

PINDAR *NEMEAN* 4.57–58 AND THE ARTS OF POETS, TRAINERS, AND WRESTLERS

NIGEL NICHOLSON

Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαωλκόν
πολεμῖα χερὶ προστραπών
Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσιν
δάμαρτος Ἴππολύτας Ἀκάστου δολίαις
τέχναισι χρησάμενος·

Pindar *Nemean* 4.54–58¹

By the foot of Pelion, turning against Iolcus with hostile
hand, Peleus gave it over to the Haemonians to be their
servant, using the crafty arts of Hippolyta, wife of Acastus.

For most of the modern history of the text of Pindar's odes, *Nemean* 4.57–58 have been seen as a problem. The lines seem to suggest a Peleus who is not suited to be a model of aristocratic conduct: a guest who made common cause with his host's wife and treacherously attacked him. Some recent critics have rejected the idea that this passage offers an unfavorable portrait of Peleus, but, in this paper, I argue that these lines do indeed disturb a smooth understanding of aristocratic ethics. What needs particular attention is a term that has been ignored, τέχναισι, the arts or skills that Peleus seems to use. "Art" is the central ideological problem of this ode and a particularly loaded word for an aristocrat, signifying many of the things he despised and

1 Text of Turyn 1952. Snell-Maehler 1987 and Race 1997 offer the unobjectionable variant reading Ἰαολκόν in 54. Bowra 1947 accepts Postgate's (1925.383–84) unnecessary προστραπών in 55. All translations are my own.

feared: commodity exchange, the rise of the baseborn, and the success of those without appropriate natural ability. Yet art was crucial to the celebration of this Nemean victory, not only the art of the poet, but also the art of wrestling practiced by the victor Timasarchus and taught by his trainer Melesias. The connection of Peleus to art that *Nemean* 4.57–58 suggests is thus both unacceptable and potentially troubling in that it points the audience towards interrogating the relationship of the aristocracy to art. While the rest of the ode works to conceal the presence of art in the economy of this athletic victory, this problematic moment serves to expose the role of art in this victory celebration.

Although the majority of editors used to agree that the lines suggested an unacceptable role for Peleus, the balance has shifted in more recent years. Many modern critics have sought to show that the lines can be understood in ways that are not prejudicial to Peleus' aristocratic standing, and such interpretations are now standard. In Part I, I defend the earlier understanding that the lines naturally suggest that Peleus uses Hippolyta's "crafty arts," but also agree with more recent commentators that a more appropriate understanding can be wrung out of the lines. Where I differ from both camps is in seeing the determination of meaning as a process that takes time: some interpretations that are now accepted are possible, but cannot be seen as the immediate suggestion of the text. The lines initially suggest that Peleus is using Hippolyta's "crafty arts," and it is only because the audience is compelled to reject this suggestion that it works to produce a meaning for the text that conforms to aristocratic ethics.

In Parts II and III, I show that the prominence of art is the central ideological problem treated by the ode. In Part II, I examine the association of Timasarchus, Pindar, and Melesias with art and show art's anti-aristocratic associations. On the one hand, art, τέχνη, was seen in some contexts as opposed to the natural abilities that were the mark of an aristocrat's superiority and taken as the justification of his power; on the other hand, art was particularly implicated in commodity exchange. Art was thought of as something that was for sale, not something that participated in a gift exchange economy, and thus, to an aristocrat, artisans were certainly marked as non-aristocratic, and possibly as untrustworthy and hostile.

Nemean 4, like many other odes, attempts to associate the poet's art with the aristocratic economy of gift exchange, but what is especially interesting about this ode is that it is not only the poet whose status is threatened by his use of art. The wrestling of the victor and the teaching of the trainer must also be made to fit the aristocratic code of ethics, and it is

through the identification of all three figures with a suitably refigured idea of wrestling that the use of art that is foundational to this particular athletic celebration is repackaged as proper aristocratic practice. I discuss this refiguring of the use of art by victor, poet, and trainer in Part III.

Art is central to the construction of this ode, but is covered over in silence. This silence is punctured, however, by the association of “crafty arts” with Peleus, the defining figure of aristocratic ethics in this ode. This draws art, if only briefly, into the orbit of aristocratic conduct, while strongly marking it as inappropriate to such conduct, and so opens a crack in the ideological facade of the ode. My argument thus presents *Nemean* 4 as a text in which a dominant ideological position is challenged by a gesture of resistance, and, in Part IV, by way of conclusion, I fit this idea of Pindar’s text into Marxist and New Historicist models of literary texts that theorize such contradictions, in particular into the model offered by Vincent Farenga in his study of *Pythian* 4. I also hope through this study of *Nemean* 4 to offer an example of the integration of certain types of textual difficulties into the interpretation of the Pindaric text; too often the task of establishing the basic meaning of the text is left to translators and editors and treated as separate from the work of interpretation.²

I

For much of their history, *Nemean* 4.57–58 have been emended. Emenders include, in chronological order, Triclinius, Schmid, Heyne, Bergk, Schroeder, Farnell, Köhnken, and, by implication, Nisetich.³ I do not want to defend their emendations (the transmitted text is sound),⁴ but their strong

2 Interpretations of *Ne.* 4 either do not mention the difficulty of these lines (Hubbard 1985.80, Crotty 1982.60, Willcock 1982) or do so only in order to justify the text being used, and do not recognize this difficulty as an experience integral to the reception of this ode (Bulman 1992.101 n.49, Köhnken 1971.200–03).

3 For a full list of emendations before 1972, see Gerber 1976.106 and 1984.23. The emendations fall into two classes, those that separate Peleus from χρησάμενος so that it is not Peleus who is using Hippolyta’s arts, and those that substitute a new participle so that Peleus is doing something else in relation to the arts. To the first group belong Köhnken 1971.200–03, Schmid, Heyne’s London edition of 1824, and Schroeder 1908.185 (whose text is accepted by Farnell 1932.269–70 and, apparently, by Nisetich 1980.248); to the second, Triclinius and Bergk 1878.267–68 (criticized by Fennell 1899.51).

4 The three manuscript traditions that contain *Ne.* 4.54–58 (BDV) agree exactly (except concerning the spelling of Ἰαωλκόν: BD Ἰαωλκόν, V Ἰαολκόν), and when a couple of minor orthographic corrections have been made (λατρίαν for λατρείαν [Schmid], χερὶ for

objections to the text as it stands testify loudly to its most natural meaning, that Peleus used Hippolyta's arts.

Recently, however, emendation has mostly been rejected. Instead, a variety of translations for *χρησάμενος* have been offered that relieve Peleus of the burden of using Hippolyta's arts and make him instead their victim or intended victim. First, the scholiast's suggestion that *χρησάμενος* be understood as "using as an excuse" found early adherents;⁵ second, from the end of the nineteenth century, comes J. B. Bury's translation "having dealt with" (1890.74–75); third, the preference of most modern commentators is that *χρησάμενος* be translated "having experienced";⁶ fourth, Jeffrey Carnes (1999.5–9, 1996.22–23) suggests that Peleus' using of Hippolyta's tricks be understood in the sense that he is turning them against her or using them to his own advantage.

None of these translations offers a simple solution. Bury's "dealing with" is probably the least satisfactory, since it involves the greatest departure from the usual sense of *χρησάμενος* (Fennell 1899.50–51, Farnell 1932.269). Further, *χρησθαι* can be used of a subject "experiencing" a variety of events, such as slavery, storms, and good or bad fortune, but these are events caused by the gods, not actions performed by another individual, so that the popular "having experienced" requires an unparalleled extension of the verb's semantic range.⁷ "Using as an excuse" and "using to one's advantage" seem to me the most plausible, but it is important to recognize that neither is an obvious meaning for *χρησθαι*.⁸ Both rely on the context for

χειρὶ [Triclinius]; note also that D offers the obviously erroneous *πελλεὺς* in 56), they offer a consistent, and grammatically and metrically correct, text. The fact that the first syllable of *φύτενέ* in 59 is short, where a long syllable is usual, seems to have been taken as a sign of the corruption of the larger passage (see Farnell 1932.268), but the same phenomenon appears in line 91. Recent editors have, therefore, accepted the transmitted text of lines 57–58: Turyn 1952, Snell-Maehler 1987, Race 1997, Bowra 1947, Willcock 1995, Williams 1976. Two additional reasons to accept the transmitted text can be added: first, it is clear from the schol. *ad Ne.* 4.92c, Drachmann 1927.80, that the text in the classical period was similar to that of the manuscripts that survive today so any corruption must be assumed to be ancient; second, it is a more usual effect of transmission that difficult phrases are simplified than that simple phrases become less comprehensible.

5 Wilamowitz 1922.175–76 n.3, also Mommsen 1864.326. See schol. *ad Ne.* 4.92c, Drachmann 1927.80.

6 Mezger 1880.395, Fennell 1899.50–51 with doubts, Cerrato 1918.517, Puech 1923.57, Lattimore 1967.105, Bowra 1969.114, Slater 1969.547, Willcock 1982.5, 1995.104, Bulman 1992.68 and 101 n.49, Race 1997.39.

7 See Carnes 1999.2–3; also Bury 1890.74–75, Farnell 1932.269, Köhnken 1971.200–01.

8 On "using as an excuse," see, however, Farnell 1932.269 and Carnes 1999.3–5.

their justification, and, with τέχνη, χρῆσθαι naturally means to use a skill or to practice a trade, not to turn it to one's advantage or use it as an excuse.⁹

We cannot escape the fact that this is a difficult passage; no obvious solution is available. Instead of assuming that the solution must be obvious, I suggest that we adopt a different approach and think of the meaning of the passage as something to be reached through a process of compromise. This allows us to agree with those who propose emendations that the suggestion of the text is that Peleus makes use of Hippolyta's arts, and, with those who reject emendation, that there are more appropriate ways to understand the text. The reception of this text must thus be thought of as layered: first, the text suggests something that is rejected as inappropriate, and then the audience, pulled in different directions by the needs of the context and the normal meanings of χρῆσθαι, works to produce a meaning that it finds more acceptable.¹⁰

That this passage should be thought of as a stumbling block is supported by the way it continues. The next sentence offers a similarly troubling picture of Peleus, only to retract it quickly (*Ne.* 4.59–60): τῶ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρα φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον / ἐκ λόχου Πελῖαιο παῖς, “But with the sword of Daedalus [Hephaestus], he sowed for him death from an ambush, the son of Pelias did.”¹¹ My translation is awkward, but it illustrates the way in which who is doing what is unclear until the final two words. The late appearance of the subject of this sentence, Πελῖαιο παῖς, must result in the assumption that Peleus is its subject. Not only was he the subject of the previous sentence, but his connection with the sword of Hephaestus was so well established that it later became proverbial, with the result that the audience must have assumed he was the subject of φύτευέ.¹² Initially, then,

9 Eur. *Phoen.* 954 and Xen. *Mem.* 3.10.1, *Oec.* 4.3–4; see LSJ *χράω* C.II.b.

10 In general, critics underplay the difficulty of Pindar's poetry for its archaic audiences; periods of doubt as to the meaning of words and phrases were surely a common feature of an ode's reception. Moreover, χρῆσάμενος may have been a strange word to an archaic audience. The middle χρῆσθαι occurs only rarely in archaic poetry: this is the only time it appears in Pindar, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Stesichorus, Sappho, Anacreon, Tyrtaeus, Archilochus, Callinus, or Alcaeus (except in the later commentaries concerning the texts), while it appears once in Simonides (epigram 118.4D = *A.P.* 7.253) and twice in the *Theognidea* (161, 772). The use of the active and passive of *χράω* to mean “prophecy” is more common; see *Oll.* 2.43, 7.92; *Py.* 4.6.

11 This is the transmitted text, recorded by Snell-Maehler 1987, but not Turyn 1952, who accepted Didymus' emendation. For the identity of Daedalus, see Bury 1890.75, Farnell 1932.270–71, Willcock 1995.104–05.

12 See Anacreon *PMG* 497. The testimony is late, but the fact that Anacreon also joins Peleus and the sword suggests that the proverb may be of considerably earlier date.

Peleus seems to be the one laying an ambush against his guest-friend, a picture that fits with that of Peleus attacking his host through his wife's arts.¹³

What then does this stumbling block mean? It gestures, albeit momentarily, towards a Peleus who breaks the code of guest-friendship. The point of this suggestion is to be found in the specific articulation of Peleus' infraction: he used Hippolyta's "crafty arts" (δολίαις τέχναισι). τέχνη, art or skill, was a particularly negative word for the Greek aristocracy, and it can cause no surprise that it is characterized here as "crafty" or "treacherous" and associated with the negative figure of Hippolyta and the breaking of the bonds of guest-friendship. Yet "arts" are largely responsible for the achievement and celebration of the victory praised in this ode: the arts of the victor's wrestling, of the trainer who taught the victor, and of the poet who praises him. The centrality of art to the economy of this athletic victory is something the rest of the ode seeks to hide, but this passage, I argue, briefly exposes this ideology, pointing the audience towards the relation of art to the aristocracy and to this athletic victory in particular. This may seem a large claim to make for a small portion of text, but the continual editorial activity that has surrounded it, whether in the form of emendation or translation, is a sign of how prominent the lines are.¹⁴

II

The implication of victor, trainer, and poet in the use of art renders all three problematic figures for aristocratic ideology. The victor celebrated in this ode, Timasarchus, won his victory in wrestling, which, along with its more violent hybrid form pancration, was recognized as requiring mastery of a particular technique and knowledge of a wide variety of complex maneuvers. Michael Poliakoff (1987.23) asserts that wrestling "maximizes

13 The similarity of Πηλεὺς (56) to Πελῖας (60) seems also to confuse the clear distinction between Acastus and Peleus.

14 It is also perhaps a sign of the ideological significance of the lines. Cf. *Ne.* 1.46–47, where the transmitted text: ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος / ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων, "As [the snakes] were throttled, time caused their lives to be breathed out of their unspeakable limbs," was long emended to replace χρόνος with a more palatable noun, such as βρόχος ("noose") or χάνος ("gaping mouth") (see Gerber 1976.100 with the addition of Gini 1989/90.23–25), but the reading is sound (Gerber 1962) and, in fact, contains a key to a major theme in the ode, the relationship between divine and human time (Segal 1998.155–65).

the role of skill and science,” while Norman Gardiner (1910.371, 1965.181) refers to it as “a science and an art.”¹⁵ The usual Greek term for wrestling was ἡ πάλη, but it was also referred to as ἡ παλαιστική or ἡ παλαιστρική, in both cases, phrases where the noun τέχνη is to be understood.¹⁶ In an ode to a pancratiast, Bacchylides describes how Heracles set his hands on the Nemean lion in a neck-breaking hold “with all types of skill,” παντοίαισι τέχναις, while Pindar’s description of another pancratiast as a fox is connected by the scholiast with the use of art in wrestling moves to defeat a larger opponent.¹⁷ As befits an art, mythology supplied it with an inventor (though accounts vary between Theseus, Phorbas, and Athena), and spoke of it being learned by various pupils (schol. *ad* Pi. *Ne.* 5.89a, b, Drachmann 1927.98–99). Given the depth of technical expertise required, it was imperative that beginners apprentice with a coach, and, in later centuries, manuals of instruction were also produced (Poliakoff 1987.52–53, Gardiner 1910.374).

The exercise of cunning and trickery was particularly important to wrestling. Pindar refers to a second wrestler as defeating his opponents with “quick-falling trickery,” ὄξυρπεῖ δόλω; Odysseus uses trickery to throw Ajax in their wrestling match at the Funeral Games of Patroclus in the *Iliad*; and Proteus tries to evade Menelaus’ holds in the same way in the *Odyssey*.¹⁸ The use of trickery was certainly not uncommon if directed, as it was in wrestling, at opponents, but such art was a cause of general anxiety in aristocratic circles. It was seen as challenging and often obscuring the natural superiority of inherited talent. In *Isthmian* 3/4, speaking of Ajax’s defeat at the hands of Odysseus in the contest for Achilles’ arms, Pindar reflects that chance and art can undermine the better man (52–53): καὶ κρέσσον’ ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων / ἔσφαλε τέχνη καταμάρψαις: “[Chance] has even caused the better man to fall, catching him through the skill of worse men.” ἔσφαλε, and the fact that this word occurs in an ode addressed

15 Cf. Kyle 1987.142.

16 LSJ s.v. παλαιστικός I, and, for ἡ παλαιστική, schol. *ad* Pi. *Ne.* 5.89b, Drachmann 1927.98.

17 B. 13.49, Pi. *Is.* 3/4.65, schol. *ad* *Is.* 4.77c, Drachmann 1927.234; the connection is endorsed by Hubbard 1985.111. Note also Simonides’ epigram 52 (Page), which is not actually by Simonides but from the early fourth century: this speaks of a wrestler who won by skill (τέχνη) rather than by size of body.

18 Pi. *Ol.* 9.98, Hom. *Il.* 23.723, *Od.* 4.455, and, in general, see Poliakoff 1987.23 and 1982.14–15 n.21. Note that the translation of ὄξυρπεῖ is difficult; Slater translates it as “delicately poised.” The scholiasts to this passage (*Ol.* 9.138a, c, d, Drachmann 1903.299) use τέχνη and δόλος interchangeably.

to a man who has won victories in the pancration (as well as the chariot race), shows that the metaphor is drawn from the world of combat sports, and suggests that Pindar had in mind Odysseus' success in throwing Ajax in the *Iliad*. The use of art in wrestling thus serves as a powerful symbol of the more general threat art poses to the aristocratic world order.¹⁹ Thomas Hubbard has warned against overstating Pindar's opposition to τέχνη by drawing on isolated statements (Pindar is not always so negative and often works to recuperate the practice of τέχνη in other parts of an ode), but it is not Pindar's attitude that is important here. Rather, statements such as that of *Isthmian* 3/4 demonstrate a definite bias against τέχνη in at least part of Pindar's audience—a bias that is strong enough to taint wrestling.²⁰ In this connection, it is also suggestive that, while mythology associated the invention of all the combat sports with Athens (Pindar also associates the training for these sports with that city), the Spartans, at least in the fourth century, seem to have disdained the technical aspects of wrestling, relying on more natural qualities such as strength.²¹

19 Poliakoff 1982 does not discuss σφάλλειν, but, for its use in wrestling, see Hom. *Il.* 23.719, Theoc. 24.112, and LSJ I. Note also Pindar's apparently odd statement that Ixion murdered his kinsman, "not without τέχνη," οὐκ ἄτερ τέχνας (*Py.* 2.32); this serves to associate τέχνη with threats to kinship.

20 Hubbard 1985.107–24. On *Is.* 3/4, Hubbard 1985.110–16 ignores the fact that the word τέχνη is not actually used again in this ode, even if, by implication, its exercise is elevated. Indeed Melissus' own wrestling victory in 67–69 is actually ascribed to inherited traits. While his external appearance (φύσιν) is famously disparaged, it is his "fighting spirit" (αἰχμῆ) that is credited with the victory. (This is often obscured, however, by the adoption of Pauw's unnecessary emendation of ἀκμῆ, accepted by Bowra 1947 and Snell-Maehler 1987 and used by Hubbard without comment.) Similarly, although Pindar does elevate the status of a technical occupation, steering, at the close of the poem (89–90), he does so crucially in the context of a relationship between athlete and trainer that resembles that of a tutor and an aristocratic youth, such as Chiron and Achilles. The force of the word τέχνη, I would argue, therefore remains negative in this ode; it is the practice of τέχνη that is repackaged.

21 On Athens, see *Pi. Ne.* 5.49 and schol. *ad Ne.* 5.89, Drachmann 1927.98–99. On Sparta, Gardiner 1910.401 and an epigram of Damagetus, a third-century poet (*A. Pl.* 1, Gow and Page XI): Οὐτ' ἀπὸ Μεσσήνας οὐτ' Ἀργόθεν εἰμὶ παλαιστάς· / Σπάρτα μοι, Σπάρτα κυδιάνειρα, πατρίς· / κείνοι τεχνάεντες, ἐγὼ γε μὲν, ὡς ἐπέοικε / τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίων παῖσι, βίᾳ κρατέω, "I am a wrestler from neither Messene nor Argos. Sparta, man-nobbling Sparta is my fatherland. Let others use skills (τεχνάεντες), while I, as befits the children of the Spartans, conquer by strength." Cf. also Plut. *Mor.* 233E, and, in general, the association between Odysseus with wrestling, on the one hand (add *S. Phil.* 431 to *Il.* 23), and anti-aristocratic values on the other (*Pi. Ne.* 7.20–30, 8.21–34; Thgn. 213–18 and Nagy 1982.120–22; Brown 1951, Goldhill 1986.154–61, and, on Odysseus' association with merchants, Von Reden 1995a.58–76).

Like wrestling, poetry was seen as an art, at least some of the time. Pindar describes poets as artisans (τέκτονες, *Py.* 3.113), a word he uses for doctors and builders (*Pyy.* 3.6, 5.36), and, like the other epinician poets, he compares his poetry to the products of architects and builders on various occasions. Although Pindar often does this in order to indicate a difference in scale or quality, the comparison nevertheless shows that poetry was marked as an art like other arts by some groups in Pindar's audience.²²

When thought of as an art, a τέχνη, poetry was viewed with suspicion by aristocrats not so much because it was seen as challenging the claims of nature (though it sometimes was),²³ but because it was associated, like most other arts, with an economy of exchange other than the gift exchange that, at least in its ideology, defined the aristocracy.²⁴ By the time of Pindar, the services that the poet rendered had become almost wholly commodified: rather than being produced as part of a long series of favors and returns either within the poet's home community or at least during a long sojourn at some foreign court, poems were now produced in single, isolatable transactions where the relationship between poet and patron was minimal and the equivalence between poem and payment (whether made in money or kind) exposed.²⁵ But, as anthropologists have shown, commodification is not without meaning in the sphere of ethics; in societies where gift and commodity exchange are both practiced, the type of exchange engaged in by two parties indicates the degree of trust and kinship that exists between

22 On the comparison of poetry to various arts, see Harriott 1969.92–95, Hubbard 1985.76–85. There are of course a variety of other ways in which Pindar describes his poetry (such as the gift of the gods) that avoid this association with art and commodity exchange.

23 E.g., *Ne.* 7.20–23. The reverse proposition, seen in *Ne.* 7.12–16, is more common in Pindar: natural talent needs poetry for its proper recognition.

24 This is not to claim that the Greek aristocracy did not engage in other forms of exchange; it is clear that they did, and, indeed, the Aeginetan aristocracy in particular must have engaged in trade (Von Reden 1995a.6–8, Hubbard 1997), but, nevertheless, few of the aristocratic groups that Pindar writes for seek to define themselves by these other forms of exchange. Von Reden 1995a.58–76 argues that, in any case, the boundary between trade and gift exchange is in large part ideological.

25 For this understanding of the difference between gift and commodity exchange, see esp. Gregory 1982.12, also Appadurai 1986, Kopytoff 1986, and Sahlins 1972.182–275; and for this idea of the development of the exchange of poetry, see Gentili 1988.155–76, Gzella 1971.189–90, Kurke 1991.7, Bell 1978.29–30. Cf. also Detienne 1981.81–143, who sees Simonides as representative of a secularization of wisdom in this period, which could be described as its transformation into a commodity. Payment does seem to have been made in the form of gifts as well as money; see ps-Pl. *Hipp.* 228c on Simonides.

them. The more like gift exchange an exchange is, that is, the more service and payment are separated in time and embedded in a series of exchanges, the more trust exists between the two parties; conversely, the more like a commodity exchange the exchange is, the more minimal the contacts between the parties and the less a relationship exists between them (Sahlins 1972.182–275, Gregory 1982.22–23, Appadurai 1986.6–16). Pindar's poetry, in so far as it was thought of as an art (τέχνη), rather than, say, the gift of the Muses, marks him as a tradesman and thus as an outsider to the aristocratic world.

Marshall Sahlins (1972.182–275) has argued that the continuum between gift and commodity exchange can be extended to include more violent forms of redistribution such as theft, swindling, and piracy: commodity exchange (what Sahlins calls balanced reciprocity) implies a neutrality or indifference, while theft and deceit (negative reciprocity) imply outright enmity. But, as Sahlins says, the line between balanced and negative reciprocity can be very thin, as the parties to an exchange such as barter are often seen as trying to profit at each other's expense. In archaic Greek culture, this phenomenon is particularly clear: balanced reciprocity is associated with the effort to deceive and swindle. In the *Theognidea*, both those who use their money to buy their way into marriage relationships with aristocratic families and the aristocratic families who take the money are seen as cheating each other: ἀλλήλους δ' ἀπατῶντες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι γελῶσιν, "deceiving one another, they laugh at one another."²⁶ Accordingly, Pindar's association with art (τέχνη) may not only mark him as an outsider but also as positively hostile towards his aristocratic patrons.²⁷

The trainer combines the problems of both the wrestler and the poet since he trades in the skills that help the lesser man defeat his superior. Trainers were certainly professionals who worked for a wage; although it is rarely noted, it cannot be doubted that they participated in the same economy as the other itinerant figures of the epinician world, the poets and charioteers, and thus, like the poets, were marked as non-kin and even hostile to

26 Thgn. 1113. Cf. also 119–28, 53–60, 61–68, and Kurke 1991.252–54.

27 Detienne 1981.105–43 argues that deceit, ἀπάτη, becomes central to the poetics of this period; see also Pratt 1993.115–29. It is interesting that this occurs while poetry is being commodified: the brazenness with which the association between poetry and ἀπάτη was proclaimed must have underlined the feeling of deceit attached to the professional poet by his mode of exchange.

aristocratic society by their mode of exchange.²⁸ Moreover, the fact that the trainer teaches is especially troubling. As a teacher, he is seen as helping those who do not deserve it to win through taught skills the glory that is due to inborn talent. Certainly it would be absurd to think that Pindar's aristocratic audience believed that an untutored talent would be enough for victory,²⁹ but it is nevertheless clear from Pindar's gnomic statements that he was able to presume a strong bias against skills learnt from teachers: τὸ δὲ φύξί κρείττον ἅπαν· πολλοὶ δὲ διδασκαίς / ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταίς κλέος / ὄρουσαν ἀρέσθαι, "That which is by nature is wholly best, but many men have sought to win glory with taught virtues" (*Ol.* 9.107–10); ὃς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνὴρ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ' ἀτρεκεῖ / κατέβα ποδί, μυριάν δ' ἀρετῶν ἀτελεῖ νόῳ γεύεται, "But he whose [abilities] are taught, [remains] an obscure man, blowing here and there, and never enters the competition with sure foot, but savors myriad virtues in his vain mind" (*Ne.* 3.39–40). Both statements, drawn from odes to victors in combat sports (wrestling in *Olympian* 9 and pancration in *Nemean* 3), reveal clearly the anxiety trainers must have occasioned for aristocratic ideology: training should not have been a component of victory, as victory was meant to illustrate the aristocrat's natural superiority, not his arts. Yet trainers taught these arts to young aristocrats, and, as teachers, they became thought of as artisans whose products were successful athletes: in *Nemean* 5, Pindar refers to one trainer, Menander, as an artisan (τέκτων) of athletes.³⁰

The aura of foreignness and hostility conferred on trainer and poet by their association with artisans must have been exacerbated by the particular circumstances of Timasarchus' victory. The poet's lack of kinship with the victor was underlined, as Pindar shows, by the presence of poets within

28 Young 1984.147–50, Gardiner 1910.111–12. Kyle 1987.145 n.132 is unwilling to admit that trainers were professionals, suggesting that they "probably did not see themselves as wage earners"; cf. also 144 n.121.

29 As Hubbard 1985.108–09 warns; cf. Gardiner 1910.111–12. Hubbard also shows that in odes such as *Ne.* 3 and *Ol.* 9 Pindar offers a different evaluation of taught virtues.

30 *Ne.* 5.49. It is interesting to note that the earliest boxing trainer known by name is Tisias, the trainer of Glaucus of Carystus. Tradition associates Glaucus with tremendous social mobility, suggesting that he rose from the lowly status of a farm worker to the position of tyrant of Camarina. Although that tradition focuses on his great natural abilities, it also makes clear that he was very vulnerable until he developed an outstanding technique; see Paus. 6.10.3, who refers to Glaucus as ἐπιτηδειότατος τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν χειρονομῆσαι, "the most skilled at boxing of his contemporaries," and Poliakoff 1987.124.

Timasarchus' family, including his father and maternal grandfather.³¹ Although the father was already dead, Pindar describes how he would have celebrated his son's victory if he had been alive (13–18).³² This close kinship between poet and victor is mirrored by a second celebration that Pindar imagines towards the end of the ode, in which the victor's maternal grandfather, Euphanes, celebrates his now dead maternal uncle, Callicles, that is, a father (here, Euphanes) again celebrates the victories of his son (here, Callicles). Due to the corruption of this passage, it cannot be determined whether this celebration is imagined happening in the future, perhaps in the presence of Callicles in Hades or without him in Aegina, or whether it did actually happen before Callicles died, but the relationship of poet to victor is again clearly father to son, with *προπάτωρ* (89) echoing *πατήρ* (14).³³ Further underlining Pindar's exclusion from the kin group is his comment that Euphanes will celebrate or has celebrated Callicles *ἐθέλων* (89), which means "willingly," and contrasts with Pindar's praise that is *συνθέμενος* (75), produced "under contract," for pay.

Melesias' lack of kinship may also have been particularly noticeable, though the evidence here is more speculative. It seems likely that the first trainers were family members (Gardiner 1910.111–12), and this practice may well have endured longer on Aegina. Certainly the practice seems to have endured as an ideal in this period: in a pair of odes for a second Aeginetan family, Pindar offers the pretense that the two victors, Lampon's sons Pytheas and Phylacidas, were trained in the pancration by family members: Phylacidas by his brother in *Isthmian* 5.66–68³⁴ and both brothers

31 Crotty 1982.58–61 and Cole 1992.97–99 see that Pindar is marked as non-kin, but do not connect this to his status as a wage earner or artisan.

32 *υἱὸν* in line 16 is an emendation, but (a), corruption in the mss. is almost certain (*ὑμνον* has probably crept in through the copying of *ὑμνου* in 11), and (b), the relationship is guaranteed by *σὸς πατήρ* in 14.

33 Turyn lists various emendations for this passage. He, the mss., and Mommsen place the celebration in the future; while Boeckh and Snell-Maehler place it in the past.

34 *Is.* 5.66–68 are difficult lines: *αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμας / Φυλακίδα πλάγαν δρόμον εὐθυπορήσαι, / χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον*. Bury 1892.102–03 points out that it would be unique if *εὐθυπορήσαι* depended on *αἰνέω*, and makes *Φυλακίδα* depend on *ἀντίπαλον* ("a match for Phylacidas"). Farnell 1932.369–70 accepts Bury's premise, but rightly dismisses Bury's solution as joining words that are too far separated. He offers instead a preferable version that makes Pytheas the older brother and coach of Phylacidas: "I praise Pytheas too, skilled with his hands to make straight for Phylacidas the running course of blows in the limb-subduing [struggles], and hostile in his mind." That the coach of the victor be mentioned here, at the end of the ode, fits with Pindar's usual practice; see Hamilton 1974.107–08.

by their father in *Isthmian* 6.68–70.³⁵ It is, however, clear from *Nemean* 5.48–49 and Bacchylides 13.190–98 that the family used at least one professional trainer, Menander of Athens, and we should assume that this was their usual practice.³⁶

Pindar and Melesias were not just from outside the kin group; they were also from outside Aegina: Pindar from Thebes, and Melesias, who was probably the father of the Athenian politician Thucydides, from Athens;³⁷ and, as Thomas Cole argues, the resentment felt at an outsider being used to celebrate Timasarchus' victory would have been "particularly sharp if he were from outside the city as well as outside the family."³⁸ The awkward political geography of this victory seems, in fact, to be mapped out in Timasarchus' victory catalogue: . . . υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον / Κλεωναίου τ' ἅπ' ἀγῶνος ὄρμον στεφάνων / πέμψαντα καὶ λιπαρᾶν / εὐωνύμων ἅπ' Ἀθανᾶν, Θήβαις τ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοις, "[Timocritus] would have sung of his victorious son, who sent a string of crowns from the contest at Cleonae, and from rich and famous Athens, and in seven-gated Thebes" (*Ne.* 4.16–19). Cleonae, Athens, and Thebes denote the places where Timasarchus has been victorious, but they also connote the worrying network of relations with foreigners that this celebration of the wrestling victory at Nemea is predicated upon: Cleonae is the place of Timasarchus' greatest victory, but Athens is the home of the trainer whose art made it possible, and Thebes of the poet whose art celebrates it.

35 Bury 1892.102–03, following Mommsen, misses the ideological work of the ode here and emends the reference to Lampon so that it refers to Menander instead.

36 Fennell 1899.53–54 emends the corrupt lines *Ne.* 4.89–90 to make Euphanes the trainer of Callicles: τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραίὸς προπάτωρ / ὃ σὸς διδάσκειτο παῖ, "Him did your aged grandfather Euphanes willingly teach, child." This is ingenious, but not as good an emendation as the more conservative offerings that render Euphanes a poet. Note that Euphanes must be alive, since he is the only viable candidate for the role of patron. The patron is always named in a victory ode, and, as both Timocritus and Callicles are dead, Euphanes must be the patron. As the victor's grandfather, he may also be the most senior person in his family.

37 Wade-Gery 1932.205–27, Davies 1971.9812, Kyle 1987.144, schol. *ad Ne.* 4.155a, Drachmann 1927.87.

38 Cole 1992.99–100. *Nemean* 4 is difficult to date precisely (Bowra 1964.409, Willcock 1982.3, and Cole 1992.91–93), and this, in turn, makes it difficult to ascertain how its Aeginetan audience felt about Athens and Thebes. Cole 1992.100 dates the ode to 479, when relations with Thebes would have been poor, but relations with Athens perhaps briefly rosy. It should be noted, however, *contra* Cole 1992.99–100, that the treatment of Athens and Thebes is very similar: both are praised in the victory catalogue (18–24), but neither is named in connection with Melesias and Pindar respectively. This perhaps favors a later date in the 470s. See also Woloch 1963.104.

Three of the four major figures in this ode (the fourth is the patron, Timasarchus' grandfather Euphanes)³⁹ are marked by their use of art as hostile to the aristocrats, either through their involvement in commodity exchange, through challenging the natural dominance of innate talent, or through a combination of the two. The potential hostility of trainer and poet is emphasized by the fact that both come from other cities and, certainly for the poet and probably for the trainer, by a tradition or ideal of providing such services in-house.

III

The anxieties surrounding poet, trainer, and wrestler are addressed through two deeply ideological representations of wrestling at key moments in the ode that, on the one hand, subordinate wrestling's use of art to the defense of the aristocracy and the defeat of their opponents, while, on the other hand, presenting this art as a natural talent. The first of the two mythical representations occurs at the end of the ode's mythical sections (*Ne.* 4.62–68):

πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς θρασυμαχάνων τε λεόντων
 ὄνυχας ὀξύτατους σχάσαις
 καὶ δεινοτάτων ἀκμὰν ὀδόντων
 ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρείδων.
 εἶδεν δ' εὐκυκλον ἔδραν,
 τᾶς οὐρανοῦ βασιλῆες πόντου τ' ἐφεζόμενοι
 δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲς αὐτῷ.

Holding fast the all-conquering fire, and the very sharp
 nails of bold-devising lions, and the edge of most dread
 teeth, [Peleus] married one of the high-throned Nereids,
 and he saw the circular seat where the kings of heaven and
 ocean sat and revealed gifts and power for his clan.

The combat depicted here is more properly described as a pancration: the epithet applied to the fire, *παγκρατὲς*, certainly suggests the name of the event. Scratching and biting were not features of wrestling, but were com-

39 See note 36 above.

mon in pancration (even though biting was banned), and “lion” seems to have been a common nickname for a pancratiast.⁴⁰ As noted above, however, wrestling and pancration were closely associated, so that the ideology generated here of pancration certainly influences the ode’s notion of wrestling.

This ideology consists of three parts. First, the bout is seen as confirming the proper order of things and endorsing the virtue that is a hero’s proper possession. The gods support Peleus, and it is implied that his victory, securing as it does Peleus’ kinship with the gods through marriage, is part of the “destined fate of Zeus” (τὸ μόρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον, 61). Second, victory in the bout does not depend on the use of art. Peleus wins through strength, simply by holding on to Thetis (σχάσαις, 63); moreover, he overcomes an opponent who does use art, as the description of the lions into which she turns as “bold in their devising” (θρασυμαχάνων) implies.⁴¹ Art, it is thus suggested, is not the crucial factor in victory. Third, the wrestling bout is seen as creating a relationship of gift exchange. The fact that Peleus marries Thetis is not the rhetorical climax of this episode; it is eclipsed by the giving of gifts and power to Peleus by the gods. As ἐγγενὲς makes clear, these gifts constitute a relationship for all time between the gods and Peleus’ descendants.⁴² Through this myth, wrestling is given a strong aristocratic flavor: it participates in the aristocratic economy of gift exchange, and, far from destabilizing the perceived superiority of natural talent, is seen as confirming it.

While this first representation of wrestling downplays the role of art, the second axial representation of wrestling focuses on the wrestler’s use of it. The passage comes at the close of the ode (*Ne.* 4.91–96):

ἄλλοισι δ’ ἄλικες ἄλλοι· τὰ δ’ αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχη,
 ἔλπεταί τις ἕκαστος ἐξοχώτατα φάσθαι.
 οἶον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι,
 ῥήματα πλέκων, ἀπάλαιστος ἐν λόγῳ ἔλκειν,

40 Poliakoff 1987.54–55; and on the nickname of lion, see also Lucian *Demon.* 49.

41 The adjective is perhaps surprising. Lions are usually associated with strength or a loud roar in Pindar (*Pyy.* 5.57–58, 9.27–28), though once also with boldness (*Is.* 3/4.64), while cunning is usually the province of the fox, with which the lion is contrasted on three occasions (*OI* 11.19–21, *Is.* 3/4.63–65, *fr.* 283 = Snell 237).

42 There is some doubt over the reading of ἐγγενὲς (Bowra 1947 offers ἐς γένος, F. Williams 1976.151, 206–07 ἐς γενεάν), but the majority of suggestions (like those of Bowra and Williams) preserve the idea of the gifts and power being family possessions.

μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐσλοῖς,
τραχὺς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος.

Each generation has its own companions. But what each person encounters, he expects to give the best account of. Emulating⁴³ Melesias, what a twisting fight would he wage, binding his words, an invincible wrestler, not dragged down in the telling, having a kindly disposition towards the good, but a combatant harsh to the spiteful, and fresh after a bye.

That the image here is of a wrestler is abundantly clear: στρέφοι, πλέκων, and ἔλκειν all point to wrestling, while ἀπάλαιστος and the technical term ἔφεδρος leave no room for doubt.⁴⁴ Unlike the previous image, this one concentrates on the arts of wrestling, the twists, turns, and grips needed to secure or avoid a fall, but this display of skill is fully subordinated to one of the most classic statements of aristocratic ethics in Pindar's odes:⁴⁵ the wrestler is "kindly disposed towards the good," that is the aristocrats, but towards their enemies he is a "harsh combatant." His superiority to these enemies is marked by the fact that he is compared to an athlete who has benefited from a bye and is now fresh, while his opponent has had to win a bout to face him.

In these two images, wrestling is characterized in conflicting but complementary ways. Both images present wrestling as a paradigmatic aristocratic activity that upholds aristocratic beliefs and values, but while the first hides its use of art, the second trumpets it as properly aristocratic. Timasarchus is obviously bound into both images as a wrestler, but the connection is also made specific in other ways: Timasarchus brings home (οἶκαδε, 76) gifts and glory for his clan (πάτρων, 77), just as Peleus secures power for his clan; and, if the above translation of ἀνιέων is accepted, Timasarchus also mirrors the metaphorical poet-wrestler of the final image in that he, too, follows the example of Melesias. The discomfort caused by Timasarchus' use of art is thus soothed by the poet's presentation of this use:

43 On the translation of ἀνιέων as "emulating," see below.

44 On these terms, see Poliakoff 1982.137–42, to whom their translation is indebted. On ἔφεδρος, see also schol. *ad Ne.* 4.155b, Drachmann 1927.87.

45 The relationship between these final lines and aristocratic ethics have been often noted; cf. Hubbard 1985.75–76, Bulman 1992.59–60, schol. *ad Ne.* 4.155d, Drachmann 1927.88.

far from representing an upsetting of the aristocratic order, it serves to reveal, endorse, and defend it. A more general effort to present the victor's athletic endeavors as part of the aristocratic economy of gift exchange can be seen in 22–23, where his victory in Thebes is described as the entertainment of a friend by friends: φίλοισι γὰρ φίλος ἐλθὼν / ξένιον ἄστυ κατέδρακεν, “A friend coming to friends, he saw a city that offered hospitality.”⁴⁶

The trainer does not appear before the final strophe of the ode. Above, αἰνέων was translated as “emulating,” following Bury's suggestion (1890.234), which is in turn derived from the scholiast's interpretation of *Isthmian* 7.31–35:

τὸ δέ, Διοδότῳ παῖ, μαχατάν
αἰνέων Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἑκτορα
Ἀμφιάρῳ τε,
εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσας ἀλκίαν
προμάχων ἄν' ὄμιλον.

But you, son of Diodotus, praising the warrior Meleager,
and praising Hector and Amphiarus, breathed out your
flowering youth, fighting among the forefighters in the
throng.

As the scholiast (*ad Is.* 7.44, Drachmann 1927.266) rightly notes, this is praise in the sense of emulation (ζηλῶν), a praise that goes beyond passive endorsement into active imitation. This idea of praise makes the best sense of *Nemean* 4.91–96, since the lines speak of any potential act of praise, not specifically praise of Melesias' feats. What is praised is thus not specified, but the poet's inspiration is very clear: Melesias is the model for the type of wrestling, metaphorical or otherwise, in which the use of art is subordinated to proper aristocratic goals.⁴⁷

The way in which the poet's use of art is presented is especially complex. Early on, the ode offers the usual strategy of presenting his art as

46 Crotty 1982.59 and Hubbard 1985.77–78 note the image, but see as its only point the binding of the poet to kinship with the victor's family.

47 αἰνέων also avoids the unpleasant associations of words more closely associated with teaching, such as μαθόν, which had especially negative connotations for some groups (see *Pi. Ol.* 2.94–97). αἰνέων, on the other hand, appears to be the *vox propria* for the process of learning from and being inspired by heroes.

part of the aristocratic economy of exchange between friends. As Kevin Crotty has shown (1982.58–61), the description of Timasarchus' victory in Thebes as “a friend coming to friends,” which was seen above as binding the victor to the aristocratic economy, also serves to suggest a relation of guest-friendship between the Theban poet and the victor. This is reinforced by the ensuing description of the comradeship of the Theban Heracles and the Aeginetan Telamon (25–30).⁴⁸ Also, as Leslie Kurke shows (1991.143–46), poetry is elevated in the opening strophe above the level of other arts such as medicine, since its power to remove pain is greater than that of the cures doctors prescribe, such as warm baths. The poem thus ceases to be a commodity and becomes a treasured heirloom that Pindar “takes out of his deep mind” (φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας, 8), as a host might take a possession out of his storehouse and give it to a guest. Similarly, it should be noted that the ode itself is described as loved by Aegina, thus suggesting again a relationship of friendship between poet and victor (44–46): ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ, / Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἀρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον / Οἰνῶνα . . ., “Weave, sweet harp, straightway this song also, in Lydian harmony, beloved by Oenone . . .”

In the first half of the ode, the poet's practice of art is also recuperated through an image of wrestling, so that when Peleus appears as a pancratiast, he evokes the poet as well as the victor (*Ne.* 4.35–41):

ἵγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νεομηνία θιγέμεν.
 ἔμπα, καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα
 μέσσον, ἀντίτειν' ἐπιβουλίᾳ· σφόδρα δόξομεν
 δαίων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν·
 φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων
 γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει
 χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν.

My heart is dragged by a charm to touch upon the new moon's feast. And so, although the deep salt sea holds you by the waist, strain against plots. We shall be seen as very much the superior of our enemies when we enter the competition in the light. But another man, with envy in his

48 See also Bulman 1992.58–61, Hubbard 1985.76–78.

eyes, wrestles in the darkness with an empty thought that
has fallen to the ground.

ἔλκομαι, ἔχει . . . μέσσον, and κυλίνδει all suggest that the image is of wrestling (Poliakoff 1982.137–42),⁴⁹ and thus the passage binds the poet's practice to Peleus'. Like Peleus, Pindar is set against artful tricks (one scholiast seems to read τέχνας and ἐπιβουλία as synonyms in this ode);⁵⁰ and like Peleus' wrestling, Pindar's serves to ensure the proper order of things: the poet's superiority withstands scrutiny in the light (ἐν φάει), while the thoughts of his opponent are empty, that is, false.⁵¹ The poet's art is thus hidden by this image (as indeed is the wrestler's), and Pindar is presented as an opponent of those who would obscure the evident quality of the aristocrats.

After the Peleus myth, however, Pindar takes a different tack, stressing the ode's status as a commodity. He speaks of himself as under contract (συνθέμενος, 75), describes his work as that of a stonemason ("a pillar whiter than Parian marble"), and speaks of the victor "bidding" (κελεύεις, 80) him to sing, a word that is used "mostly of persons in authority,"⁵² and so contradicts the impression of equality between victor and poet offered by the guest-friendship metaphors.⁵³ But this brief suggestion that the poet's service is an art proves to be only a prelude to its further refiguring through two strategies. The first strategy is familiar from earlier in the ode: elevating the art of poetry beyond other arts. Pindar's art is lifted out

49 καταβαίνειν is also a technical term in athletics for entering a contest; see LSJ I.4, Köhnken 1971.208–09, Willcock 1982.8–10, and Bulman 1992.64–65.

50 The schol. *ad Ne.* 4.92b, Drachmann 1927.79–80, speaks of Hippolyta's δολίαις τέχνασι as "ἐπιβουλᾷς" (perhaps the source of V's reading, accepted by Snell-Maehler 1987), and explains that she treacherously plotted (δολίως ἐπεβούλευσε) against Peleus. Norwood 1956.180, Köhnken 1971.205–06, and Hubbard 1985.80 also see Pindar's opposition to ἐπιβουλία as parallel to Peleus' opposition to Hippolyta's δολίαις τέχνασι.

51 Note that the wrestling image fractures here: Pindar moves from an image of himself fighting his opponent to one where his opponent and his false thoughts wrestle together on the ground.

52 See LSJ, who note that the word is also used of friendly exhortations, and cf. *Ol.* 6.32, 70; *Py.* 9.119.

53 Pindar also compares himself to a smelter of metals; see Hubbard 1985.81–82. Kurke 1991.192–94 argues that such images do not degrade the poet, but raise up the status of his product, and thus also enhance the glory of the patron who commissioned it. Similarly, Von Reden 1995a.195–216, 1995b.41–44 argues that references to payments by the patron serve as a reference to the patron's power. But although both arguments are surely correct, the references to payments and the suggestion that poetry is an art cannot be seen as meaningful only for the patron; they inevitably characterize the poet also.

of the sphere of gift exchange by the very magnitude of its service (*Ne.* 4.82–86):

ὁ χρυσὸς ἐψόμενος
 αὐγὰς ἔδειξεν ἀπάσας, ὕμνος δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν
 ἐργμάτων βασιλεῦσιν ἰσοδαίμονα τεύχει
 φῶτα· κείνος ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμάν
 γλῶσσαν εὐρέτω κελαδῆτιν . . .

Refined gold shows all its rays, but a song of good deeds
 makes a man equal to kings. Let that man [Callicles] who
 dwells by Acheron find my voice, ringing loudly . . .

Pindar's words do not just make (τεύχει, 4) men's limbs soft, they make (τεύχει, 84) a man equal to kings and establish communication with the dead.⁵⁴ These are services that, unlike the setting up of a Parian marble, cannot be equated with any payment.

The second strategy is the more daring and unique: Pindar presents poetry as an occupation of amateurs, requiring no specialist training. After noting that Euphanes will praise or has praised his son Callicles at no charge, Pindar does not return to himself, as he usually does, at the end of an ode, but drops out of the poem in favor of a universal and anonymous τις, "anyone."⁵⁵ Where we might expect Pindar's account of the victory to be the best (ἐξοχώτατα, 92), just as it is Pindar who is "pre-eminent in wisdom" at the end of *Olympian* 1 (προφάντων σοφία, 116) or Tiresias, Pindar's mythical double in *Nemean* 1, who is the "best prophet" (προφάταν ἔξοχον, 60), anyone who was there, Pindar implies, can now reach these previously lonely heights. Commentators have for the most part ignored the oddity of this ending, taking the τις as a barely disguised synonym for Pindar, who is then thought of as the real subject of στρέφοι in 93,⁵⁶ but if this most unusual

54 On this theme more generally in the odes, see Segal 1998.133–48 and Kurke 1991.65–70.

55 Pindar usually includes a forceful reference to himself at the end of an ode: *Oll.* 1.115b, 3.47, 6.105, 8.86, 10.104/5, 11.16; *Pyg.* 2.96, 3.111, 4.299, 5.124, 7.18, 10.69; *Nee.* 6.68, 7.102, 8.48, 9.54; *Iss.* 2.48, 3/4.90, 5.66, 6.71. *Py.* 7.19 and *Ol.* 2.110 both look to other speakers, but there is no sense in either that the poet is replaceable, while *Is.* 8.65–67 is perhaps the only real parallel.

56 Bulman 1992.76 writes: "clearly the subject of the verb στρέφοι is Pindar himself." See also Bury 1890.234, Köhnken 1971.215–17, Poliakoff 1982.138, Willcock 1995.109.

substitution is taken seriously, its meaning is clear: if the poet has a special art, it is something everyone has, not something one needs to learn. All that is needed is that one come upon the deed oneself. What might have been the technical knowledge of the wrestling poet, twisting and gripping his way to true praise, is now a natural ability. Art is subsumed by nature, and the basic notion of art that causes Pindar's audience to worry about his use of it is rejected. We are left with a contradictory spectacle: Pindar, in effect, makes his praise worth paying for by affirming that the art he produces could be provided by anyone at no cost at all.⁵⁷

This development affects the audience's ideas of wrestler and trainer as well. The final image presents the wrestler's art not only as supportive of aristocratic society but also as a natural, untaught ability. The trainer, for his part, ceases to be a teacher and becomes instead a model, just as Hector and Meleager were models for Strepsiades, the son of Diodotus, the uncle of the victor who is celebrated in *Isthmian* 7.31–35. The opposition between learned skills and natural abilities is collapsed, and the whole economy of teaching and learning is transformed to make it compatible with aristocratic prejudices.

Previous criticism of the ideological work of *Nemean* 4 has focused on the way in which Pindar's foreignness is recuperated through images of guest-friendship (Crotty 1982.58–61, Kurke 1991.143–46), but, as I have argued, the ideological concerns of this ode are far more complex. *Nemean* 4 addresses anxieties occasioned by the arts not only of the poet, but also of the trainer and victor. Although it does make liberal use of the guest-friendship metaphor, it also displays a more individual tactic: poet, trainer, and victor are identified through two images of wrestling (Peleus in 62–68 and the anonymous poet of 91–96), and, in these two images of wrestling, their activities are refigured as the exercise of a natural artfulness in support of aristocratic ideals.

Before I conclude this section, another figure that contributes to this ideological work deserves notice, the centaur Chiron. Chiron helps Peleus survive Acastus' ambush (*Ne.* 4.60–61): ἄλαλκε δὲ Χείρων, / καὶ τὸ μῶρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερεν: "Chiron warded off [the danger], and carried out the destined fate of Zeus." Insofar as Chiron and Peleus stand together against a common enemy, they mirror the partnership of Heracles

57 Cf. the argument of Hubbard 1985.117–24 on *Ol.* 9 that Pindar fuses nature and nurture rather than subsuming the latter in the former.

and Telamon—but with one significant difference: Heracles and Telamon are of equal status, while Peleus and Chiron are not. Peleus is a hero, but Chiron is the senior of the two, able to help Peleus with his greater knowledge and wisdom. This relationship thus suggests that of the victor with both poet and trainer, for, while it is actually Timasarchus who wins the victory and gets the glory, he needs the support of Melesias and Pindar to do so. Chiron is, in fact, an obvious figure for the trainer, since, in mythology in general and in Pindar's odes in particular, Chiron is cast as a teacher of heroic youths.⁵⁸ But, as a teacher from outside the community, Chiron also suggests the poet, a suggestion that is reinforced, as several commentators have noted, by the fact that both Chiron and the poet are presented as the servants and promoters of fate: *πεπρωμένον* (61) clearly echoes *πεπρωμένον* (43).⁵⁹

Chiron thus stands as a mythological counterpart to Pindar and Melesias, but, as such, he also represents an ideological transformation of their meanings. While poet and trainer are marked as non-aristocrats by their participation in commodity exchange, Chiron is emblematic of the aristocratic world. His teachings are reserved for those of the highest birth (Achilles, Asclepius, Jason), and the pseudo-Hesiodic *Precepts of Chiron* was particularly associated with the education of aristocratic youths.⁶⁰ Moreover, Chiron's link to Zeus' order is significant for the mode of exchange of trainer and poet: since the order of Zeus and the order constituted by gift exchange were linked by the aristocrats, commodity exchange was seen as upsetting Zeus' order.⁶¹ Chiron is thus an ideological transformation of poet and trainer: their anti-aristocratic associations are hidden as they take on the mantle of Chiron's education of aristocratic youths.

IV

Nemean 4 is thus structured around one particular problem—which it is concerned to refigure—the foundational role of art in securing and celebrating the victory. What, then, is the role of the textual difficulty in

58 See esp. Pyy. 3.45, 4.102; *Ne.* 3.53, and ps.-Hes. *Precepts of Chiron* (Schwartz 1960.228–44).

59 On the connection, see Köhnken 1971.208–09, Carey 1980.150, Hubbard 1985.80–81, Bulman 1992.70

60 On this work's association with aristocratic education, see Kurke 1990.90–95.

61 On the immorality of commodity exchange and trade, cf. Von Reden 1995a.175–82, 1995b.36–37.

57–58, which characterizes the use of arts extremely negatively, but which, as I argued in Part I, also initially suggests that Peleus is involved in such use? How does this passage contribute to the ode's central ideological work of refiguring the arts of victor, poet, and trainer?

Nemean 4.57–58 offers the only explicit mention of arts in the ode, and it associates them with the treacherous assault of a lustful woman on a guest-friend. Such actions belong to the baseborn, not noble aristocrats, and, consequently, when Peleus, *Nemean* 4's central symbol of aristocratic conduct, is initially seen as using these arts, the audience must be disoriented. On the one hand, they will, as I suggested in Part I, seek to make better ideological sense of the text by reinterpreting *χρησόμενος*; but, on the other hand, I would suggest that the audience may also be led to interrogate the relationship between the aristocracy Peleus symbolizes and art in general. Such an interrogation would uncover an uncomfortable fact: the demonstration of the aristocracy's natural superiority in athletic contests depends on the use of those acquired arts against which the Greek aristocracy traditionally defined its identity. In disrupting, if only briefly, the separation of aristocrat from art (*τέχνη*) that aristocratic ideology usually observes, *Nemean* 4.57–58 thus exposes the ode's remarkably consistent ideological refiguring of the relationship between art and aristocratic athletics.

The model of the Pindaric ode that this conclusion suggests accords with the Marxist idea of the literary text for which Louis Althusser (1971.203–08) and Pierre Macherey (1978) are perhaps the most responsible. Both saw the literary text as a place where ideology was not only retailed, but also critiqued. The literary text became a vehicle through which the gaps and silences that ideology refigured were exposed.⁶² But because they made literary form itself the cause of this exposure, the role the two critics gave to literature was rejected as unjustifiably privileged (Eagleton 1976, Howard 1986.28–29, Gallagher 1989.43–44). Their notion of the literary text as plural and conflicted proved more popular, however, and has become important to the criticism now grouped under the rubric of the “New Historicism.” A text's plurality is seen as the result of its necessary overdetermination by the many ideologies that traverse it. As Louis Montrose argues (1989.22), in the textual space of the literary work, “so many cultural codes converge and interact that ideological coherence and stability are scarcely possible.” Jean Howard (1986.30) concludes,

62 See also Jameson 1981.281–97, Frow 1986.18–50, and Eagleton 1991.45–46.

[I]t seems important to entertain the possibility that neither literary texts nor other cultural products are monologic, organically unified wholes. Only when their heterogeneity is suppressed by a criticism committed to the idea of organic unity do they seem to reveal a unitary ideological perspective or generic code. It may be more productive to see them as sites where many voices of culture and many systems of intelligibility interact.

For both Howard and Montrose, it is a given that, as a result of the complexity of its contextual situation, a literary text will not simply promote a single ideology.

Kurke's recent study of Pindar's odes draws much of its inspiration from the New Historicism. True to its idea of text, Kurke describes how some aspects of the odes need to be understood within an aristocratic code, some within a familial code, and others within a civic code. For example, for Kurke, the language of arts and crafts should be understood within a civic code that focuses on the artwork produced and not an aristocratic code that marks the artisan as inferior (1991.192–94). The Pindaric ode is thus revealed as a complex ideological mediation between conflicting interest groups, often directed more at teaching the aristocracy how to survive and succeed amid the changes of the late archaic period than at any simple praise of their achievements. Nevertheless, the ode is still seen as wholly directed towards promoting the interests of the aristocracy.

For the presence of oppositional codes within the Pindaric ode, we must look to Peter Rose (1992.141–84) and Vincent Farenga (1977a, also 1977b), whose analyses of *Pythian* 10 and *Pythian* 4 offer a more conflictual model of the ode's voices. Farenga's conclusions (1977a.31) about the ideological complexity of the Pindaric text anticipate the more general suggestions of Howard:

[E]ven Pindaric writing, which we have always read—or charged—to uphold the old order of the father-tyrant's thesis, might now be said to reveal, in the festive time of celebration (when all difference is momentarily threatened), a silent gesture fated to wrest a certain something from the father-tyrant's hands.

For Farenga, the Pindaric ode does promote a particular ideology, but, at the same time, also offers brief moments of resistance to it. Like the New Historicists, he grounds such moments of resistance in the complexity of the context of the text, pointing to the festival of which the ode was part, the revel or κῶμος. Recent New Historicist work on festivals has warned us not to see them simply as sites where dominant ideologies are contested, but rather as sites where support, opposition, and co-optation mix together;⁶³ they become, in effect, just one particular place where the “many voices of culture and many systems of intelligibility” that traverse society as a whole interact.⁶⁴ It is in such a context, as Farenga sees, that we can expect the contradictions in the production of a work to be revealed, and the contradictions that provide the context of *Nemean* 4 are particularly pointed: an aristocracy, which defines itself by opposition to the teaching and use of art and to the commodity exchange in which art is particularly implicated, seeks to prove its natural superiority through athletic competition by hiring professional trainers to teach the art of combat sport to its children and professional artists to make their victories more widely known.

The textual difficulty of *Nemean* 4.57–58 offers two lessons for interpreting the Pindaric ode: first, to be open to the heterogeneity of the ode and not to impose a unitary ideological perspective; and second, to appreciate that the meaning of a passage may not have been transparent and that determining it may have been a process that left an imprint on the interpretation of the whole. The editorial activity that has surrounded these lines points to the fact that this is a difficult moment in the text, and this difficulty must be incorporated into its interpretation, not seen as the burden of the late-coming critic. Through questioning the relationship to art of the aristocrats celebrated in this ode, these difficult lines disturb the ideological work of the ode: while the rest of the ode seeks to hide in silence the central role art plays in Timasarchus’ victory, this difficult moment gives it a brief voice.⁶⁵

Reed College

63 See, for example, Stallybrass and White 1986.1–26; cf. Graff 1989.168–81. On the Pindaric revel specifically, see Newman and Newman 1984, Cole 1992.11–32, and Heath 1988.180–82.

64 The quotation is from Howard 1986.30, given above.

65 I would like to thank Joel Robbins, Walter Englert, and the anonymous reader for *Arethusa* for their help in writing this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althusser, L. 1971. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. B. Brewster). London.
- Appadurai, A. 1986. "The Social Life of Things: Commoditization in Cultural Perspective," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in a Cultural Perspective*, ed. A. Appadurai. Cambridge. 3–63.
- Bell, J. M. 1978. "Κίμβιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition," *QUCC* 28.29–86.
- Bergk, T. (ed.) 1878. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, 4th ed., vol. 1. Leipzig.
- Bowra, C. M. (ed.) 1947. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 2nd ed. Oxford.
- . 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
- . (trans.) 1969. *The Odes of Pindar*. Oxford.
- Brown, N. 1951. "Pindar, Sophocles, and the Thirty Years' Peace," *TAPA* 82.1–28.
- Bulman, P. 1992. *Phthonos in Pindar*. Berkeley.
- Bury, J. B. (ed.) 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London.
- . (ed.) 1892. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*. London.
- Carey, C. 1980. "Three Myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3," *Eranos* 78.143–62.
- Carnes, J. 1996. "The Ends of the Earth: Fathers, Ephebes, and Wild Women in *Nemean* 4 and 5," *Arethusa* 29.15–55.
- . 1999. "The Tricker Tricked: A Reinterpretation of *Nemean* 4.57–58," *RhM* 142.1–9.
- Cerrato, L. (ed.) 1918. *Le Odi di Pindaro*. Sestri Ponente.
- Cole, Thomas. 1992. *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power*. Rome.
- Crotty, Kevin. 1982. *Song and Action*. Baltimore.
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*. Oxford.
- Detienne, M. 1981. *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*. Paris.
- Drachmann, A. B. (ed.) 1903. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vol. 1. Leipzig.
- . (ed.) 1927. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vol. 3. Leipzig.
- Eagleton, T. 1976. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London.
- . 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London.
- Farenga, V. 1977a. "Pindaric Craft and the Writing of *Pythia* IV," *Helios* 5.3–37.
- . 1977b. "Violent Structure: The Writing of Pindar's *Olympian* 1," *Arethusa* 10.197–218.

- Farnell, L. 1932. *The Works of Pindar*, vol. 2. London.
- Fennell, C. A. M. (ed.) 1899. *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge.
- Frow, J. 1986. *Marxism and Literary History*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gallagher, G. 1989. "Marxism and the New Historicism," in *The New Historicism*, ed. H. A. Veenser. New York. 37–48.
- Gardiner, N. 1910. *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. London.
- . 1965. *Athletics of the Ancient World*. Oxford.
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (trans. A. T. Cole). Baltimore.
- Gerber, D. E. 1962. "What Time Can Do (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.46–7)," *TAPA* 93.30–33.
- . 1976. *Emendations in Pindar*. Amsterdam.
- . 1984. "Emendations in the Odes of Pindar: An Historical Analysis," *Entretiens Hardt* 31.1–32.
- Gini, A. 1989/90. "Naming the Victor in Pindar: Chromius in *Nemeans* 1 and 9," *CW* 83.23–25.
- Goldhill, S. 1986. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Graff, G. 1989. "Cooptation," in *The New Historicism*, ed. H. A. Veenser. New York. 168–81.
- Gregory, C. 1982. *Gifts and Commodities*. London.
- Gzella, S. 1971. "The Problem of the Fee in Greek Lyric," *Eos* 59.189–202.
- Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*. The Hague.
- Harriott, R. 1969. *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*. London.
- Heath, M. 1988. "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician," *AJP* 109.180–95.
- Heyne, C. (ed.) 1817. *Pindari Carmina et Fragmenta*, vol. 1. Leipzig.
- Howard, J. 1986. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies," *ELR* 13.13–43.
- Hubbard, T. K. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind*. Leiden.
- . 1997. "Pindar and the Problematized Elite in Greek Society," delivered at the APA Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Jameson, F. 1981. *The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca.
- Köhnken, A. 1971. *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*. Berlin.
- Kopytoff, L. 1986. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as a Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in a Cultural Perspective*, ed. A. Appadurai. Cambridge. 64–91.

- Kurke, L. 1990. "Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* and the Tradition of Advice Poetry," *TAPA* 120.85–107.
- . 1991. *The Traffic in Praise*. Ithaca.
- Kyle, D. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 95). Leiden.
- Lattimore, Richmond (trans.) 1967. *The Odes of Pindar*. Chicago.
- Macherey, P. 1978. *A Theory of Literary Production* (trans. G. Wall). New York.
- Mezger, F. (ed.) 1880. *Pindars Siegeslieder*. Leipzig.
- Mommsen, T. (ed.) 1864. *Pindari Carmina*. Berlin.
- Montrose, L. 1989. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture," in *The New Historicism*, ed. H. A. Veenser. New York. 15–36.
- Nagy, G. 1982. "Theognis of Megara: The Poet as Seer, Pilot, and Revenant," *Arethusa* 15.120–22.
- Newman, J. and F. Newman. 1984. *Pindar's Art: Its Tradition and Aims*. Hildesheim.
- Nisetich, F. (trans.) 1980. *Pindar's Victory Songs*. Baltimore.
- Norwood, G. 1956. *Pindar*. Berkeley.
- Poliakoff, M. 1982. *Studies in the Terminology of Greek Combat Sports*. Königstein.
- . 1987. *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*. New Haven.
- Postgate, J. P. 1925. "Ad Pindari Nemea," *Mnemosyne* ns. 53.382–92.
- Pratt, L. 1993. *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar*. Ann Arbor.
- Puech, A. (ed.) 1923. *Pindare*, vol. 3. Paris.
- Race, W. (ed. and trans.) 1997. *Pindar*, vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rose, P. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
- Sahlins, M. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago.
- Schroeder, O. (ed.) 1908. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis Selectis*. Leipzig.
- Schwartz, J. 1960. *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*. Leiden.
- Segal, C. 1998. *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*. Lanham.
- Slater, W. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- Snell, B. and H. Maehler (eds.) 1987. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig.
- Stallybrass, P. and A. White. 1986. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca.
- Turyn, A. (ed.) 1952. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Von Reden, S. 1995a. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.

- . 1995b. “Deceptive Readings: Poetry and its Value Reconsidered,” *CQ* 45.30–50.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1932. “Thucydides the Son of Melesias,” *JHS* 52.205–27.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M. 1982. “Second Reading of Pindar: The Fourth *Nemean*,” *G&R* 29.1–10.
- . 1995. *Pindar: Victory Odes*. Cambridge.
- Williams, F. 1976. *A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1–4 of Pindar*. Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Woloch, M. 1963. “Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides,” *CW* 56.102–04, 121.
- Young, D. 1984. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago.



Silver decadrachm from Acragas, Sicily, c. 411 B.C.E., depicting the portent of eagles from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. Photo courtesy Hirmer Verlag GmbH.