENEUTICS

In the modern era of Pindaric criticism, E. L. Bundy (1962) laid emphasis on the rhetorical nature of Pindaric discourse. His method was based on close reading, the par excellence *interpretive key tool of New Criticism, and on a tradition of literary criticism using* Rhetorisierung, *an interpretive method introduced by German classical scholars at the beginning of the 20th century. In the postmodern era of classical studies the momentum of what is nowadays called* New Ritualistic Movement *(Kowalzig 2007) is urging most classical scholars to focus on a corrective effort. This effort entails that we should at least add a flare of contextualization to the Bundyan model, or at the most abandon it altogether. The appeal of the 'contextual' turn proves to be large. Thus, sketching the principles underlying the two major modern interpretive modes in Pindaric criticism looks as if these two modes represent antithetical poles that almost exclude each another.*

As a result, the paper focuses on Ol. *12 and selected passages of epinician odes, on which it is attempted to apply the ritualistic interpretive mode in juxtaposition to the Bundyan one. Its goal is to indicate that the best way to approach Pindar's epinician poetry is always to have in mind that our poet is consistently inconsistent, because the* hic et nunc *of each ode determine and shape the rhetorical devices that the poet has at his disposal and he finally uses in the ode.*

Keywords: Pindaric poetry; hermeneutics; literary interpretation; rhetoric; historicism; aestheticism.

Introduction

Through the centuries, Pindaric hermeneutics has evolved through various phases and shaped many different approaches. Chronologically placed

in the heyday of New Criticism and based on a tradition of literary criticism using *Rhetorisierung*, E. L. Bundy laid emphasis on the rhetorical nature of Pindaric discourse, as the Subject Index of his *Studia Pindarica* indicate.[1] As the text proper of these two short monographs reveal, he has developed his critical discourse, based on a close reading of the ancient text. First published in 1962, *Studia Pindarica* are still considered a groundbreaking work. However, their reception was marked by controversy, because some scholars had criticized Bundy for not treating Pindar's poetry as poetry *per se* and thus ignoring its quality and virtues. Their author had professed that the study of Pindar in particular must become a study of genre,[2] and that only by analysing the poet's choice of formulae, motifs, themes, topics, and set sequences[3] can a correct view of the odes be arrived at.[4] Hence, he focused on his view that we have in Pindar an oral, public, epideictic literature dedicated to the single purpose of eulogizing men and communities.[5]

In other words, Bundy asserts the importance of pursuing a grammar of choral style that will tell us what systems of shared symbols enabled the poet and his audience to view the odes as unified artistic wholes.[6] His last phrase, namely, "unified artistic wholes", reveals a strong influence exerted from the German school of thought, whose beginning lies in August Boeckh's *Einheitstheorie*.[7]

---

1   BUNDY, ELROY L. 1986. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 125–135; see also the preface of HUBBARD, THOMAS. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, vii.

2   BUNDY (1986: 92).

3   Ibid.

4   BURTON, R. W. B. [REV.]. 1963. "Studies in Pindar." *The Classical Review*, n.s. 13, 144.

5   BUNDY (1986: 35); BURTON (1963: 144).

6   BUNDY (1962: 32); WELLS, JAMES B. 2009. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Center for Hellenic Studies: Hellenic Studies Series, 40. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 17.

7   SCHADEWALDT, WOLFGANG. 1928 [1966]. *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 259 [1]: "Nach der Einheit pindarischer Gedichte zu fragen galt bis vor kurzem freilich fast als Ketzerei, nachdem A. B. Drachmann die Betrachtungsweise August Boeckhs zum Exponenten der ‚Einheitstheorien' gemacht hatte und ihr prinzipiell und empirisch zu Leibe gegangen war."; see also HUBBARD (1985: 1); for Boeckh's view on the notion of "unity" see BOECKH, AUGUSTUS. 1821. *Pindari Opera quae supersunt. Tomi secundi pars altera: Pindari Interpretatio Latina cum commentario perpetuo fragmenta et indices*. Lipsiae: Weigel, 6, and BOECKH, AUGUST. 1830. "Kritik der Ausgabe des Pindar von Dissen." In ASCHERSON, FERDINAND – EICHHOLTZ PAUL [EDS.]. *August Boeckh Gesammelte*

Bundy's way: reviving rhetorical theory and the German school of thought

With its limited size *Ol.* 12 provides a working example of Bundy's interpretive mode. This ode was composed for Ergoteles, an exile from Knossos due to civil strife, settled in Himera, who won his first Olympian victory in the dolichos.[8] He eventually became a double περιοδονίκης in the same type of long race.[9] In his brief analysis of *Ol.* 12 Bundy focuses on the rhetorical patterns and encomiastic *topoi*, found ubiquitously in Pindaric *epinicia*. This focus is largely practiced by using rhetorical terms, for example, priamel, gnomic cap, name cap, climactic term, crescendo, and similar terms.[10] Particular emphasis is laid on the introductory priamel of *Ol.* 12, extending up to v. 6a and occupying the strophe:

Ol. 12.1–6a (M. post S.)[11]
Λίσσομαι, παῖ Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου,
Ἱμέραν εὐρυσθενέ᾽ ἀμφιπόλει, σώτειρα Τύχα.
τὶν γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ κυβερνῶνται θοαί
νᾶες, ἐν χέρσῳ τε λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι
κἀγοραὶ βουλαφόροι. αἵ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν
πόλλ᾽ ἄνω, τὰ δ᾽ αὖ κάτω
ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ᾽ ἐλπίδες·
[…]

According to Bundy, this priamel serves as a foil for Ergoteles' Olympian success. It portrays a gloomy setting of instability and volatile reverse of fortune, being in tune with Ergoteles' historical background. Therefore, the priamel turns political exile after a bloody revolt into a dark foil for an Olympian victory.[12]

Kleine Schriften, vol. VII: Kritiken nebst einem Anhang. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2005, 369–403, esp. 384–385; for a diachronic overview on "Einheitstheorie", see KÖHNKEN, ADOLF. 1971. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1–18.

[8]   See Σ ad *Ol.* 12, Inscr. a, b Dr.

[9]   Paus. 6.4.11.3–11.

[10]   BUNDY (1986: 51–52); for all these terms see also BUNDY's (1986: 125–135) Subject Index.

[11]   In all occasions I cite the Pindaric text as edited by MAEHLER, HERWIG [ED.]. 1997. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Pars I: Epinicia, post Brunonem Snell edidit Hervicus Maehler*. Editio Stereotypa Editionis Octavae (MCMLXXXVII). Stutgardiae – Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner.

[12]   BUNDY (1986: 51).

The structure of the ode is plain. The priamel (vv. 1–6a), cast as an invocation to *Τύχα* (v. 2), is capped by a gnomic utterance:

Ol. 12.5–6a (M. post. S.)
αἵ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν
πόλλ᾽ ἄνω, τὰ δ᾽ αὖ κάτω
ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ᾽ ἐλπίδες·
[…].

Bundy construes the antistrophe (vv. 7–12a) as an attempt to gloss the above-mentioned gnomic cap with what he calls "vicissitude foil"[13] or the *ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλος* motif[14] in the antistrophe:

Ol. 12.7–12a (M. post S.)
σύμβολον δ᾽ οὔ πώ τις ἐπιχθονίων
πιστὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἐσσομένας εὗρεν θεόθεν,
τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί·
πολλὰ δ᾽ ἀνθρώποις παρὰ γνώμαν ἔπεσεν,
ἔμπαλιν μὲν τέρψιος, οἱ δ᾽ ἀνιαραῖς
ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις
ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πήματος ἐν μικρῷ πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ.

The vicissitude motif then introduces the name cap (v. 13 υἱὲ *Φιλάνορος*), i.e. the standard reference of the name of the victor, father, polis and event,[15] reinforced by asseveration, of the epode:[16]

Ol. 12.13–19 (M. post S.)
υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἤτοι καὶ τεά κεν
ἐνδομάχας ἅτ᾽ ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ᾽ ἑστίᾳ
ἀκλεὴς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε(ν) ποδῶν,
εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ᾽ ἄμερσε πάτρας.
νῦν δ᾽ Ὀλυμπίᾳ στεφανωσάμενος
καὶ δὶς ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοῖ τ᾽, Ἐργότελες,
θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν λουτρὰ βαστάζεις ὁμι-
λέων παρ᾽ οἰκείαις ἀρούραις.

Bundy also underlines the supplementary function of both the strophe (vv. 1–6a) and antistrophe (7–12a), because the vicissitude foil, occupying both,

---

13   BUNDY (1986: 52).

14   KRAUSE, JUTTA. 1976. *ΑΛΛΟΤΕ ΑΛΛΟΣ: Untersuchung zum Motiv des Schicksalswechsels in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides*. München: Tuduv-Verlagsgesellschaft, 115–116.

15   BUNDY (1962: 20).

16   BUNDY (1986: 52).

is intended to provide a background for the changing fortunes of Ergoteles. Exiled from Knossos, but finding political sanctuary at Himera, Ergoteles has prospered and now [v. 18 *νῦν δ΄(έ)*] wears an Olympic crown.[17] As a result, Bundy's analysis considers the epode (vv. 13–19) featuring a common *topos* in Pindaric epinicia, an experience transformed from bitter to triumphant through the twist of fortune.[18] He also considers the citation of Ergoteles' current athletic success (vv. 17–19) the climactic term of the above *topos*.[19]

Bundy's stated scope draws on what could be called the German school of thought on the interpretation of Pindaric poetry. Two monographs, the first by Franz Dornseiff and the second by Wolfgang Schadewaldt, mainly represent this school, and both exerted a strong influence on Bundy's *Studia Pindarica*.[20] Already in the preface of his *Pindars Stil* published in 1921, Dornseiff uses a language full of rhetorical terms, which anticipate his rhetorical interpretation of Pindaric poetry: "Es gibt für viele griechische Dichter Arbeiten de genere dicendi, Programme über einzelne Tropen und Figuren."[21] Although trying to underline the need for classical scholars to venture research toward this type of interpretation, he notes: "Aber mit der Menge des noch zu Leistenden verglichen, liegt für altgriechische Semasiologie, Synonymik und Stilistik wenig Gedrucktes vor, und es wäre sehr zu begrüßen, wenn mehr Kräfte sich diesen vernachläßigten Gebieten zuwenden würden." Though he encourages the use of semantics and stylistics in literary interpretation, he also recommends the link between literary history and what he calls *Stilphysiognomik* to avenge the danger of literary history becoming a mere catalogue of biographical data, subjective reports, evaluation, and reinterpretation of the literary material.[22]

Although Dornseiff is preoccupied with tracing Pindar's literary style, Wolfgang Schadewaldt is concerned with a notion inherited by Boeckh,

---

[17]   BUNDY (1986: 52).

[18]   BUNDY (1986: 52) cites *I.* 1.34–40, *I.* 7.23–38, *I.* 4.16–19, *P.* 5.10–11, as parallels of the abovementioned *topos*.

[19]   BUNDY (1986: 52).

[20]   As can be seen in BUNDY'S citation (1986: 4, 6) of these two monographs at an early stage: 4, for Dornseiff; 6, for Schadewaldt; however, Bundy's intellectual debt toward Dornseiff and Schadewaldt is better appreciated in his application of their method than by often citation of their works; *pace* WELLS, JAMES BRADLEY. 2009. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 16.

[21]   DORNSEIFF, FRANZ. 1921. *Pindars Stil*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, iii; with the terms "Arbeiten" and "Programme" Dornseiff refers to small scale printed studies on the use of rhetorical figures, published as booklets.

[22]   DORNSEIFF (1921: 3).

the unity of the Pindaric ode (*Einheitstheorie*). Seven years after Dornseiff's monograph, in his 1928 *Aufbau* Schadewaldt starts from A. Boeckh's *Einheitstheorie* and he considers the form of the Pindaric ode a unity molded in three aspects: (a) stylistic-formal, (b) objective-historical, and (c) subjective-personal.[23] Being in alignment with Dornseiff he asserts that the stylistic-formal aspect is predominant.[24] However, Schadewaldt considers these aspects equal to three, different, viewpoints of applied scholarly criticism. He stresses the need to analyse Pindar's poetry according to these three viewpoints. The first viewpoint, the stylistic-formal, corresponds to the tradition of genre (*Tradition des Genos*) and examines how Pindar exploited the opportunities given to him by this tradition of genre and how the critic is to understand the forms of thought, impressed on the poet's mind. Second, the objective-historical, defines the Program of each poem from the outset, so as for the critic to track down what were the external realities Pindar had to consider. Third, the subjective-personal, examines how Pindar handled the given task."[25] Conclusively, Dornseiff's and Schadewaldt's preference for the stylistic-formal aspect informs the agenda of Bundy's *Studia Pindarica*.

The modern era of Pindaric hermeneutics: from the 90's and onwards

The modern era of Pindaric hermeneutics has been marked by three important developments in recent studies of epinician performance: first, the last quarter of the twentieth century has been marked by "the choral-monody debate" as featured in a series of articles, which have been categorized under the above rubric. Classical scholars, such as Lefkowitz,[26] Heath,[27]

---

23   SCHADEWALDT (1928: 261).

24   SCHADEWALDT (1928: 263); WELLS (2009: 16–17).

25   SCHADEWALDT (1928: 263).

26   LEFKOWITZ, MARY R. 1963. "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 67, 177–253; EAD. 1988. "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?" *American Journal of Philology*, 109, 1–11; EAD. 1991. *First Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; EAD. 1995. "The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered – Again." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studie*s, 40, 139–150.

27   HEATH, MALCOLM. 1988. "Receiving the Κῶμος: the Context and Performance of Epinician." *American Journal of Philology*, 109, 180–195.

Burnett,[28] Carey,[29] Heath & Lefkowitz,[30] and Morgan[31] have been engaged in this debate arguing for the performance of an epinician ode by a single singer or by a chorus; second, Hilary Mackie's monograph,[32] published in 2003, recaptures Bundy's claim that the conventions of Pindar's epinicia should be interpreted with a view to the function of the odes, which is the praise for the victor;[33] third, the new historicism featuring in Kurke's,[34] Dougherty's[35] and Nicholson's[36] monographs is a scholarly trend, which revives historicism as an interpretive approach. However, this new, scholarly trend is different from Wilamowitz's[37] purely historicist approach of Pindaric poetry. Wilamowitz's aim was to reconstruct Pindar's life and the circumstances that influenced it.[38] The methodological approach of all the above neo-historicist studies have been criticized by J. B. Wells.[39] Wells considers that the methodological agenda underlying all these studies is first, the reconstruction of a hypothetical contextual backdrop of historical

28   BURNETT, ANNE P. 1989. "Performing Pindar's Odes." *Classical Philology*, 84, 283–293.

29   CAREY, CHRISTOPHER. 1989. "The Performance of the Victory Ode." *American Journal of Philology*, 110, 545–565; CAREY, CHRISTOPHER. 1991. "The Victory Ode in Performance: the Case for the Chorus." *Classical Philology*, 86, 192–200.

30   HEATH, MALCOLM & LEFKOWITZ, MARY R. 1991. "Epinician Performance." *Classical Philology*, 86, 173–191.

31   MORGAN, KATHRYN A. 1993. "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ." *Classical Philology*, 88, 1–15.

32   MACKIE, HILARY. 2003. *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

33   BUNDY (1986: 3); BUDELMANN, FELIX. [REV.]. 2003. "Hilary Mackie, Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise. Anna Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003. Pp. 127. ISBN 0-472-11330-5." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* [retrieved August 10, 2010, from http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2003/2003-12-26.html]

34   KURKE, LESLIE. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

35   DOUGHERTY, CAROL. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

36   NICHOLSON, NIGEL JAMES. 2005. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

37   VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, ULRICH. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlag.

38   YOUNG, DAVID C. 1970. "Pindaric Criticism." In CALDER III, WILLIAM M. – STERN J. [EDS.] *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1–95, esp. 52.

39   WELLS, JAMES BRADLEY. 2009. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

events and circumstances putatively associated with the composition of an individual victory song; and second, the interpretation of individual passages or songs based on such a reconstructed contextual backdrop.[40]

Mackie's *Graceful Errors*: revamping Bundy's theory in the 21st century C.E.

In her monograph, *Graceful Errors* Hilary Mackie studies Pindar's epinician poetry from the perspective of performance.[41] Her agenda is informed by Bundy's earlier claim that the conventions of Pindar's epinicia should be interpreted with a view to the function of the odes, namely, the praise of the victor.[42] On many occasions, she acknowledges her debt to Bundy[43] and her Bundyan vein could be traced throughout *Graceful Errors*. A notable example is how she interprets *Ol.* 12. In a paraphrase of the ode, Mackie underlines the poet's attempt to interpret contemporary events from a perspective that enables him to find order and meaning in what may look to others like disaster.[44] She holds that the poet's aim is to explain the earlier misfortunes of Ergoteles, namely, his exile from his homeland, Knossos, optimistically. According to Mackie, this attempt to reconcile the disparate realia of Ergoteles' historical background is better realized in

Ol. 12.13–16 (M. post S.)
υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἤτοι καὶ τεά κεν
ἐνδομάχας ἅτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἑστίᾳ
ἀκλεὴς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε(ν) ποδῶν,
εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας

where the poet's long-term, quasi-prophetic perspective is at work.[45] Here, the poet professes that without the negative twist of fortune Ergoteles

---

40   WELLS (2009: 5).

41   MACKIE (2003: 1).

42   BUNDY (1986: 3): "I have observed and catalogued a host of these conventions and find that is not in its primary intent encomiastic – that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular person."; MACKIE (2003: 4); BUDELMANN, F. [REV.]. Hilary Mackie, *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise*. In BMCR [2003.12.26], 2003.12.26. Available from URL http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2003/2003-12-26.html [quoted 2010-08-10].

43   MACKIE (2003: 1–4, 6–7, 10–11, 21, 42, 53, 71, 76–78).

44   MACKIE (2003: 84).

45   MACKIE (2003: 84).

would never have won the eventual $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}o\varsigma$.[46] This is also Mackie's major interpretive deviation from Bundyan hermeneutics. Mackie argues that what has been registered by Bundy as "dark foil", namely, the priamel with its gloomy setting of instability and volatile reverse of fortune, is a common statement about the uncertainty of the future, often coupled with wishes and prayers for the future. The reason for this odd combination lies in the poet's need to satisfy various audiences, divine and human.[47] The prophetic status of the poet is based on two abilities: (a) to detect long-term patterns in past and present, and (b) to mediate between human beings and gods. The statements about human limitations do not serve as "dark foils", but rather as the poet's understanding of the rightful place of mortals, which lends strength to his prayers.[48] However, criticism has added one disclaimer on Mackie's interpretive approach. Wells has recently noted that that she approaches genre and convention from an outside-in perspective, from which the relationship between Pindar and his audience is a matter of fulfilling prefabricated roles.[49]

Kurke's *The traffic in Praise*: neo-historicism without reconstruction of the past

Leslie Kurke's revolutionizing study *The Traffic in Praise* cannot be categorized as a typical "new historicist" work.[50] As criticism has noted, this study achieves two major goals: first, it sees all aspects of society as interlinked, and thus reads the odes of Pindar against their social context; second, it is an innovative but more subtle work.[51] Being aware that the Pindaric ode is an agalma,[52] in the sense it equals with a dedication composed of words, but similar in form and intent to the statues and treasuries, which adorned the great Panhellenic sanctuaries of Greece, the author pro-

---

[46]   MACKIE (2003: 84).

[47]   MACKIE (2003: 78); BUDELMANN (2003).

[48]   MACKIE (2003: 105–106); BUDELMANN (2003).

[49]   WELLS (2009: 5).

[50]   CRANE, G. [REV.]. Leslie Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. In BMCR [02.05.11] 02.05.11. Available from URL http://bmcr. brynmawr.edu/1991/02.05.11.html [quoted 2010-08-20].

[51]   CRANE (1991).

[52]   However, the best example against this view remains *N.* 5.1–3 (M. post S.).

vides new insights on the influence exerted by literary artifacts like epini-
cian odes on physical forms of building and dedication.[53]

Kurke considers *Ol.* 12 offering a good model for one of the key ideas
she is pursuing in her study, namely, the heroic or agonistic necessity for the
individual to leave home and to return bearing the glory he has won.[54] She
points out that Pindar's attributing to saving Fortune (v. 2 σώτειρα Τύχα)
the victor's expulsion from his Cretan homeland due to civil strife is the
key notion throughout the ode.[55] While analysing *Ol.* 12.17–19 (M. post S.)

νῦν δ᾽ Ὀλυμπίᾳ στεφανωσάμενος
καὶ δὶς ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοῖ τ᾽, Ἐργότελες,
θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν λουτρὰ βαστάζεις ὁμι
        λέων παρ᾽ οἰκείαις ἀρούραις

Kurke considers how saving Fortune works, namely, she is a benevolent
"saving" goddess because she has given Ergoteles, first, the occasion to
leave home and win kleos and, then, a home to which he can return.[56] She
lays special emphasis on the final words παρ᾽ οἰκείαις ἀρούραις (v. 19),
because only with these words is the victor's return completed and the ad-
jective οἰκείαις implies that the victor is not an isolated individual, for his
holdings in Sicily constitute an oikos.[57]

Taking also into account the dominant imagery of sea travel in the strophe
(vv. 1–6a) and antistrophe (vv. 7–12a), Kurke connects it with the victor's
literal homecoming and the metaphor of nostos that shapes the entire poem.[58]
The same type of interpretation is applied in *Ol.* 12.11–12a (M. post S.)

[…], οἱ δ᾽ ἀνιαραῖς
ἀντικύρσαντες ζάλαις
ἐσλὸν βαθὺ πήματος ἐν μικρῷ πεδάμειψαν χρόνῳ.

In the previous vv. the nautical imagery remains, but the poet moves on
from the most general statement of *Ol.* 12.5–6a (M. post S.)

κἀγοραὶ βουλαφόροι. αἵ γε μὲν ἀνδρῶν
πόλλ᾽ ἄνω, τὰ δ᾽ αὖ κάτω

---

53   CRANE (1991).
54   KURKE (1991: 32).
55   KURKE (1991: 32–33).
56   KURKE (1991: 32).
57   KURKE (1991: 32–33).
58   KURKE (1991: 33).

ψεύδη μεταμώνια τάμνοισαι κυλίνδοντ' ἐλπίδες·
[…]

to the specific application to the victor in vv. 11–12a. *Βαθύ* (v. 12a) suggests the open sea, but calm rather than storm. These have survived, but they are not home yet. Then the epode and the entire poem end with a different kind of water, the warm baths of the Nymphs, in v. 19.[59]

Athanassaki's *Ἀείδετο πὰν τέμενος* and Kowalzig's Singing for the Gods: performance and ritual studies reloaded

One of the recent breakthroughs in Pindaric hermeneutics is Lucia Athanassaki's *Ἀείδετο πὰν τέμενος* book-length study.[60] The main idea that Athanassaki promotes is that choral odes cannot be interpreted simply as the outcome of genre conventions; one must focus on the relationship between the ode and the context of its performance, especially the occasion of its composition, the religious setting of its performance, and its ideological agenda. The author discusses issues of re-performance and re-performability.[61] One of its most important contributions is Athanassaki's argument that both poet and audience are viewers of the monuments linked to the original performance, so the enactment of the odes functions as an extension of that viewing experience as with *P*. 6:[62]

> *P*. 6.1–18 (M. post S.)
> *Ἀκούσατ'· ἦ γὰρ ἑλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας*
> *ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων*
> *ἀναπολίζομεν, ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου*
> *χθονὸς ἐς νάϊον προσοιχόμενοι·*
> *Πυθιόνικος ἔνθ' ὀλβίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις*
> *ποταμίᾳ τ' Ἀκράγαντι καὶ μὰν Ξενοκράτει*

---

59   KURKE (1991: 33–34).

60   ATHANASSAKI, LUCIA. 2009. *Ἀείδετο πὰν τέμενος: οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη κλασική περίοδο* [=*Choral Performances and Their Audience in the Archaic and Early Classical Periods*]. Ηράκλειο: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης.

61   LADIANOU, K. [REV.]. Lucia Athanassaki, *Ἀείδετο πὰν τέμενος: οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη κλασική περίοδο*. (*Choral Performances and Their Audience in the Archaic and Early Classical Periods*). In BMCR [2010.09.21], 2010.09.21. Available from URL <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2010/2010-09-21.html> [quoted 2010-08-25].

62   ATHANASSAKI (2009: 126–163).

ἑτοῖμος ὕμνων θησαυρὸς ἐν πολυχρύσῳ
Ἀπολλωνίᾳ τετείχισται νάπᾳ·

τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθών
ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας
στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχούς
ἁλὸς ἄξοισι παμφόρῳ χεράδει
τυπτόμενον. φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ
πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ
λόγοισι θνατῶν εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν
Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ

which according to Athanassaki[63] following Brinkmann[64] recalls the frieze of the Siphnians' treasury.

Other scholars have pursued this line of inquiry, but Athanassaki's achievement emerges in her discussion of the analogies between the visual and poetic representation that the audience is invited to find. For Athanassaki, the poetic representation of the performance seeks to preserve the memory of the epinician ritual for emotional and ideological reasons.[65] Her approach continues and expands Kurke's seminal train of thought. In her brief discussion of *Ol.* 12 Athanassaki endorses Kurke's proposition that in this ode the poet promotes the heroic or agonistic necessity for the individual to leave home and to return bearing the glory he has won.[66] She also underlines the vicissitude of fate, the beneficial turnout of Ergoteles' initial misfortune, and the concluding emphasis laid by the poet on Ergoteles' conferring κλέος to his permanent place of residence, Himera (v. 19 ὁμιλέων παρ' οἰκείαις ἀρούραις).[67]

Barbara Kowalzig's seminal work on performances of myth and ritual counts amongst the latest contributions on ritual enactments of mythical narrative.[68] Her study provides a multilayered analysis, which combines the understanding of choral performance with narrative history, a profusion of

---

63   ATHANASSAKI (2009: 132–146).

64   BRINKMANN, VINZENZ. 1985. "Die aufgemalten Namensbeischriften an Nord- und Ostfries des Siphnierschatzhauses." *BCH*, 109, 77–130; BRINKMANN, VINZENZ. 1994. *Beobachtungen zum formalen Aufbau und zum Sinngehalt der Friese des Siphnierschatzhauses*. München: Biering & Brinkmann, *passim*.

65   LADIANOU (2010).

66   KURKE (1991: 32).

67   ATHANASSAKI (2009: 262).

68   KOWALZIG, BARBARA. 2007. *Singing for the Gods. Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

myth, archaeology, and epigraphy.[69] According to Kowalzig, cultic choral songs in specific ritual contexts narrate myths of how the rituals arose. It is by looking at these concrete situations, in which myth and ritual closely interact, that we can best understand the old (and often abstractly formulated) problem of the relationship between myth and ritual. Although Kowalzig describes the long history of this controversy, it is not her primary concern, which is rather with the social and political effects of this interaction of myth and ritual, in choral performances that lend themselves to the definition, negotiation, and redefinition of group identity and of power relations.

Such performances are traditional, and guarantee stability.[70] Yet they can take on an active share in social and historical developments of their time and effect cultural change. The former function may, paradoxically, contribute to the latter. The implication of unchangeability in the choral performance of myth and ritual, say in a performance in the Heraion by its new Argive masters, may contribute to the establishment of their control by implying that their sacred authority was long standing. Kowalzig's position is that ritual and myth, rather than saying the same thing, say more if related to each other, and thereby contribute a fundamental part in historical processes. They do so by, in a sense, abolishing history. A cultic *aition* seems to establish a timeless continuity between the moment of origins and today.[71] Ritual too transcends historical time, implying by its archaism and repetition that it has always been the same. However, these implicit claims to continuity belong in fact to a constant attempt to re-create the relationship between the past and a constantly changing present.

Kowalzig uses *Ol.* 7 as an example. In particular, in

Ol. 7.77–81 (M. post S.)
τόθι λύτρον συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὺ Τλαπολέμῳ
ἵσταται Τιρυνθίων ἀρχαγέτᾳ,
ὥσπερ θεῷ,
μήλων τε κνισάεσσα πομπὰ
καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ᾽ ἀέθλοις. τῶν ἄνθεσι Διαγόρας
ἐστεφανώσατο δίς, […],

---

69   SEAFORD, R. [REV.]. Barbara Kowalzig, *Singing for the Gods. Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. In BMCR [2008.09.25], 2008.09.25. Available from URL <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2008/2008-09-25.html> [quoted 2010-08-27].

70   KOWALZIG (2007: 5).

71   KOWALZIG (2007: 27).

she interprets τόθι as the local reference to create continuity from the mythical past, so elaborately told, into the ritual present, and the narrative seems to glide into the ritual celebration at this point. The transition from ritual to myth and myth to ritual in this song establishes the worship of Tlepolemos as the link between the two-time spheres of myth and ritual in the performance.[72]

Silk's aestheticism: Pindar's poetry as poetry

There is a new, fourth development in Pindaric studies, which in my view, treats Pindaric odes more profoundly. In 2007, Michael S. Silk professed that the easiest way of illuminating Pindar's poetry 'as poetry' is through a close reading of a Pindaric ode.[73] As mentioned earlier, close reading is the scholarly method, also used by Bundy in his analysis of Pindaric *epinicia*. Hardly a Bundyist, Silk, however, advocates for the perception of the epinician ode as a celebration of, but also around, athletic victory.[74] This enacted celebration (as Pindar's concentrated language makes it) involves victor, kin, city, echoes the aristocratic value system, is made of the plasticity of a mythic-ideological tradition, and based on the inherited poetic-linguistic tradition in which all the above are embodied.[75] Using *Ol.* 12 as a working example, because of its brevity, homogeneity, and intensively organized structure, Silk stresses the elevated[76] – even heightened[77] tone of Pindaric verse. Underlining the intensive schematizing in stanzas I and II, Silk stresses the exact parallelism in:

a. the exact parallels ἐν πόντῳ ~ ἐν χέρσῳ (vv. 3–4),
b. the chiastic sequence of adjective, noun: noun, adjective: λαιψηροὶ πόλεμοι | κἀγοραὶ βουλαφόροι (vv. 4–5),
c. the matching σύμβολον ~ πιστόν (vv. 7–8) located at the beginning of successive cola,

---

72   Kowalzig (2007: 247).

73   Silk, Michael. 2007. "Pindar's Poetry as Poetry: A Literary Commentary on Olympian 12". In Hornblower Simon – Morgan Catherine [eds.]. *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, 177.

74   Silk (2007: 196).

75   Silk (2007: 196).

76   Silk (2007: 179).

77   Silk (2007: 180).

    d. the contrasting ἐπιχθονίων (v. 7) ~ θεόθεν (v. 8), concluding each verse.[78]

According to Silk, each of the three stanzas contains its own major image, maritime in the strophe (6–7) and the antistrophe (12–13), and the fighting cock in the epode (14–15). Silk construes the first image as the black and beautiful dismissal of human hope. The maritime image represents the darkly felicitous Pindar familiar to even casual reader, while the cock the elusively humorous Pindar.[79] These images equal with discreet switches of tone, evading the notice of the earnest Bundyan, the anxious neo-historicist, and many others between and besides.[80] By these words, Silk acknowledges the existence of many interpretive modes in Pindaric criticism. However, he confers a benefit to the epinician ode as the literary and aesthetic output of an artist, who is solely responsible for his work.

As one can realize, Silk dismisses the Bundyan interpretive mode, shifts to the poet himself and considers the text an extension of the poetic genius. He interprets the text as the literary outcome of aesthetic value. He sums up his thesis and almost concludes his literary commentary on *Ol.* 12, by discarding the precedence given by a host of influential interpreters, from Elroy L. Bundy to Leslie Kurke, to praise as the key notion for Pindaric hermeneutics. He regards this precedence as a means for unnecessarily vulgarizing Pindar's celebration.[81] However, he admits the existence of praise, but hardly as the 'point' of an ode. This praise is correlated with the framework formed by the occasion of an athletic event and its socially approved outcome, and offers a celebration of value arising from and connected with the specific occasion and outcome, because both are the starting point of the Pindaric epinician ode.[82] Hence, his critical stance equals with a foil to Bundy's interpretive mode.

Conclusion

This article focused on various modes of Pindaric interpretation. All of them underline how multifaceted Pindar's text is. They also stress its kaleidoscopic nature, because one can follow various trains of thought while

---

78   SILK (2007: 195).
79   SILK (2007: 195).
80   SILK (2007: 195).
81   SILK (2007: 196).
82   SILK (2007: 196).

reading a Pindaric epinician ode, but still reach to one certain conclusion that these odes are mainly artifacts made of best-quality materials. Despite their fluidity and to a degree arbitrariness, Pindaric hermeneutics have helped us so far increase our philological awareness and understand how multilayered these odes are and how deep one can search so one can cherish their quality. Moreover, modern Pindaric hermeneutics have provided philologists with additional interpretive tools that paved new ways for scholarly research. New readings cater for new modes of interpretation and, despite their interpretive variety, Pindaric odes will always reinforce their volatile literary nature, not standing there like the statues in the proemium of *N.* 5.1–3 (M. post. S.):

Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ’, ὥστ’ ἐλινύσοντα ἐργά-
ζεσθαι ἀγάλματ’ ἐπ’ αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος
ἑσταότ’· ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ’ ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ’ ἀοιδά
στεῖχ’(ε), […],

rather escaping a typecast interpretation. In this way, they display their only standard literary property, their consistent inconsistency[83] of modes or tropes *de genere dicendi*. Thus, they set the standard and urge us to invent perspectives to interpret with scholarly precision their aesthetic value and their factual entity within their cultural context and within the context of our modern civilization.

---

83   I borrow the term from SILK, MICHAEL S. 1996. "The People of Aristophanes." In SEGAL, ERICH [ED.]. *Oxfords Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, 229–251, esp. 240.