C H R I S   E C K E R M A N

# Pindar's Olympian 1, 1 – 7 and its Relation to Bacchylides 3, 85 – 87

*Summary* – Scholars generally assume that Olympian 1, 1–7 and Bacchylides 3, 85–87 contain priamels. I argue that these passages do not contain priamels. I suggest that we have thought that these passages contain priamels because we have not recognized Pindar's and Bacchylides' metaphorical language. At Bacchylides 3, 85–87, Bacchylides caps Olympian 1, 1–7, while making the argument with Hieron, the patron of both Olympian 1 and Bacchylides 3, that Bacchylides is a better poet than Pindar.

P. Oxy. 2432 (PMG 541 = Poltera 256), usually attributed to Simonides (less often to Bacchylides), preserves nearly fifteen lines of melic poetry.[1] The preserved section begins as follows:[2]

> τό τ]ε καλὸν κρίνει τό τ' αἰσχρόν· εἰ δέ
> …κ]α̣καγορεῖ τις ἄθυρον [σ]τόμα
> περι]φέρ[ω]ν, ὁ μὲν καπνὸς ἀτελής, ὁ δέ[
> χρυ]σὸς οὐ μιαίνετ[α]ι,
> 5   ἁ δ'] ἀλά̣θε[ι]α παγκρατής·

"...distinguishes between the noble and the base; and if someone defames him, carrying around a mouth unbarred, the smoke is ineffectual, and the gold is not tarnished, and truth is all-powerful."[3]

I am interested in this passage for the metaphor that it contains. In lines 3, 4, and 5, there are references to smoke, gold, and truth. Given the context,

---

[1] For productive comments on a previous version of this paper, I thank anonymous referees. I also thank David Larmour, Donald Lavigne, and Peter Miller, both for comments and for *xenia* at Texas Tech, where I first had the pleasure of discussing these materials in spring of 2016.

[2] For discussion, see Ferreira 2013, 199f.; Poltera 2008, 435–444, with reference to previous bibliography.

[3] Text and translation: Campbell 1991, 432f. On line 2, see now, however, Henry (1998, 303), who suggests μεγ]αλαγορεῖ in place of κ]α̣καγορεῖ (suggested by Treu 1960, 321f.) and suggests, accordingly, that smoke is a metaphor for 'braggart's chatter'. For the argument developed here, it is important to note that the smoke is a metaphor for ill-speech, whether we interpret the smoke as slander or bragging.

we should conclude that the smoke (and probably the gold) is a metaphor. Scholars regularly gloss the smoke as slander and suggest that the gold is the man (or his character) who remains untarnished in the face of slander.[4] I think it is possible that the gold serves as a metaphor for the man's wealth, rather than for the man himself (given the manner in which gold is used in Olympian 1, Olympian 3, and in Bacchylides 3, as noted below). Regardless, in addition to noting the metaphorical language, I note that the smoke and gold, elements of nature, are in close spatial relation in this passage. Henderson refers to such practice as 'imagery in clusters'.[5] In what follows, I shall suggest that Pindar, in Olympian 1, and Bacchylides, in Bacchylides 3, similarly employ imagery in clusters, with elements of nature, and that their elements, on occasion, similarly serve as metaphors.[6]

The opening of Olympian 1 is one of the most famous passages of Pindaric poetry, but it is not uncommon to find scholars using expressions of *aporia* in reference to interpreting the passage.[7] I believe that the common scholarly *aporia* derives from our generally interpreting Pindar's language in a literal manner when we should interpret some of it metaphorically.[8] Accordingly, I suggest here a new interpretation. In relation to the contemporary *opinio communis*, I argue for a new interpretation of ὕδωρ in line 1, for a new interpretation of φίλον ἦτορ in line 4, and for a new interpretation of ἀελίου, ἄστρον, and related materials in lines 5 and 6. I also suggest new avenues of interpretation for line 7. The lines in question are the following:[9]

---

[4] On smoke: Ferreira 2013, 201; Henry 1998, 303; Campbell 1991, 433. On gold: Ferreira 2013, 201; Henderson 1999, 97. For smoke as slander, see too N. 1, 24, with Carey 1981, 112.

[5] 1999, 95.

[6] For clustered metaphorical elements in Pindar (water and smoke), see too N. 1, 24, with Carey 1981, 112, and footnote 23 below.

[7] Recently, for example, Maslov (2015, 162) refers to the opening as having an 'elusive simile', and Briand (2014, viii) refers to the opening as 'mal connu' and to its images as 'énigmatiques'. Finley (1955, 51) says the opening, in respect to interpretation, 'remains dark'.

[8] Sandin (2014) recently also turns to metaphor to explicate the opening. He suggests that water is the Isthmos (or the Isthmos and Nemea), that gold is Delphi, and that the sun is Olympia. Sandin does not provide appropriate *comparanda* for his argument, however. Accordingly, his suggestions seem implausible to me.

[9] All excerpts of text are taken from Snell and Maehler's edition of Pindar (1987) and from Maehler's edition of Bacchylides (1982).

ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·
εἰ δ᾽ ἄεθλα γαρύεν
ἔλδεαι, φίλον ἦτορ,
5　μηκέθ᾽ ἀελίου σκόπει
ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἁμέρᾳ φαεννὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι᾽ αἰθέρος,
μηδ᾽ Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν·

On water

The clause ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ was interpreted in various ways in antiquity, but ὕδωρ was, within the explicit exegetic tradition, understood as literal water.[10] In modern scholarship, some scholars have suggested that ὕδωρ may serve as a metaphor for 'song', but others have discarded the suggestion.[11] For example, responding to the water-as-song hypothesis, multiple scholars assert that water cannot serve as a metaphorical expression in this passage because, they contend, Pindar does not do enough to make the metaphor obvious.[12] I think these scholars have been too quick to discard the metaphorical interpretation.

There are multiple reasons to consider that the passage may contain metaphor. Firstly, it is recognized that Pindar regularly uses metaphor in the openings of his poems.[13] Furthermore, Pindar comments that he composes for the learned;[14] thus, there may be no good reason to expect that Pindar's metaphors should be obvious: Pindar may want to open the ode in a recherché manner. Moreover, perhaps Pindar had told Hieron and others that he was using ὕδωρ as a metaphor for song; thus, Hieron and the intended audience would have been in a position to explain Pindar's language if called upon to do so, and the metaphor would not have been difficult. Perhaps ὕδωρ was even used as a common metaphor for song at this time.

I make these observations to point out that the one criticism that scholars bring against the water-as-song hypothesis, namely that Pindar cannot use metaphor here because the metaphor is not obvious, is not strong, both

---

[10]  For discussion, see Cannatà Fera 2012, 9–12.

[11]  In favor of water as song in this passage, see Hubbard 1985, 154f.; Kirkwood (more hesitantly) 1982, 48; Finley (for whom overtones of water as song are present) 1955, 52; discussion against the hypothesis in Gerber 1982, 8; *aporia* with regard to the hypothesis, Slater 1977, 199.

[12]  Gentili et al. 2013, 315; Verdenius 1988, 5; Gerber 1982, 8.

[13]  Cf. e. g. P. 6, 2f. (ἄρουραν … ἀναπολίζομεν), P. 7, 3 (κρηπῖδ᾽).

[14]  O. 2, 85, for parallels, see Maehler 2004, 98. Cf. Arrighetti 1987, 115.

because we have no reason to assert that Pindar wanted all his metaphors to be obvious and because we do not know that the metaphor would not have been obvious to Pindar's intended audience. Perhaps most importantly, however, Pindar uses water as a metaphor for song at Nemean 1, 24, as has been noted.[15] Thus, those scholars who assert that Pindar does not do enough to make a metaphorical use of water obvious at the opening of Olympian 1 have not taken into consideration that it is in accord with Pindar's practice to use plain water as a metaphor for song.

The suggestion that ὕδωρ is song at Olympian 1, 1 is corroborated by Pindar's use of an analogous phrase in Olympian 3, 42 – 44:

εἰ δ᾽ ἀριστεύει μὲν ὕδωρ, κτεάνων δὲ χρυσὸς αἰδοιέστατος,
νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται
οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν.

"And if water, on the one hand, is preeminent, and gold, on the other hand, is the most august of possessions, Theron now has reached the furthest point with his accomplishments and from his home grasps the Pillars of Herakles."

Pindar positions his water within a μέν and δέ construction and, in the δέ construction, he praises gold as the most august of possessions. The water and gold are conjoined as discrete elements in a protasis introduced by εἰ δ᾽ (42) and in an apodosis introduced by νῦν δέ (43). I reference Pindar's use of particles because it is important to note that Pindar is linking both the preeminence of water and the preeminence of gold with Theron's current preeminence (νῦν δέ). Pindar says that if water is preeminent and that if gold is most august, *now* Theron has reached a preeminent point. How, then, do both water and gold relate to Theron's present preeminence? It is obvious how gold relates to Theron's present preeminence: Theron is an affluent tyrant. And it is relevant how song would relate to Theron's preeminence, if the water is song, since Pindar makes this statement when praising Theron in his currently performed song. It is not obvious how literal water would relate to Theron's present preeminence because literal water is irrelevant to Pindar's encomiastic purpose.[16] If we interpret the water as song, then, the passage makes good sense.[17]

---

[15] Carey 1981, 112: "The water is the present song. The image of song as water is familiar in Pindar."

[16] Since antiquity, scholars have suggested that Pindar praises water here and in O. 1 for its value to human life generally. Thus e. g. scholium 1a (Daude et al. 2013, 187 = Drachmann 1903, 16); Ferrari 1998, 64; Gerber 1982, 4; Race 1981; Gildersleeve 1890, 161, 129. Proponents of the priamel-hypothesis infer that Pindar references preeminent

Pindar elsewhere uses the possession of song and wealth to describe a state of human prosperity, and I suggest that we should interpret the opening of Olympian 1 with this in mind.[18] I suggest that Pindar is working within the same conceptual frame, in Olympians 1 and 3, by referencing the value of song and wealth and by encouraging the audience to reflect on how song and wealth relate to Hieron's and Theron's preeminence.[19] It is not surprising that Pindar uses analogous phraseology in these odes since both odes were most likely composed around the same time (both odes celebrate Olympic victories won in 476). Pindar, then, is using a *topos* independently in both Olympian 1 and Olympian 3.[20]

I turn now briefly to conceptual metaphor theory to provide further support of the suggestion that water refers to song in these passages.[21] In 1980, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson published *Metaphors We Live By*, a foundational study in conceptual metaphor theory. A primary idea motivating this work is that metaphor is based on concepts rather than words. Lakoff and Johnson showed that we can think of one concept in terms of another concept and that there are various metaphorical expressions that can be developed to relate the two concepts to one another. In conceptual metaphor theory, there are two domains (a source domain and a target domain), and a conceptual metaphor is comprised of a mapping between these two domains. The source domain comprises the realm that one draws on when conceptualizing one thing in terms of another (i. e. it is the source),

---

things in various realms in this passage (i. e. water is great, gold is great, and Theron is great) and that Pindar references gold and water because he wants to suggest that Theron is great just as water and gold are great. The priamel-hypothesis, however, does not adequately account for why Pindar would place these supposedly parallel items in a conditional sentence that marks the items as non-parallel and it does not explain Pindar's use of νῦν.

[17]  Cf. Hubbard 1985, 14.

[18]  See e. g. O. 5, 23 f.; N. 4, 82–85, where 'song' and 'gold' are conjoined.

[19]  As Maehler observes, Pindar introduces gold in the opening of Olympian 1 in reference to wealth. For discussion, see Maehler 2004, 97.

[20]  Accordingly, given the conventional nature of the song- and wealth-theme, we need not suggest that Pindar alludes to O. 1 with his use of 'water' and gold in O. 3. (Contrast Hubbard 1985, 154; Gerber 1982, 5. Morrison rightly critiques the allusion-thesis based on the assumption that it privileges O. 1 without reason, 2007, 87.) Given the nature of epinician commissions, furthermore, there is no reason to think that Theron would want to receive an ode whose interpretation is dependent upon an ode composed for Hieron, and Pindar would have no reason to do something in his ode for Theron that could displease Theron.

[21]  For an introduction to conceptual metaphor theory, see Kövecses 2010.

and we can recognize that there is a common source domain that is being drawn upon when there are multiple linguistic expressions that 'realize' or 'manifest' the source domain of a conceptual metaphor. The target domain references the target onto which the mapping from the source domain occurs.

Let me take an example from Lakoff and Johnson to clarify these terms.[22] Within conceptual metaphor theory, it is conventional to use small caps to articulate statements of conceptual metaphors and italics to articulate metaphorical linguistic expressions, and I follow that convention. The conceptual metaphor is AN ARGUMENT IS WAR, and it is realized in the examples in italics below:

Your claims are *indefensible.*
He *attacked* every weak point in my argument.
His criticisms were *right on target.*
I *demolished* his argument.
I've never *won* an argument with him.
You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe* you *out.*
He *shot down* all of my arguments.

This is an example of a conceptual metaphor that is known as a structural metaphor. The speaker conceptualizes the structure of an argument based on his or her understanding of the structure of war. The target domain (ARGUMENT) is understood in relation to the source domain (WAR). With the sentences provided above, we see that there are metaphorical linguistic expressions (i. e. the items in italics) that manifest a conceptual metaphor: AN ARGUMENT IS WAR. With this example from Lakoff and Johnson in mind, I return to Pindar.

As scholars have observed, Pindar regularly uses several liquids as metaphorical expressions for song. Accordingly, we can suggest that Pindar's odes manifest several examples of the conceptual metaphor AN ODE IS A LIQUID. I suggest that it is realized, for example, in the metaphorical linguistic expressions in italics below:

*Water* is a preeminent thing (O. 1, 1)
If *water*, on the one hand, is preeminent and gold, on the other hand, is the most august of possessions (O. 3, 42)
I too, sending *poured nectar*, gift of the Muses (O. 7, 7f.)

---

[22] The example is taken from Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 4.

The soft *dew* of songs (P. 5, 99)

It is his lot to bring *water* against smoke as noble men against fault-finders (N. 1, 24f.)[23]

The *streams* of the Muses (N. 7, 12)

*Streams of water* (N. 7, 62)

The sounding *streams* of verse (I. 7, 19)

*Pour* poetry like a *libation* (I. 6, 19)

*Sprinkle* men with praise (I. 6, 21)

Pindar's odes provide further expressions of the AN ODE IS A LIQUID conceptual metaphor.[24] If we reflect on the fact that Pindar regularly constructs his songs as liquids, it becomes easier, I believe, to recognize 'water' as a metaphorical expression of the AN ODE IS A LIQUID conceptual metaphor at the opening of Olympian 1. The AN ODE IS A LIQUID conceptual metaphor was very productive in Greco-Roman poetry, and familiarity with it,[25] I suggest, should help us recognize metaphor at the opening of Olympian 1.

Although the water-as-song hypothesis has made no notable headway in Pindaric criticism,[26] I believe that those scholars, notably T. Hubbard, who have asserted that water serves as a metaphor at the opening of Olympian 1 have been correct to do so. In order to support the hypothesis, I have added the evidence of P. Oxy. 2432, since there we find metaphor in clustered elements that are analogous to the clustered elements at the opening of Olympian 1. Furthermore, I have added new discussion in relation to the relevant corroborative passage of Olympian 3, and I have added the evidence

---

[23] Chromios has been allotted water (i. e. Pindar's praise-song), which fights against smoke (i. e. ill-speech), as good men fight against fault-finders. Pindar's song is as powerful as ἐσλοί in its ability to praise Chromios against his detractors. As in P. Oxy. 2432, discussed above, smoke here is a metaphor, and the water is a metaphor (contrast Braswell 1992, 49). The passage has been a crux, largely because the use of water and smoke as metaphors for song and ill-speech has regularly not been recognized (Henry recently [1998, 303] suggests that the water is a metaphor for Chromios' merits). For discussion, and reference to previous bibliography, see Poiss 1993, 174–176; Braswell 1992, 49.

[24] See Cannatà Fera 2012, 5f.; Kurke 1991, 62–70; Hubbard 1985, 154; Carey 1981, 140; Wilhelmi 1967, 41–75; Finley 1955, 52/53; Dornseiff 1921, 62.

[25] See e. g. Vergil, Eclogues 3, 111; 7, 56; 8, 64; 10, 3–5; cf. Fleming 2014.

[26] See discussion of the passage in e. g. Maslov 2015, 162f.; Morgan 2015, 220–222; Eckerman 2015; Gentili 2013, 315; Race 2010, 514–516; Negri 2004, 29; Fisker 1990, 13–16; Steiner 1986, 19f.; Gerber 1982, 7; Race 1982, 75f.; Race 1981; Bowra 1964, 204.

of conceptual metaphor theory. I have also brought to our attention that scholars already accept that Pindar uses water as a metaphor for his song at Nemean 1, 24, and I suggest that the reason that scholars have not taken this metaphorical use of water into account in their interpretations of the opening of Olympian 1 derives from the supposition that Olympian 1 contains a priamel, which supposition requires that the water at the opening of Olympian 1 be literal water. As I shall argue, we should discard the notion that Olympian 1 opens with a priamel. Thus the metaphorical use of water in Nemean 1 becomes particularly relevant. As we shall see below, the broader literary context of Olympian 1 and a passage from Bacchylides 3 provide further evidence in favor of the suggestion that ὕδωρ is song at Olympian 1, 1. I turn now, however, to the vocative in line 4.

On the φίλον ἦτορ

Scholars, nearly universally, assume that φίλον ἦτορ is a vocative addressed by the speaker to himself, if a soloist is speaking, or by the speakers to themselves, if a chorus is speaking.[27] I do not believe that this is correct. Following Schwickert, I believe that φίλον ἦτορ is Hieron.[28] In support of this suggestion, I note that it is more common for vocatives to refer to others than to selves, that the *laudandus* is an apposite addressee in an epinician ode, and that Pindar uses an analogous expression in Pythian 3, that I, following others, suggest is addressed to Hieron.

The vocative of Pythian 3 that is analogous to the φίλον ἦτορ of Olympian 1 is φίλα ψυχά:[29]

μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον
σπεῦδε, τὰν δ' ἔμπρακτον ἄντλει μαχανάν.

"Do not, dear soul, strive for a life without death, but exhaust the practical means at your disposal."

Debate goes back to the scholiasts as to whether these lines were addressed to Hieron, and this suggests that there is no immediate reason to

---

[27] Cf. e. g. Briand 2014, 13f.; Gentili et al. 2013, 357; Negri 2004, 46; Sullivan 2002, 97; Instone 1996, 94; Pelliccia 1995, 300; Fisker 1990, 14; Ferrari 1998, 65; Verdenius 1988, 7; Bowra 1964, 362; Wilamowitz 1922, 492.

[28] For Schwickert, see Gerber 1982, 17. Gerber does not provide page-citation for his discussion of Schwickert, however, and I was not able, via a WorldCat search, to find the work referenced by Gerber.

[29] The vocative is analogous because an apostrophe to a 'body-part' is accompanied by the adjective 'dear.'

discard the suggestion that these lines may be addressed to Hieron. Since the time of the scholiasts, however, most scholars have concluded that this passage includes an address by the speaker to himself, if a soloist performs this passage, or by chorus members to themselves, if a chorus performs this passage.[30]

Scholars generally claim that Hieron is not the addressee, asserting that the vocative is too intimate to be addressed to Hieron,[31] but this 'evidence' is not compelling. I note that we have no record of conversations between Hieron and Pindar to know the spectrum of tones that Pindar used when he addressed Hieron, and, in fact, Pindar addresses Hieron quite intimately with ὦ φίλε at Pythian 1, 92. Furthermore, as Fennell notes, intimacy in apostrophe might well be expected in this ode, given that Pindar focuses attention on Hieron's current ailing condition in this ode.[32] Thus, the tone of the apostrophe need not provide a problem.

The context of the apostrophe suggests that the addressee is Hieron. Immediately after using the apostrophe in question, Pindar comments that he would have had Cheiron aid him in providing aid to Hieron, if it were possible. Accordingly, given that the passage immediately following the vocative refers to the fact that Pindar will not be able to affect the mortal condition of Hieron, it makes good sense for Pindar beforehand to have exhorted Hieron to accept his mortal condition. We should wonder, moreover, why it would be appropriate for Pindar to urge himself not to seek an immortal life in the context of this ode, since, as a human, Pindar would have no reason to expect a literal immortal life. And the supposition that Pindar would be commenting on the possibility of having an immortal life when he is addressing someone who is close to death is problematic, for it would be inconsiderate for Pindar to write to provide consolation to Hieron while being pre-occupied with his own human condition.

Moreover, scholars regularly suggest that Pythian 3 was a letter sent to Hieron, and, if this is correct, there would be no performers to gesture in such a way as to make clear to Hieron that they are not addressing Hieron in this passage.[33] Given that the letter would be addressed to Hieron, Hieron would have good reason to think that the vocative in the text is directed at

---

[30] For discussion, see Briand 2011; cf. Gentili et al. 2012, 415; Ferrari 2008, 102; Sullivan 2002, 99f.; Gerber 1982, 17; Bowra 1964, 362; Schroeder 1922, 30.

[31] See e. g. Farnell 1932, 140; Gildersleeve 1890, 274.

[32] 1879, 136. On Hieron's sickness, see e. g. Maehler 2004, 79f.; Hutchinson 2001, 329.

[33] On the generic peculiarity of the ode, see, with reference to extensive bibliography, Sullivan 2002, 98; cf. Ferrari 2008, 96; Hutchinson 2001, 328; Lefkowitz 1976, 142.

him. This should make us pause to consider what it would be like for Hieron to have first come in contact with this ode, knowing that he is the person for whom the ode was intended. It seems unlikely to me that Hieron would not be able to read himself into the vocative, believing that Pindar addresses him here. If Hieron, through 'reader/audience response', were to interpret himself as the addressee, who would be able to tell him that he were erring?[34]

Following Fennell, I believe that φίλα ψυχά refers to Hieron in Pythian 3, and I suggest that Pindar's use of this phrase in Pythian 3 provides corroborative evidence in support of the suggestion that the analogous phrase, φίλον ἦτορ, refers to Hieron in Olympian 1. Moreover, as noted in the next section, I suggest that the 'sun' in line 5 refers to Pindar, and, if the sun refers to Pindar, it is impossible to interpret φίλον ἦτορ as self-address.[35] As we shall see below, Bacchylides 3 provides further evidence in favor of the suggestion that φίλον ἦτορ refers to Hieron, but I turn now to the 'sun'.

On the Sun

In lines 3 – 6, the speaker exhorts the addressee not to be seeking a star appearing more intensely[36] than the sun if the addressee wishes to vaunt[37] about prizes (i. e. victories).[38] The sentence in which this phrase occurs does not make sense if the star is taken literally, since there is no reason to seek a star if one wishes to laud athletic accomplishment.[39] Scholars have

---

[34]  Briand (2011, 5) suggests that we should be open to the possible polyvalence that the vocative may have (i. e. the vocative may refer to Pindar, to a chorus, to Hieron, or to anyone who may read the ode).

[35]  Gerber (1982, 16) remarks that φίλον ἦτορ "is one of the commonest of Homeric phrases, occurring at least 50 times and often at verse-end, but neither in Homer nor anywhere else have I found an example of an address to one's ἦτορ." Thus, there are no extant examples of φίλον ἦτορ being used in self-address.

[36]  On θαλπνότερον, cf. Gerber 1982, 19.

[37]  As Verdenius observes (1988, 7), γαρύεν usually denotes loud or emphatic utterance; hence the translation 'vaunt'. In support of this interpretation, cf. B. 3, 85, O. 2, 87.

[38]  There is disagreement among scholars as to whether ἄεθλα denotes 'prizes' or 'contests', but Pindaric *comparanda* favor the denotation 'prizes' (Von der Mühll 1963, 203; cf. Gerber 1982, 15; Bowra 1964, 204). For the argument made here, it does not matter what denotation is chosen ('prizes' would include prizes won by Hieron and 'contests' would include contests won by Hieron).

[39]  The transition from second person address in lines 4 and 5 to first person plural exhortation in line 7 can be accounted for in various ways. A soloist, for example, could be speaking the opening lines and addressing Hieron and thereafter, at line 7, exhort self and group, which may include a chorus, to not mention a greater ἀγών. Alternatively, a chorus may speak this whole opening section and address Hieron at lines 4 and 5. On the

responded to this concern by assuming that line 7 should be viewed as an addition to line 6, and that, when Pindar refers to the sun, Pindar is really referring to the Olympics.[40] I do not think that this interpretation is compelling.

I suggest that 'star' (ἄστρον) is a metaphorical expression for 'poet'. If we follow the interpretation offered here, the protasis and apodosis are linked since one needs an epinician poet if one wishes to celebrate athletic victory in song; and they are further linked since we infer both that Hieron wants to vaunt about his athletic victories in song and that he wants to have the most preeminent epinician poet celebrate these victories; from Pindar's perspective, that poet is Pindar. Accordingly, the protasis and apodosis provide a complete sentence and need not be linked with the following material.

In favor of a metaphorical interpretation of ἄστρον in this passage, we note that Pindar regularly uses ἄστρον/ἀστήρ metaphorically in reference to prominence and that Greek poets regularly use ἄστρον/ἀστήρ metaphorically in reference to prominent individuals. At Olympian 2, 53 – 55, Pindar refers to wealth (πλοῦτος) as a conspicuous star.[41] In the Hymn to Zeus, Pindar refers to Delos as "the far shining star of the dark-blue earth" (τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον, fr. 33c, 5), envisioning the prominence of the island in relation to the prominence of a well-visible star,[42] and, similarly, at Paean 6, 126, Pindar refers to another island, Aegina, as a shining star (φαεννὸν ἄστρον). In Sophokles' Elektra, Orestes envisions himself as a brilliant star (66), and, in Euripides' Hippolytus, Hippolytus is referred to as Greece's

---

possibility of the poem being performed by a soloist, by a chorus, or by a soloist and chorus in dialogue, see Eckerman 2015c. On the *persona loquens* of epinician, see, with reference to further bibliography, Currie 2013; D'Alessio 1994.

[40] See e. g. Fisker 1990, 13; Sicking 1983, 67; Gerber 1982,18; Finley 1955, 52. In a telling statement, Gerber says that the sun is 'essentially' the games that follow in the next clause (1982, 4). Thus Gerber's language suggests dissatisfaction with the sun equals games equivalence, as I suggest is correct, but Gerber's dissatisfaction did not lead Gerber to make the suggestion that I make here. Gerber's 'essentially' is problematic, for, if the sun refers to the Olympic games, the sun should completely, not essentially, refer to the Olympic games. To explain the peculiarity of the sentence, Race (1982, 76) suggests that Pindar here constructs a 'logically false apodosis', but he cites no *comparanda* in favor of 'logically false apodoses'.

[41] Pindar uses wealth as a conspicuous object here in the same manner as he does at the beginning of O. 1, where he likens gold (i. e. wealth) to a conspicuous object (i. e. blazing fire).

[42] The metaphor is particularly apposite given the etymological connection with Asteria; cf. Rutherford 2001, 324.

most brilliant star (1122). At [Theocritus] 15, 140, a prominent bull, Phaethon, is likened to a star for being conspicuous among a herd of cattle, and Callimachus, in the Aetia, refers to Acontius and Cydippe as 'beautiful stars' (fr. 67 Harder = fr. 67 Pfeiffer). Furthermore, already in Homer, prominent individuals, Hector and Achilles, are likened to stars (Iliad 11, 62; 22, 26). In the Palatine Anthology, in an epigram attributed to Alcaeus of Messene, Homer is referred to as a 'star' (ἀστήρ) of the Muses and Kharites (A. P. 7, 1, 8 = GP XI); here, then, we find an example of a star being used to refer to a preeminent poet.[43]

From these examples, we see that the star is used metaphorically, from Homer onward, in Greek poetry as a symbol of prominence and brilliance. This corroborates the argument made here, namely that Pindar uses ἄστρον as a metaphorical expression in the opening of Olympian 1.[44] If we accept that a poet is the 'star' of Olympian 1, we infer that the most brilliant star, the sun, must be Pindar. Accordingly, by telling the addressee not to look for a star greater than the sun, manifestly the greatest star in the sky, Pindar tells the addressee not to look for a poet greater than Pindar, manifestly the greatest poet in the realm of poets.[45]

Further observations may be made in favor of the suggestion that the φίλον ἦτορ is Hieron and that the sun is Pindar. First, the present imperative σκόπει makes good sense in its context if Hieron is the φίλον ἦτορ, since it makes good sense for Pindar to exhort Hieron to stop looking (μηκέθ᾽ … σκόπει) for a preeminent celestial phenomenon when we understand that the celestial phenomenon is a poet, other than Pindar, that Hieron may be looking for to celebrate his victories. If the φίλον ἦτορ is to refer to the performer who is looking for a contest greater than the Olympic games (following the reasoning of scholars who suggest that the sun serves as a

---

[43]  For Homer and the sun in Hellenistic epigram, see too Antipater of Sidon (A. P. 7, 6, 2 = GP IX) and Leonidas of Tarentum (A. P. 9, 24 = GP XXX).

[44]  Pindar envisions himself, as a poet, in relation to a 'heavenly star' (ἀστέρος οὐρανίου) at P. 3, 75f. The poet is not a 'star' in that passage, but the language that Pindar uses there to envision himself as a shining light is envisioned in relation to the light of a heavenly star; thus, Pindar's poetic craft and the brilliance of heavenly stars are aligned.

[45]  Simonides too used the image of the singularity of the sun in the sky (†μόνος ἅλιος ἐν οὐρανῷ† [PMG 605 = Poltera 314]). The phrase is preserved by Theodoros Metochites, who cites it twice (for citations, see Poltera 2008, 247). Although we do not know whether Simonides used the image in a metapoetic manner, it is noteworthy that Theodoros quotes Simonides' phrase when he wants to emphasize the singularity of other phenomena; for discussion, see Poltera 2008, 561. Simonides may have used the sun as a metaphor for himself.

metaphor for the Olympic games), the passage makes little sense, since the performer would be describing himself in an unattractive manner: according to the tense of the present imperative (with its progressive/repeated aspect), the performer would be looking for games greater than the Olympics in an ongoing manner and the performer would be telling himself to stop doing this because the Olympic games are at hand. Given the prominence of the Olympic games among the Panhellenic festivals, it would make the performer seem dull-witted to be seeking games greater than the Olympics. The tense of the imperative σκόπει, then, corroborates the suggestion that the sun is Pindar.

Pindar's use of θαλπνότερον to describe the intensity of the 'sun', a fiery celestial object, corroborates the suggestion that the sun is Pindar since Pindar elsewhere uses heat-imagery in descriptions of the performance of his songs. Scholars specializing in conceptual metaphor theory have shown that particular source realms, such as that of fire, can be shown to have a 'main meaning focus'. Kövecses defines the 'main meaning focus' as follows: "Each source is associated with a particular meaning focus (or foci) that is (or are) mapped onto the target. This meaning focus is conventionally fixed and agreed-on within a speech community; it is typical of most cases of the source; and it is characteristic of the source only. The target inherits the main meaning focus (or foci) of the source."[46]

Specialists in conceptual metaphor theory have further shown that the main meaning focus for the fire source domain is 'intensity' and that it derives from embodied experience. As Kövecses further remarks: "The linguistic examples that dominate the various applications of [the fire] source domain consist of metaphors that reflect intensity as a main meaning focus … there is very clear experiential basis for this mapping. When we engage in intense situations (actions, events, states), we produce body heat. This is especially clear in the case of such emotion concepts as anger and love, where many linguistic expressions capture this kind of bodily experience associated with intense emotion."[47]

When we take these findings into consideration with regard to Pindar's use of the fire source domain, such as in Olympian 1, 3f. and Isthmian 4, 43 (where Pindar refers to the performance of his ode as 'lighting a beacon of hymns', ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων), we can assert that Pindar's heat metaphors construct the performance of the ode as an intense experience and that this

---

[46]  2010, 138.
[47]  2010, 144.

experience is expressed through the bodies of the performer(s) of the ode. Thus, when Pindar asserts that Hieron will not find a star 'warmer' than the sun, the term 'warmer' refers to the intensity that Pindar has to offer Hieron during the performance of his ode (whether a soloist or a chorus is performing this part of the ode). Thus, Pindaric *comparanda* and the findings of conceptual metaphor theory, in relation to θαλπνότερον, corroborate the suggestion that the sun is Pindar.

The phrase μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον at line 114 corroborates the suggestion that the analogous phrase μηκέθ᾽ ἀελίου σκόπει / ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἀμέρᾳ φαεννὸν ἄστρον ἐρήμας δι᾽ αἰθέρος is addressed to Hieron. Toward the end of the ode, Pindar comments on his hope to celebrate, in the future, an Olympic τέθριππον victory of Hieron (110f.) and, thereafter, Pindar comments that he is ready to celebrate that victory since the Muse is already nourishing a strong weapon for him (111f.). Pindar here uses metaphor, and we are to infer that Pindar's weapon is an ode that the Muse is nourishing for Pindar on Hieron's behalf. Given that Pindar here comments on his preeminence as a poet who has the favor of a Muse, the gnomic statement at lines 113f. is to be read, at least partially, in relation to Pindar's poetic preeminence (no harm would be done, however, if Hieron were to infer that he too is a king who crowns a summit).[48] This leads Pindar thereafter to assert μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον.[49] In his Loeb translation, Race translates the passage as 'look no further', and I believe that he is correct to do so, but I do not believe that Race is correct when he suggests that Hieron should look no further because Hieron has "reached the pinnacle of political power of being king."[50] Given that Pindar has expressed hopes that he will celebrate a future victory for Hieron, given that he has asserted that the Muse is nourishing a weapon for him, and given that he has used a gnomic statement that is best interpreted as support of Pindar's previous statements, we should interpret Pindar's μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον in relation to poetics. Pindar is telling Hieron not to look for another poet. Furthermore, Pindar closes the ode with hope that Hieron will continue to be preeminent and that Pindar will continue to praise athletic victors in song (115–117). Thus, the context after the imperative also encourages us to conclude that, with the phrase μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον, Pindar exhorts Hieron to look for no other

---

[48] For discussion, see Eckerman 2013, 19.
[49] We infer that the imperative is directed at Hieron, since the narrator addresses Hieron in the immediately preceding and in the immediately following passages.
[50] 1997, 59. So too e. g. Instone 196, 115; Gerber 1982, 173.

poet than Pindar to celebrate his victories.[51] μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον, then, provides evidence in favor of the argument made above in relation to lines 5 and 6, since Pindar here uses the same syntactical construction (μηκέτι with a present imperative for a verb of vision), when he exhorts Hieron not to turn to a poet other than Pindar to celebrate his future victories.[52]

There are two viable interpretations of line 7. Given that line 6 ended with a complete sentence, when the audience hears μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν, they will construe a new sentence (with δέ in second position in the sentence [in accord with Wackernagel's Law] and with a negated hortatory subjunctive). We may translate the sentence as 'and let us not proclaim a contest greater than Olympia,' as does Race, and, if so, we understand Pindar to be praising the importance of the Olympic games directly and thereby indirectly to be praising Hieron for having won the κέλης competition at Olympia. There is another possibility, however. As Von der Mühll remarks, "Pindar kommt es im Siegeslied für Hieron nicht darauf an, den Wettkampf zu preisen, sondern eben den Sieg."[53] We note that we could translate the sentence as, 'and let us not speak of a competition of Olympia as greater.' Accordingly, if Pindar means, 'let us not speak of a competition of Olympia as greater' he would refer to the specific κέλης competition that Hieron won in 476 (i. e. the competition celebrated with this ode). Although Pindar does not mention the κέλης competition that Hieron won, Pindar's intended audience, including Hieron, could infer that Pindar here references the competition that Hieron has won; after all, they are gathered to celebrate that victory. Hieron would be pleased to hear that Pindar thinks that the κέλης competition that Hieron won was the best competition of the Olympiad, particularly because Theron won the τέθριππον competition during this Olympiad.[54] In fact, the fact that Theron had won the τέθριππον competition provides explanation for why Pindar would make this statement: there was another competition at the Olympiad

---

[51] Thus, both due to what precedes and due to what follows, μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον should not be classified as an example of the *ne plus ultra* motif.

[52] Thus, I suggest that Pindar uses μηκέτι plus a verb of vision in the present imperative in ring composition in this ode when he exhorts Hieron, as addressee, on two occasions (lines 5 and 114) to look to no other poet to celebrate his victories. On symmetry in the ode, cf. Sicking 1983, 60f.; Young 1968, 121 – 123.

[53] 1963, 204.

[54] Pindar would not be asserting that the κέλης competition has the highest status as a competition (we know that that is not the case, given the τέθριππον), but Pindar would be asserting that the κέλης competition, plausibly for various reasons of sport, provided a competition in 476 better than those of other events.

of 476 that could be viewed as overshadowing Hieron's κέλης victory. By making this statement, Pindar would be discounting the importance of Theron's victory, while focusing on the importance of Hieron's victory. I think that this interpretation is plausible (particularly because it derives from a literal reading of Pindar's Greek, whereas the standard interpretation does not),[55] but I do not think that we can rule out the traditional interpretation of line 7 (namely that line 7 references the greatness of the Olympic games generally). Regardless, line 7 should be detached from line 6 and μηδ᾽ should be written as μὴ δ᾽. We have previously not detached line 7 because we have thought that it needs to be connected to the preceding material in order for the preceding material to make sense. As I have argued above in relation to the 'sun', that is not the case. Line 7 is an independent sentence, and a full stop should be placed at the end of line 6.

Preliminary Conclusions

An entailment of the argument developed above is that we see now that the various clauses of the opening of Olympian 1 are interconnected, whereas scholars have regularly viewed the opening as a series of 'detached statements' that comprise a priamel.[56] I have suggested that the opening provides a celebration of song, of wealth, of athletic achievement, and of Pindar as preeminent poet; and that it begins with a direct address to Hieron.[57] The ode's opening images are all connected in relation to the celebration of Hieron's accomplishment, and none of this serves as 'foil' to the Olympic games.[58] We have used the term foil previously because we have not recognized the relevance of 'water' and the 'sun' to Pindar's epinician performance. 'Foil' allowed scholars, such as Bundy, to see the

---

[55] For the traditional interpretation of the grammar, see e. g. Gerber 1982, 23f.

[56] For discussion of the opening of this ode in relation to a priamel, see Gerber 1982, 3f. The phrase 'detached statements' is Fraenkel's; see Gerber 1982, 3 for reference. For readings of the passage as a priamel, see Morgan 2015, 220–222; Briand 2014, 12f.; Gentili et al. 2013; Race 2010, 514f.; Athanassaki 2004, 320; Fisker 1990, 13f.; Sicking 1983, 67; Race 1982, 74–76; Wind 1971, 12; Dornseiff 1922, 98.

[57] It is noteworthy that this ode begins with apostrophe to Hieron because personages usually addressed within the opening of epinician odes are divinities, addressed within the context of prayer. By opening the ode with an apostrophe to Hieron, Pindar places Hieron formally within a 'generic realm' regularly allotted to gods in epinician poetry, and this is to Hieron's benefit. (Thus, second-person reference occurs in the ode earlier than is generally recognized in the ode; on this topic, see Athanassaki 2004, 320f.) Bacchylides similarly addresses Hieron at the beginning of his fifth ode.

[58] Contrast Bundy 1962, 5 (on priamel), 6 (on the opening of O. 1); Gerber 1982, 4.

opening of the ode moving in a 'crescendo' toward the Olympic games, with water, gold, and the sun serving as symbols for preeminent things in various realms. We see now, however, that such a reading does not do justice to Pindar's proem because it does not articulate how 'water', 'gold', and 'the sun' are all immediately relevant to the immediate context of the performance of this ode. There is no crescendo: all 'elements' are equally important to Hieron and to the celebration of his status and accomplishments. We have used the term priamel to describe this passage because we have not understood Pindar's metaphors. There is no priamel. We should abandon the terms foil, priamel, and crescendo in interpretation of this passage.

Depending upon the audience's perspective, Pindar's exhortation to Hieron to look for no poet other than Pindar may be read either as Pindar being self-assured of his excellence or as Pindar being anxious regarding his standing with Hieron. Pindar presumably would want Hieron to infer the former, but Hieron may infer the latter. Given that ἄεθλα (3) need not be interpreted as a poetic plural, referring only to the victory that Pindar celebrates in Olympian 1, Pindar may be telling Hieron that, whenever Hieron wishes to celebrate his athletic accomplishments, he should turn to Pindar.[59] In fact, we know that Bacchylides, in ode 3, celebrated the future chariot victory that Pindar expresses hope to celebrate at Olympian 1, 108–114. Although we do not know that Pindar did not celebrate that victory in song, it is noteworthy that we do not have an extant ode by Pindar celebrating that victory. Perhaps Pindar had reason to be anxious with regard to celebrating Hieron's victories in the future. Thus, Pindar may stress his self-professed excellence to Hieron precisely because he is aware that he has meaningful competition for Hieron's favor.

It is unclear how we should interpret ἄριστον.[60] Gold, as Maehler observes, is introduced as a symbol for wealth (as is made clear in line 2);[61] thus the opening of the ode may be interpreted as juxtaposing the valuable good that Pindar has to offer (song) with the valuable good that Hieron has to offer (wealth). This provides one reason to suggest that ἄριστον may best be interpreted as a superlative that references the attainment of a quality to a

---

[59] As noted above, line 114 provides evidence in favor of Pindar's hope to win future commissions from Hieron.

[60] Cf. Instone 1996, 94.

[61] On gold's relation to 'Reichtum' in this passage, see Maehler 2004, 97; 1982, 57. Wilamowitz (1922, 491) suggests that Pindar privileges gold over water in the passage since Pindar describes gold in greater detail. The 'privileging' may better be explained, however, by 'das Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder'.

high degree (i. e. ἄριστον means preeminent) rather than the attainment of a quality to the highest degree (i. e. ἄριστον means best),[62] for it would seemingly be untactful for Pindar to suggest that his song is the 'best' thing in a context in which Pindar is also praising a preeminent thing that derives from Hieron.[63] By asserting that song is a preeminent thing, however, just as wealth, we know, is a preeminent thing, Pindar would be positioning himself and Hieron on a parallel plane. The parallelism inherent in the μέν and δέ construction may further encourage this interpretation. Alternatively, it may be suggested that Pindar wants his audience to interpret his song not as a 'preeminent' thing but as the 'best' thing, and Pindar might want to do this for various reasons. For example, he might want to encourage Hieron to invest in song with his material resources. Pindar does this implicitly, for example, at the end of Pythian 3 (110 – 115), which is addressed to Hieron. One may suggest, finally, that Pindar chose the word ἄριστον because it provides useful ambiguity. Some audience members, presumably, inter-preted ἄριστον as 'preeminent thing' and other audience members, pre-sumably, interpreted it as 'best thing.'[64]

### Bacchylides' Pindar

It has long been recognized that the end of Bacchylides 3, particularly lines 85 – 87, shares remarkable similarities with the opening of Olympian 1. The passage of Bacchylides has received a lot of scholarly attention, but the passage remains, as Cairns remarks, 'enigmatic', as does the relationship of the passage to Olympian 1.[65] I suggest that the respective passage of Bacchylides remains enigmatic because we have assumed that Bacchylides speaks of literal αἰθήρ and sea,[66] although αἰθήρ and sea serve as elemental

---

[62]  For good discussion on this topic, see Sandin 2014, 99f.

[63]  Finley suggests 'excellent' rather than 'best' as a translation for ἄριστον, 1955, 53.

[64]  Since antiquity, scholars have regularly suggested that we should supply a genitive plural to make sense of this opening phrase; we see, however, that this need not be the case. For various suggestions as to the presumed identity of the conjectured genitive plural, see Race 1981. For Pindaric openings comprised of a subject and predicate (with no apparent need to supply anything), as I suggest is the case with O. 1, see e. g. P. 5, 1; P. 10, 1.

[65]  For an overview discussion of several interpretations of the passage, see Cairns 2010, 211f. Morgan recently calls the passage 'cryptic', 2015, 358. See too Morrison 2007, 88; Hutchinson 2001, 353; Gerber 1982, 6; Bowra 1964, 230. For specific discussions, see Arrighetti 1987, 108 – 116; Carey 1977/1978; Wind 1971. For reference to earlier discussions, see Stenger 2004, 97; Arrighetti 1987, 111.

[66]  See e. g. Cairns, 2010, 212; Morrison 2007, 88; Stenger 2004, 99; Maehler 2004, 97; Hutchinson 2001, 353; Arrighetti 1987, 110, 114; Race 1982, 85; Bowra 1964, 205f.

metaphorical expressions that are analogous to the elemental metaphorical expressions, discussed above, in Olympian 1 and in P. Oxy. 2432. The argument made above opens the respective lines of Bacchylides in a new manner, for now we see that, in his own metapoetic section, Bacchylides responds to Pindar's metapoetic statements. I suggest that Bacchylides caps Pindar, surmounting the imagery that Pindar developed.[67] The lines are the following:

85   φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω· βαθὺς μέν
      αἰθὴρ ἀμίαντος· ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου
      οὐ σάπεται· εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός·

"I vaunt/say things understandable to him that can think. The deep *aither* is undefiled. The water of the sea does not rot. Gold is festive cheer."

This passage begins with the narrator asserting that he says things that are understandable for he who can think. Bacchylides may use this phrase to clarify that what follows will not be literal language,[68] but he may also use this phrase to draw attention to the fact that he is alluding to a specific passage of Pindar's poetry, as I, following others, suggest he is; members of the audience will have to decide for themselves how to interpret Bacchylides' statement. Sandin suggests that "the … words φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω suggest that [the following] images have a particular, hidden meaning."[69] After drawing the audience's attention to their need to interpret the material that will follow, Bacchylides begins his section by using the same verb as Pindar does in Olympian 1: γαρύω. Thus allusions to Olympian 1 begin.[70]

Recollecting that Pindar is the sun in the empty αἰθήρ in Olympian 1, as I argued above, we recognize that, from the perspective of Olympian 1, Bacchylides could be included in Pindar's empty αἰθήρ. If Pindar, as a poet, is a star, so too Bacchylides, as a poet, could be considered a star, but Bacchylides chooses to change the frame of reference. Bacchylides seems to have chosen to do this because Pindar deprecates the αἰθήρ as empty. Given

---

[67]  Capping is a well-attested phenomenon of Greco-Roman poetics. See e. g. Hesk 2007, with reference to further bibliography; Collins 2004; cf. Eckerman 2015b.

[68]  At P. 4, 142 Jason uses similar language before introducing a statement that includes noteworthy metaphor: εἰδότι τοι ἐρέω· μία βοῦς Κρηθεῖ τε μάτηρ / καὶ θρασυμήδεϊ Σαλμωνεῖ. Therewith see Braswell 1988, 227. See too O. 2, 84–86.

[69]  2014, 98.

[70]  The passage does not relate to esoteric knowledge associated with mystery rites, *pace* Currie 2005, 386f. and 389; Krummen 1990, 258.

that Pindar, as sun, is brilliant and surrounded by empty αἰθήρ, it makes good sense for Bacchylides to read himself into the αἰθήρ, whether Pindar intended the αἰθήρ to be interpreted as a space for rivals or not: Bacchylides takes advantage of the space that Pindar affords him. Pindar's designation of the αἰθήρ as 'empty' devalued the αἰθήρ relative to the sun. Bacchylides refashions αἰθήρ as 'deep' and 'undefiled', rather than as 'empty'. Bacchylides' reconceptualization of the αἰθήρ is purposeful, and Bacchylides' idealization of αἰθήρ in this passage corroborates the suggestion made above about the sun, namely that the sun is Pindar, for Bacchylides has no interest in saying anything good about the sun. However he does have interest in saying good things about the αἰθήρ, since he is now constructing himself as αἰθήρ. As Sandin observes, "here [Pindar's] sun is replaced by the aether."[71] Nothing suggests that Bacchylides links Pindar's sun with the Olympics.

Thereafter, Bacchylides follows with reference to Pindar's 'aquatic' imagery. Bacchylides one-ups Pindar's water, for Pindar's water is mere water, while Bacchylides' water is the water of the sea (i. e. it is vaster than Pindar's mere water). Furthermore, we note that Bacchylides' water does not rot. If taken literally, this is a strange phrase, since it is not conventional for people to comment on the sea as being non-rotting. This leads me to suggest that Bacchylides chooses the language of rotting in reference to the sea because he is working with the *topos* of the immortality of song. By saying that the water of the sea is not subject to decay, Bacchylides creates his own expression of the AN ODE IS A LIQUID conceptual metaphor and he asserts that his song is immortal. Thus, based on Bacchylides' imagery of a non-rotting sea, we may conclude that Bacchylides interprets Pindar's ὕδωρ as a metaphorical expression of the AN ODE IS A LIQUID conceptual metaphor. Bacchylides recognizes Pindar's water as song and he one-ups it, both by asserting that his own water is vaster than Pindar's water and by asserting that his song, by not rotting, is immortal. Pindar had not commented on how song may be viewed as ἄριστον, and Bacchylides caps Pindar's ἄριστον by making his own song not merely ἄριστον but immortal.

Bacchylides's vision of his song as vast (βαθὺς, ὕδωρ … πόντου) is noteworthy, particularly in light of poets such as Callimachus, who prefer their own poetic waters to be small-scale.[72] Bacchylides' vision of his

---

[71] 2014, 97.

[72] Accordingly, Bacchylides' sea does not represent the composition of epic poetry. For the *topos* of the sea as epic, see Harrison 2006. Pindar may also use the image of the sea in relation to the composition of melic poetry in his metapoetic passage at N. 5, 21. Therewith see Pfeijffer 1994, 309f.

poetics as being vast derives, at least partially, from Bacchylides accepting and working with the imagery that Pindar develops in Olympian 1. He very well may not have constructed a poetics of vastness for himself, had Pindar not already set the frame of discourse. If Bacchylides were to stray too far from Pindar's imagery, the audience might not be able to recognize that Bacchylides here alludes to Olympian 1.

Bacchylides also follows Olympian 1 closely by introducing gold. As noted above, Maehler remarks that Pindar's gold in Olympian 1 serves as a symbol for wealth, and Maehler notes that the same is the case in regard to the respective passage of Bacchylides 3. Bacchylides' gold is coupled with εὐφροσύνα, which generally denotes 'joy', but, as scholars have noted, εὐφροσύνα, in epinician poetry, regularly denotes the joy that comes through the celebration of an athletic achievement with a κῶμος (victory celebration).[73] By saying that 'gold' is 'joy', Bacchylides alludes to the fact that wealth can finance a κῶμος that celebrates an athletic accomplishment. Accordingly, I suggest that Bacchylides again caps Pindar with his use of gold, for, while Pindar's gold simply stands out for its preeminence among other objects, Bacchylides' gold is productively put to use. Bacchylides here works with the epinician *topos* that wealth should not be an end.[74]

Although anyone who recognizes the allusions to Olympian 1 in Bacchylides 3 may read himself or herself into being 'the one who can think' (φρονέοντι, 85), Bacchylides' 'one who can think' is directed at Hieron specifically, as scholars note.[75] The reference to Hieron in Bacchylides 3 suggests that Bacchylides interpreted Pindar's φίλον ἦτορ as Hieron, and not as a vocative of self-address, for, while following Pindar's passage closely, Bacchylides integrates Hieron into his song. Thus, Bacchylides 3 provides corroborative evidence for the argument that I made above, namely that φίλον ἦτορ is Hieron in Olympian 1.

---

[73] See B. 11, 9–14; cf. e. g. Cairns 2010, 72, 212; Maehler 1982, 55; Slater 1977, 200; Bundy 1962, 2. For discussion of various earlier interpretations of εὐφροσύνα in this passage, see Maehler 1982, 57. For κῶμος as victory celebration, see Eckerman 2010.

[74] Cf. Cairns 2010, 213; Carey 1977/1978, 70. For examples and discussion of the *topos*, see Maehler 2004, 88. Bacchylides had already commented on Hieron's proclivity to put wealth to use earlier in the ode (13f.; 63–66).

[75] E. g. Maehler 2004, 97; Hutchinson 2001, 352; Race 1982, 85. Cf. B. 5, 1–5, where Bacchylides addresses Hieron as being a knowledgeable interpreter of poetry. Therewith see Cairns 2010, 217; Maehler 2004, 111.

Conclusion

Olympian 1 begins with a metaphorical metapoetic section, and Bacchylides responds thereto in his own metaphorical metapoetic section in his third ode. Just as Pindar interlinks song, wealth, poet, and Hieron within the context of celebrating Hieron's athletic accomplishment, so too does Bacchylides.[76] 'αἰθήρ', 'water of the sea', and 'gold' are conjoined as programmatic elements of epinician celebration in Bacchylides 3, and they are all in close relation, because related terms are in close relation in the passage to which Bacchylides alludes. As we saw above, much is the same with regard to the proximity of elements, with metaphor, in P. Oxy. 2432. Maehler suggests that Bacchylides 3, 85–87 is the only example of a priamel in Bacchylides' poetry,[77] but it would be better not to refer to Bacchylides' passage as a priamel, since, as in Olympian 1, the clauses are meaningfully united and are not used as 'foil' for anything else.[78] There is no priamel in this passage; as with Olympian 1, we have thought that there was a priamel, because we did not recognize Bacchylides' use of metaphor among clustered elements. Accordingly, we may conclude that the several meaningful correspondences between Bacchylides' 'elements' in B. 3 and Pindar's 'elements' in Olympian 1 assure us that Bacchylides recognized metapoetic imagery at the beginning of Olympian 1.

The relation of gold to αἰθήρ and water, as well as to what follows, has provided the chief hermeneutic crux for interpretations of the relevant passage of Bacchylides 3,[79] but the passage now makes good sense. Before and after Bacchylides' metapoetic passage, Bacchylides introduces references both to the importance of expenditure (83, 92–94) and to the importance of the Muse in fostering a man's accomplishment (90–92), and his capping of Pindar goes right in the middle. By capping Pindar, Bacchylides wants Hieron to infer that he is a better poet than Pindar and that Hieron, accordingly, should expend wealth on commissioning Bacchylides (not Pindar) to celebrate his accomplishments in song. As I noted

---

[76] For a recent overview of Pindar's metapoetics, see Carey 2012. Once we recognize that Bacchylides is actively engaging with O. 1 in B. 3, we recognize other noteworthy similarities between O. 1 and B. 3. We note, for example, that B. 3 similarly begins with an *aristo*-root word but that Bacchylides uses the root in a new manner.

[77] 1982, 56; cf. 2004, 96.

[78] For discussion of priamels in terms of unrelated parts and foil, see Gerber 1982, 3–5; Race 2010, 514f., with reference to previous bibliography.

[79] Cairns 2010, 12; Stenger 2004, 97.

above, Pindar was making a similar argument with Hieron in his own metapoetic sections of Olympian 1.

Scholars have noted that Bacchylides is a notably allusive poet, but we have not previously had evidence of Bacchylides rivaling with Pindar in such a direct manner.[80] How Hieron responded to Pindar's and Bacchylides' metapoetic statements, and Bacchylides' capping, we do not know. It is hard to tell, moreover, how widely recognized Pindar's and Bacchylides' metaphorical, metapoetic language was in antiquity. It is noteworthy, however, that there is no sign of recognition that the opening of Olympian 1 is metapoetic in the *scholia vetera* that accompany Pindar's odes;[81] and it is noteworthy that we have previously not understood what Bacchylides was doing with his clustered elements.[82] Recognition of the metaphorical language of these metapoetic passages seems to have been lost rather quickly.

## Bibliography

Arrighetti, G., Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura, Pisa 1987.

Athanassaki, L., Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's First Olympian Ode, Arethusa 37 (2004), 317 – 341.

Bowra, C., Pindar, Oxford 1964.

Braswell, B., A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One, Fribourg 1992.

--------

[80] For Bacchylides as a deeply allusive poet, cf. e. g. Most 2012, 266; Cairns 2010, 55. Furthermore, we now have further corroborative evidence in favor of suggesting that Pindar rivals with peers, perhaps Simonides and Bacchylides, at O. 2, 84 – 86, for we see that Pindar introduces that passage in much the same way that Bacchylides introduces his own passage of poetic rivalry at B. 3, 85 (cf. e. g. Sullivan 2002, 90; Pfeijffer 1994, 311f.). Perhaps it was a *topos* to introduce passages of metapoetic rivalry with such phrases.

[81] For the scholia, see Daude et al. 2013, 187 – 190 = Drachmann 1903, 16 – 22. P. Oxy. 5201, a commentary to O. 1 on papyrus, does not preserve comment on text before line 17 of the ode and, thus, cannot be taken into consideration with regard to the material discussed here.

[82] According to the Vita Thomana (vol. I, p. 7, 14 – 17 Drachmann), Aristophanes of Byzantium chose to place O. 1 at the beginning of a collection of Pindar's Olympian odes. If Aristophanes recognized O. 1's metapoetic opening, it may well have provided reason for him to choose to place the ode first in his collection. It is noteworthy that the scholiast writes that Aristophanes' decision was partially due to the ode addressing an "ἐγκώμιον of the/an ἀγών". This need not mean an ἐγκώμιον of the Olympic games (as scholars generally understand the phrase); no word for the Olympics is provided, and it is noteworthy that ἀγών is singular. The phrase could mean 'a celebration of [a/the] competition'. On an Aristophanic edition and on the position of O. 1 in the odes, see Phillips 2016, 55 – 60, with reference to further bibliography; Negri 2004, 27 – 43.

Braswell, B., A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar, Berlin 1988.

Briand, M., Pindare. Olympiques, Paris 2014.

Briand, M., "Ô mon âme, n'aspire pas à la vie immortelle ..." Sur les avatars de Pindare, Pythique III, 61/62, des scholiastes anciens à Saint-John Perse, Paul Valéry, Albert Camus, et à l'entour, Rursus 6 (2011) [https://rursus.revues.org/468]

Bundy, E., Studia Pindarica, Berkeley 1962.

Burton, R., Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation, Oxford 1962.

Cairns, D. L., Bacchylides. Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, 13), Cambridge 2010.

Campbell, D., Greek Lyric III. Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others, Cambridge. MA 1991.

Cannatà Fera, M., Acqua e poesia nella Grecia antica, in: Cultura e religione delle acque. Atti del Convegno interdisciplinare "Qui fresca l'acqua mormora ..." (S. Quasimodo, Sapph. fr. 2,5), Messina, 29/30 marzo 2011. Archaeologica 167, ed. A. Calderone, Rome 2012, 3 – 16.

Carey, C., Pindaric metapoetics revisited, in: Hyperboreans: essays in Greek and Latin poetry, philosophy, rhetoric and linguistics, edd. P. da Cunha Corrêa - M. Martinho - J. Macedo - A. Hasegawa, São Paulo 2012, 25 – 50.

Carey, C., A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8, Salem, NH 1981.

Carey, C., Bacchylides 3, 85 – 90, Maia 29/30 (1977/1978), 69 – 71.

Collins, D., Master of the Game. Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry, Cambridge 2004.

Currie, B., The Pindaric First Person in Flux, CA 32 (2013), 243 – 282.

Currie, B., Pindar and the Cult of Heroes, Oxford 2005.

D'Alessio, G. B., First-Person Problems in Pindar, BICS 39 (1994), 117 – 134.

Daude, C., S. David, M. Fartzoff, C. Muckensturm-Poulle, Scholies à Pindare. Volume I, Vies de Pindare et scholies à la première Olympique 'Un chemin de paroles' (O. I, 110), Franche-Comté 2013.

Dornseiff, F., Pindars Stil, Berlin 1921.

Drachmann, A., Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina. Volumen I: Scholia in Olympionikas, Leipzig 1903.

Eckerman, C., Behind the Camera: Athletes and Spatial Dynamics in Pindar's Olympian 1, in: Classics@ Issue 13: Greek Poetry and Sport, ed. T. Scanlon (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2015a) [http://www.chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6052].

Eckerman, C., Thyrsis' Arcadian Shepherds in Vergil's Seventh Eclogue, CQ 65 (2015b), 669 – 672.

Eckerman, C., Notes to a Recent Edition of Pindar's Olympian Odes, ExCl 19 (2015c), 193 – 202.

Eckerman, C., The Landscape and Heritage of Pindar's Olympia, CJ 107 (2013), 3 – 33.

Eckerman, C., The kômos of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration, CQ 60 (2010), 302 – 312.

Farnell, L., The Works of Pindar. Vol. 2. Critical Commentary, London 1932.

Fennell, C., Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes, Cambridge, 1879.

Ferrari, F., Pindaro. Pitiche, Milan 2008.

Ferrari, F., Pindaro. Olimpiche, Milan 1998.

Ferreira, L. de Nazaré, Mobilidade poética na Grécia Antiga: uma leitura da obra de Simónides, Coimbra 2013.

Finley, J., Pindar and Aeschylus, Cambridge, MA 1955.

Fisker, D., Pindars erste Olympische Ode, Odense 1990.

Fleming, K., Put a Cork in It: Martial and the Metaphor of Wine for Writing, Sunoikisis 2014 [http://wp.chs.harvard.edu/surs/2014/10/15/put-a-cork-in-it/].

Gentili, B.-Bernardini, P.-Cingano, E.-Giannini, P., Pindaro. Le Pitiche, Verona 1995.

Gentili, B.-Catenacci, C.-Giannini, P.-Lomiento, L., Pindaro. Le Olimpiche, Verona 2013.

Gerber, D., Greek Lyric III. Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others, Cambridge, MA 1991.

Gerber, D., Pindar's Olympian One. A Commentary, Toronto 1982.

Gildersleeve, B., Pindar: Olympian and Pythian Odes, New York 1890.

Harrison, S., The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace, Dictynna 4 (2006) [http://dictynna.revues.org/146].

Henderson, W., Imagery in Simonides, AClass 42 (1999), 95–103.

Henry, W., Simonides, PMG 541, ZPE 121 (1998) 303/304.

Hesk, J., Combative Capping in Aristophanic Comedy, CCJ 53 (2007), 124–160.

Hubbard, T., The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry, Leiden 1985.

Hutchinson, G., Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces, Oxford 2001.

Instone, S., Pindar. Selected Odes, Eastbourne 1996.

Kirkwood, G., Selections from Pindar, Chico, CA 1982.

Kövecses, Z., Metaphor: An Introduction, Oxford 2010.

Krummen, E., Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3), Berlin 1990.

Kurke, L., The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy, Ithaca 1991.

Lakoff, G. - Johnson, M., Metaphors We Live By, Chicago 1980.

Lefkowitz, M., The Victory Ode, Park Ridge, NJ 1976.

Maehler, H., Bacchylides. A Selection, Cambridge 2004.

Maehler, H., Die Lieder des Bakchylides, Erster Teil, Die Siegeslieder, II. Kommentar, Leiden 1982.

Maslov, B., Pindar and the Emergence of Literature, Cambridge 2015.

Morgan, K., Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C., Oxford 2015.

Morrison, A., Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes, London 2007.

Most, G., Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides, in: Reading the Victory Ode, edd. P. Agócs -C. Carey - R. Rawles, Cambridge 2012, 249–276.

Negri, M., Pindaro ad Alessandria. Le edizioni e gli editori, Brescia 2004.

Park, A., Truth and Genre in Pindar, CQ 63 (2013), 17–36.

Pelliccia, H., Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar, Göttingen 1995.

Pfeijffer, I., The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides, CP 89 (1994), 305–317.

Phillips, T., Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts, Oxford 2016.

Poiss, T., Momente der Einheit: Interpretationen zu Pindars Epinikion und Hölderlins Andenken, Wien 1993.

Poltera, O., Simonides lyricus. Testimonia und Fragmente, Basel 2008.

Race, W., Rhetoric and Lyric Poetry, in: Greek Rhetoric, ed. I. Worthington, Malden, MA 2010, 509 – 525.

Race, W., Pindar. Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes, Cambridge, MA 1997.

Race, W., The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius, Leiden 1982.

Race, W., Pindar's 'Best is Water': Best of What?, GRBS 22 (1981), 119 – 124.

Rutherford, I., Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre, Oxford 2001.

Sandin, P., The Emblems of Excellence in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes and Bacchylides' Third Epinician, Lexis 32 (2014), 90 – 112.

Schroeder, O., Pindars Pythien, Berlin 1922.

Sicking, C., Pindar's First Olympian. An Interpretation, Mnemosyne 36 (1983), 60 – 70.

Slater, W., Doubts about Pindaric Interpretation, CJ 72 (1977), 193 – 208,

Snell, B. - Maehler, H., Pindari carmina cum fragmentis, Leipzig 1987.

Steiner, D., The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar, Oxford 1986.

Stenger, J., Poetische Argumentation: Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides, Berlin 2004.

Sullivan, S., Aspects of the 'Fictive I' in Pindar: Address to Psychic Entities, Emerita 70 (2002), 83 – 102.

Treu, M., Neues zu Simonides (P. Oxy. 2432), RhM 103 (1960), 319 – 336.

Verdenius, W., Commentaries on Pindar, Volume II, Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2, Leiden 1987.

Von der Mühll, P., Weitere pindarische Notizen, MH 20 (1963), 203/204.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, Pindaros, Berlin 1922.

Wilhelmi, G., Untersuchungen zum Bild vom Fließen der Sprache in der griechischen Literatur, Bamberg 1967.

Wind, R., Bacchylides and Pindar: A Question of Imitation, CJ 67 (1971), 9 – 13.

Young, D., Three Odes of Pindar, Leiden 1968.

Chris Eckerman
University of Oregon
311 Susan Campbell Hall [SC]
1267 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1267