

## PINDAR ON THE BIRTH OF APOLLO

Pindar must have narrated the myth of the birth of Apollo in many poems. We know of at least three, perhaps four versions: his only extant account of the birth itself is in *Pa.* XII;<sup>1</sup> the latter of the two surviving sections of *Pa.* VIIb describes the flight of Asteria from Zeus, her transformation into an island and (probably) Zeus' desire to have Apollo and Artemis born there; the birth also seems to have been mentioned in the *Hymn to Zeus* immediately after the address to Delos and the account of Delos being rooted to the sea-bed in fr. 33c–d; finally a source reports that according to Pindar Apollo passed from Delos to Delphi *via* Tanagra and this would probably have followed an account of the birth, though it could refer to a lost part of *Pa.* XII or the *Hymn to Zeus*.<sup>2</sup> These accounts have never been the subject of systematic investigation, which is regrettable, because they make up an important aspect of Pindar's attitude to religion. In this preliminary study I focus on two interrelated aspects: the stance Pindar takes towards the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and the role he attributes to Zeus.

### I. PROGRAMME AND MYTH IN *PA.* VIIb

We start with *Pa.* VIIb. The title partially preserved in the papyri specifies Delos as the place of performance but it does not allow us to identify the performers.<sup>3</sup> Two sections of the poem survive, the first an introduction, concerned in part with the theory of poetry, the second from an epode, narrating part of the myth of the birth of Apollo. This is the first:

"Απολλο[ν	-- -- --	]	
	σέ και [	-- -- --	]
ματέρ[		]	
παιαν[		]	
στεφ[		]	ἐὐανθέος
ἔρνεσ[		]	α ..
μή μοι		]	υς
ἄρχομ[		]	ραν
ῥωϊ[		]	χων
κελαδ[ήσαθ' ὕμνους,			10
Ὀμήρου [ μὲν οὐ τριπτόν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν			
ἰόντες, ἀλλ' ἄλλοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις			

<sup>1</sup> All references are to *Pindarus, pars II, Fragmenta, Indices post B. Snell edidit H. Maehler* (Leipzig, 1975; henceforth 'Snell–Maehler'), the text of which is followed, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. 286 = schol. on A. *Eum.* 11. Albert Schachter, *Cults of Boeotia I, Acheloos to Hera, BICS Supp.* 38.1 (1981), p. 57 suggests that this fragment was part of a Pindaric 'suite pythique'.

<sup>3</sup> What survives of the title is: Π[ ]. [ΑΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΗΛΟΝ], the first letter contributed by *P.Oxy.* 2440 fr. 1 line 8, the rest preserved in *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 14 line 3a. This conforms to the regular pattern of titles given to Pindar's *Paeans* by Hellenistic editors which specified (a) the performers (in the dative) and (b) the place of performance (εἰς + accusative). Cf. the titles of Pindar, *Pa.* VI, VIII in Snell–Maehler; also Simonides [?] PMG 519 fr. 35 line 12. It is likely that these titles were in many cases reliably deduced from the poems and that *Paeans* often specified the nationality and destination of the chorus.

ἐπεὶ αὐ[        π]τανὸν ἄρμα  
 Μοισα[        ]μεν.  
 ἐ]πεύχο[μαι] δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' εὐπέπλω θυγατρὶ  
       Μναμ[ο]σύ[ν]α κόραισί τ' εὐ-  
       μαχανίαν διδόμεν.  
 τ]υφλα[ῖ γὰρ] ἀνδρῶν φρένες,  
 δ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων  
 βαθείαν εἰ[...], ὧν ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν.  
 ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦτο[ν δ]ιέδω-  
       κ[υ] ἀθάνατ[ο]ν πόνον

... sing hymns, not going along the worn wagon-track of Homer, but on the mares of another, [for we have mounted] the winged chariot of the Muses. I pray to the well-robed daughter of Uranus, Mnemosyne, and her girls to provide capability. For blind are the minds of men, whoever... seeks out the deep path of mortal wisdom without the Muses. But they have given me this immortal task...

What does the contrast in lines 11–12 mean and what is the point of the reference to Homer?<sup>4</sup> Pindar mentions Homer on three other occasions, in one case clearly referring to the *Odyssey* and in the others probably to the *Iliad*.<sup>5</sup> But in this case since the later part of *Pa. VIIb* narrates part of the myth of the birth of Apollo and Artemis, it seems likely that they are thinking primarily of a contrast between the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and the paean they are themselves about to sing. There seems no reason to doubt that the *Hymn*, which describes its author as a blind old man living in Chios (line 172), was believed to be by Homer in the 5th century. This is in any case guaranteed by Thucydides.<sup>6</sup>

The reference of ἀλλοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις in line 11 ought to be *Pa. VIIb* itself, but the precise sense is unclear. We would expect ἀλλοτρίαις to mean 'belonging to another'. Slater suggested that it is equivalent to 'belonging to the Muses',<sup>7</sup> but a contrast between the path of Homer and mares of the Muses is pointless. Perhaps the sense was a vague one, it being left unclear who the mares belonged to except that they

<sup>4</sup> The all-important word Ὀμήρου together with the openings of the next two lines is preserved in *P.Oxy.* 841 fr. 17. Some early editors placed this fragment in (what are now) lines 23ff. Its correct position was determined by Lobel (*P.Oxy.* 26, pp. 40–1, with pl. v), who recognised traces of the openings of the same lines in *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 14(b), the position of which in the poem was known. As for the lacuna in line 11, I would prefer Ὀμήρου [μὲν οὐ τρι]πτόν..., first suggested by J. K. Newman, 'Callimachus and Pindar', *JCS* 10 (1985), 182 to Lobel's Ὀμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]πτόν... The trouble with the latter is that Pindar does not use δέ to introduce hanging circumstantial clauses. Grammar requires μὴ with an imperative, but the scope of οὐ is τρι]πτόν κατ' ἀμαξιδόν/ἰόντες, not the imperative.

<sup>5</sup> The passages are *P.* 4.277ff., *I.* 3/4.55ff., *N.* 7.21ff. E. Fitch, 'Pindar and Homer', *CPh.* 19 (1924), 57ff., argued that *I.* 3/4.55ff. and *N.* 7.21ff. could refer to the account of the quarrel between Odysseus and Ajax in the *Aithiopis*, but it seems more likely that Pindar is thinking of the favourable portrayal of Ajax in the *Iliad*.

<sup>6</sup> 3.104.4–6: he attributes lines 146ff. and 168ff. to Homer. M. L. West ('Cynaethus' Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 25 [1975], 166) suggests that belief in Homeric authorship of the *Hymn* is also indicated by *Ar. Birds* 575: Ἴριν δέ γ' Ὀμηρος ἔφασκεν ἰκέλην εἶναι τρήρωνι πελείῃ, which must allude to *h. Hom. Ap.* 114, where Iris and Eileithuia are compared to τρήρωνι πελειάσιν, since this simile is not used of Iris in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Since all of this evidence relates to the Delian part of the *Hymn*, it remains possible that the Pythian part was not regarded as the work of Homer in the 5th century. Perhaps it was thought to have been added by a rhapsode such as Cynaethus (cf. schol. *Nem.* II.1c, 29.9ff.Dr.). I note that R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Oxford, 1982), has recently reasserted the view (contra West, op. cit.) that the Delian part of the *Hymn* is earlier than the Pythian part, concluding that the former dates from the 7th century (pp. 114–15) and the latter from 585 B.C. (p. 132).

<sup>7</sup> W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), s. ἵππος.

were not Homer's. Another possibility is that it means 'belonging to another poet', that is 'belonging to Pindar'. This would be an eccentric way for Pindar to refer to his own poem if he were understood to be the speaker, but in Pindar's *Paeans* the first person regularly refers to the chorus and not the poet, so no problem need arise.<sup>8</sup>

Another question is whether the point of contrast between the poems is a matter of form, content or both. If it is to do with form, the chorus must be saying that their poem is not in hexameters (like the *Hymn*) but in a lyric metre. This is not out of the question: Pindar talks about formal features of poems elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it is worth noting that the contrast between riding in a chariot and walking is used as a metaphor for the difference between poetry and prose in ancient literary criticism.<sup>10</sup> But elsewhere when Pindar refers to Homer it is subject matter that interests him, for example at *N.* 7.21ff., where Homer is criticised on the grounds that he allowed himself to be taken in by the misrepresentations of Odysseus.<sup>11</sup> Again, on other occasions where Pindar uses the 'path of poetry' metaphor, the point has to do with subject matter, for example in the context of digressions,<sup>12</sup> so that it would be surprising if the contrast drawn at *Pa.* VIIb.11 were not about content, or at least content as well as form. We may compare the programmatic image of contrasting paths of poetry at Callimachus, *Aetia* 1.25ff. (generally agreed to be modelled on *Pa.* VIIb.11)<sup>13</sup> which seems to concern both form and content.<sup>14</sup>

The suggestion, then, is that lines 11–12 of *Pa.* VIIb announce a criticism of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. It seems likely that the focus of criticism would have been the account of the birth of Apollo in the Delian part of the *Hymn* since *Pa.* VIIb was written for performance at Delos and since the second surviving section relates

<sup>8</sup> See M. R. Lefkowitz, 'The First Person in Pindar', *HSCP* 67 (1963), 155ff. The rule does not seem to apply to *Pa.* VI, though see A. Hoekstra, 'The Absence of the Aeginetans', *Mn.* 15 (1962), 9ff. R. Hamilton, *Epinikion (De proprietatibus litterarum, series practica* 91), 113ff., defends the implausible view that the first persons at *Pa.* II.28 and *Pa.* IV.21ff. represent places speaking.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. in particular the contrast between new and old styles of dithyramb in fr. 70b. A. Hardie, 'Horace Odes 1.37 and Pindar Dithyramb 2', *PLLS* 1 (1976), 113ff., thinks that fr. 70b makes a point about subject matter also.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*<sup>5</sup> i.33 n. 3, Aristides 45.8 with A. Höfler, *Der Sarapis hymnus der Aelius Aristides*, Tübingen Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 27 (1935), 30.

<sup>11</sup> See A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 50ff.

<sup>12</sup> For example *N.* 4.69, *P.* 11.38, *P.* 4.247, *N.* 6.53, *O.* 9.80. On the metaphor of the path of poetry, see O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges*, Hermes Einzelschriften IV (Berlin, 1936), 58ff. (68ff. on Pindar), and M. Durante, *Sulla Preistoria della Tradizione Poetica Greca, Parte seconda*, Incunabula Graeca 64 (Rome, 1976), 123ff.

<sup>13</sup> See B. A. Van Groningen, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 128; N. Richardson, 'Pindar and Later Literary Criticism', *PLLS* 5 (1985), 393ff.; Newman, op. cit., p. 182. Callimachus, *Aitia* 1.25ff. is as follows (Apollo speaks): *πρὸς δέ σε | καὶ τὸδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι | τὰ στείβειν, ἐτέρων δ' ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμὰ | δίφρον ἐλᾶν μὴδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτους, εἰ καὶ στενωτέρην ἐλάσεις* (In addition, I bid you to tread where the wagons do not go, to drive your chariot neither along the even tracks of others nor along the broad paths, even if that way you drive a narrower path). In particular, *ἀτρίπτους* may be presumed to pick up *τριπτόν* in *Pa.* VIIb.11 and *τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι* to echo *ἄμαξιτόν* in the same line. We may reflect that it is particularly appropriate that Apollo should speak these lines if their model was a contrast (in a paean) between two different poetic treatments of his own birth. *Pa.* VIIb was also known by Plato if Friedländer, 'Plato *Phaedrus* 245a', *CPh* 36 (1941), 51–2, was right to recognise an imitation of lines 19–20 at *Phaedrus* 245a: *...ὃς ἀνευ μανίας Μουσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται*.

<sup>14</sup> I take it as uncontentious that Callimachus' poetic programme covered both form and content. It is indicated, for example, by *Ep.* 27.1: *Ἡσιόδου τό τ' αἶσιμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος*, where *τρόπος* could refer to form and *αἶσιμα* to content.



Lines 42–4 are about Asteria in flight from the embraces of Zeus,<sup>18</sup> line 42 being the last line of a speech she makes.<sup>19</sup> The next line expresses reservations about what precedes.<sup>20</sup> Asyndeton is normal in such statements,<sup>21</sup> so that *ἄπιστα* could well be the first word of a sentence.<sup>22</sup> It is unclear whether these reservations amount to an outright rejection of the myth of the type that Pindar claims to make at *O.* 1.51ff. (in which case it could be regarded as parallel to the rejection of aspects of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* announced in lines 11–12) or whether he intends merely to indicate embarrassment about the improbable or impious nature of the myth without full rejection of it, rather as in *O.* 9.35ff. he distances himself from the myth of Heracles fighting with the gods on moral grounds without saying that it is false.<sup>23</sup> The second alternative seems slightly preferable since as far as we can see he does not say that the story is false. After being thrown into the sea, Asteria ‘appeared as a conspicuous rock’ (line 47), almost certainly an etymological allusion to the fact that the name ‘Delos’ means ‘clear’.<sup>24</sup> The island then wandered until<sup>25</sup> Zeus<sup>26</sup> desired to father Apollo and Artemis (lines 50–2).<sup>27</sup>

The next event was the rooting down of Delos to the sea-bed, willed by Zeus in order to provide a place for Leto to give birth. If the coronis at line 20 of *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 14 col. 2 signifies the end of the poem and the poem had only one triad, which is what is implied in Snell–Maehler, there are only five lines left to complete the narrative, less than five if we take into account the fact that other *Paeans* end with a closural formula.<sup>28</sup> In that case the rooting down of Delos must have been dealt with very briefly and the birth stated without any elaboration. However, it would be odd if the poem went into the origin of Delos in detail but glossed over the birth itself. There are two solutions to the difficulty: either there was a detailed account of the birth earlier on in the lacuna between the two surviving fragments<sup>29</sup> or – and this

<sup>18</sup> Snell’s supplement in lines 43–4: *ἦ Διὸς οὐκ ἐθέλο[ισ]’ ἐμβῆναι λέχος|Κοίου θυγάτηρ π[όντονδ’] ἐφύγεν* must be on the right lines.

<sup>19</sup> Of unknown length, but it must have been short if, as seems to be the case, *ἔσσατο* in line 40 is not part of it. It is unlikely to have begun with the start of the epode (line 41) since exact correspondence between start of speech and start of stanza is extremely rare: see R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, *Zetemata* 44 (Munich, 1967), 72.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *O.* 1.52ff., *O.* 9.35ff., *N.* 9.33ff.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *O.* 1.52, *N.* 9.33.

<sup>22</sup> Snell supplements: *ἄπιστά μ[οι] δέδο[ι]κα κα[ὶ] εἰβῆ λέγειν φάτις*|| δέ..

<sup>23</sup> *ἀπό μοι λόγον|τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῆμον|ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδορῆσαι θεοὺς|ἐχθρὰ σοφία, καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν|μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει* (Mouth, cast this speech away from me, for insulting the gods is a hateful form of wisdom and inopportune boasting sounds in harmony with madness). On the analysis of this passage see T. C. W. Stinton, ‘Si credere dignum est’, *PCPhS* 202 (1976), 67ff., G. A. Privitera, ‘Il criterio della pertinenza: Pind. *Ol.* 9.35–41’, *RFIC* 114 (1986), 48ff.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Call. *Del.* 53ff., Arist. fr. 488 Rose, Pliny, *HN* 4.12.66. On the similar allusion in fr. 33c.6, see below.

<sup>25</sup> In line 50 the meaning of *τᾶς* is probably ‘until’, as suggested by V. Schmidt, ‘Zu Pindar’, *Glotta* 53 (1975), 39ff. Snell tries to make it work as a relative pronoun by supplementing: ...*Λατῶ Κρονίδας ἐπ’ ἀσφαλεῖ πέδῳ*, which seems highly unlikely.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *O.* 14.14: *θεῶν κρατίστου παῖδες*, which refers to Zeus as father of the Charites.

<sup>27</sup> It is just possible that *τοξοφόρον*...*γόνον* refers to Apollo only, but the fact that Pindar consistently presents Apollo and Artemis as twins makes it almost certain that they are both meant here.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the fairly deliberate closes of *Pa.* I.5ff., *Pa.* II.102ff., *Pa.* V.43ff., *Pa.* VI.178ff., *Pa.* XIV.35ff.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. the scholion to line 33 (preserved in *P.Oxy.* 841 fr. 19): *λέχος ἐπὶ τὴν λοχείαν*, from which editors restore *λέχος* in the text.

seems more likely – there was more than one triad, giving room for a full description of the birth.<sup>30</sup>

If lines 11ff. announce a rejection of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and if this rejection is at least in part a rejection of its content, we would expect Pindar's version of the myth of the birth of Apollo to be different from the account in the *Homeric Hymn*. This is in fact what we find. The *Hymn* does not mention the Asteria, it says nothing about the origins of Delos or the idea of the floating island and it does not allude to the fact that 'Delos' means 'clear' in Greek. Furthermore, in calling Delos Ortygia, Pindar seems to be going against the *Hymn* which regards Delos and Ortygia as different places.<sup>31</sup> So far so good. Unfortunately the impression of Pindar's version of this myth given by the surviving fragments of *Pa. VII* is seriously incomplete since they do not cover the birth itself. For this we must turn to *Pa. XII*.

## II. DIVINE PROVIDENCE IN *PA. XII*

There are papyrological reasons for supposing that *Pa. XII* is a paean<sup>32</sup> and if it is, it may have been written for performance by Naxians at Delos.<sup>33</sup> Here is the text:<sup>34</sup>

]με[.....]ωνιο[  
 ...]οισιν ἐνέ[α Μοί]σais  
 ...]αλαδαρτεμι [..] ωῖονας[  
 ...]χος ἀμφέπο[ισ' ἀνθεα τοιαύτας  
 ...] ὑμνήσιος δρέπη· θαμά δ' ἔρ[χεται  
 Ν]αξόθεν λιπαροτρόφων θυσί[α(ι)  
 μῆ]λων Χαρίτεσσι μίγδαν  
 Κῦ]νθιον παρὰ κρημνόν, ἔνθα [  
 κε]λαινεφέ' ἀργιβρένταν λέγο[ντι  
 Ζῆ]να καθεζόμενον

5  
10

<sup>30</sup> The coronis marks the end of the triad rather than the end of the poem in *P.Oxy.* 659 (Pindar, fr. 94a and b), *P.Lit.Lond.* 46 (Odes of Bacchylides), *P.Oxy.* 2042 (Pindar, *Ol.* 2: coronis at lines 52–3, between the third and fourth triads). In *P.Oxy.* 841 there is a coronis at the end of every strophe of the monostrophic Pindar, *Pa. V*. See Gwendolin M. Stephen, 'The Coronis', *Scriptorium* 13 (1959), p. 5 n. 15. Snell–Maehler are so confident that the coronis in *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 14 col. 2 line 20 marks the end of the poem that they print the lines that follow under *Pa. VIIc*, associating them (for no compelling reason) with *P.Oxy.* 841 fr. 21.

<sup>31</sup> Lines 14–16: χαῖρε, μάκαιρ' ὦ Λητοί, ἐπεὶ τέκες ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, | Ἀπόλλωνά τ' ἀνακτα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν, | τὴν μὲν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ, τὸν δὲ κραναῇ ἐνὶ Δῆλῳ... Lines 14–18 of the *Hymn* should not be regarded as an interpolation: see F. Cassola, *Inni Omerici* (Verona, 1975), pp. 486–7, A. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi, Mnemosyne* Suppl. 93 (1986), pp. 17ff. E. Eichgrün, *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios* (Berlin, 1961), p. 260 n. 38, suggests that in calling Delos 'Ortygia' *Pa. VIIb* reacts against the tradition. Lycophron (*Alexandra* 401) apparently describes Delos as ὄρτυγος πετρομένης and a scholiast explains that Asteria transformed herself into a quail before a second transformation into an island (E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra* [Berlin, 1908], ii.149, 24ff.). There is an outside chance that this was mentioned earlier in *Pa. VIIb*.

<sup>32</sup> The crucial point is that two small fragments of the papyrus roll from which *Pa. XII* comes (*P.Oxy.* 1792) contribute to Pindar, *Pa. VI*: fr. 15 (renumbered as fr. 60 by Lobel in *Ox. Pap.* 26, p. 17) = *Pa. VI*.128–31 and fr. 16 = *Pa. VI*.134–6.

<sup>33</sup> If it was a paean we would expect it to have specified the identity of the performers and the place of performance (see n. 3). It is likely enough that the place of performance is Delos. There is a reasonable chance that *Ναξόθεν* in line 6 indicates the identity of the chorus. Snell–Maehler print a title *ΝΑΞΙΟΙΣ Εἰς ΔΗΛΟΝ* in brackets.

<sup>34</sup> I omit lines 21ff., which are very fragmentary. Snell–Maehler print five smaller fragments of *P.Oxy.* 1792 as '*Pa. XII(a)–(e)*', but these as likely as not do not belong to the same poem as the main fragment.

κορυφαῖσιν ὕπερθε φυλάξαι π[ρ]ονοῖα  
 ἀνίκ' ἀγανόφρων  
 Κοίου θυγάτηρ λύετο τερπνᾶς  
 ὠδίνος· ἐλαμβαν δ' ἀελίου δέμας ὅπως  
 ἀγλαὸν ἐς φάος ἰόντες δίδυμοι  
 παῖδες, πολὺν ῥό[ο]ν ἔεσαν ἀπὸ στομ[ά]των  
 'Ε]λείθυιά τε καὶ Λά[χ]εσις· τελέσαι δ' οἱ  
 κα]τελάμβανον [ . . . ]  
 . . . ]εφθέγγαντο δ' ἐγχώρῃαι  
 ἀγ]λαὸς ᾗς ἀν' ἐρκε[ . . . ]

...with the nine Muses...Artemis...guarding the couch plucks flowers of such hymning... often comes from Naxos for the sacrifice of sleekly-reared sheep in the company of the Graces to the cliff, where they say that black-clouded, bright-thundering Zeus sat above the heights and guarded with foresight, when the mild-minded daughter of Coeus was released from her sweet birth-pang. The twins shone like the body of the sun, moving toward the bright light, and Eleithuia and Lachesis emitted a great noise from their mouths...the native (women? nymphs?) spoke...

If we compare this with the account of the birth in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, we find three differences.

(1) *The providence of Zeus*

Zeus hardly plays any part in the Delian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. He is mentioned only in the proem (lines 5 and 10), where he and Leto receive Apollo on Olympus. He makes no attempt to make it easier for Leto to give birth and does not intervene to prevent Hera persecuting her.<sup>35</sup> Pindar tells a different story: Zeus watches over the birth of Apollo from Mt Cynthus in the same way that he surveys the battle from Mt Ida in the *Iliad*.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, he watches over it with divine providence (π[ρ]ονοῖα),<sup>37</sup> a detail unparalleled in Pindar and rare in early Greek poetry generally.<sup>38</sup> The word λέγοντι in line 9 suggests that Zeus' presence during the birth was part of an established version of the myth,<sup>39</sup> but perhaps λέγοντι could have a merely rhetorical function, giving expression to a degree of reserve which is

<sup>35</sup> Zeus' role is minimal in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* also, where he does no more than calm Hera's anger (line 259; see W. H. Mineur, *Commentary on Callimachus' Hymn to Delos*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 83 [1984] on this line and on line 195).

<sup>36</sup> For example *Il.* 11.182–3: πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε | Ἴδης ἐν κορυφῇσι καθέζετο | παίδεσσι, *Il.* 8.51–2: αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κορυφῇσι καθέζετο | κύδει γαιῶν, | εἰσορόων Τρώων τε πόλιν | καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.

<sup>37</sup> The supplement π[ρ]ονοῖα requires a brief comment. In the *editio princeps* (*Ox.Pap.* 15 [1922], p. 57) Grenfell and Hunt restored the end of l.11: φυλάξαι χρόνον, which was generally accepted until Lobel (*Ox.Pap.* 22 [1961], pp. 13–14 with pl. XIX) added a new fragment of the same papyrus containing the letters αιπ, which made some form of πρόνοια inevitable. The dative singular with φυλάξαι is stylistically attractive, but it remains possible that a different case of πρόνοια was in construction with another word or words following, for example πρόνοιαν ἴσχοντα (cf. *S. Ant.* 283) or προνοίας ἔξ (cf. *Hdt.* 1.120, *IG* i.<sup>2</sup> 115.11). For another possibility, see n. 41.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *προνοίαισι τοῦ πεπρωμένου* at *A. Ag.* 683, *τᾶς παλαιφάτου προνοίας* at *S. Tr.* 823 (referring to divine πρόνοια), *θεῖα προνοία* at *E. Ph.* 636 (which E. Fraenkel, (*Aeschylus Agamemnon* [Oxford, 1950], II, p. 330) takes as modelled on *A. Ag.* 683), *τοῦ θείου ἢ προνοίᾳ* at *Hdt.* 3.108. The same word is used for reverence for the gods, e.g. at *S. OC.* 1180. See J.-P. Martin, *Providentia Deorum* (Collection de l'école française de Rome 61, 1982), 13ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *O.* 9.49; λέγοντι μὲν, which introduces the story of the flood and *O.* 7.54: *φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες*..., which introduces the story of the early history of Rhodes. On such expressions, see Richardson, op. cit., 395, J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, Collection Latomus 88 (Brussels, 1967), p. 46.

only appropriate when the poet pretends to be talking about ancient and unverifiable events, in which case it is not ruled out that Pindar invented the scene. Either way there may be a connection with the worship of Zeus and Athena on Mt Cynthus, of which there is indirect evidence for this period.<sup>40</sup> In the context of the birth of Apollo the word  $\pi[\rho]ονοῖ\alpha$  suggests Athena Pronoia who in one version of the myth guided the pregnant Leto to Delos and there is a possibility that Pindar was thinking of this.<sup>41</sup>

(2) *Apollo and Artemis are born together*

Pindar consistently makes Apollo and Artemis twins,<sup>42</sup> but outside Pindar this detail is surprisingly rare.<sup>43</sup> In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* Apollo is born on Delos and Artemis in Ortygia, wherever that was,<sup>44</sup> and it is not stated that they were twins. There were many other traditions, some of them no doubt going back to the 5th century, that placed the birth of one or both deities in other localities.<sup>45</sup> According to another version they were both born on Delos but Artemis was born a day before, so that she was in a position to play midwife in the delivery of Apollo.<sup>46</sup> It has been suggested that the version in which both deities were born on Delos became the dominant one during the period when Athens controlled Delos and was propagated by the Athenians, but the data do not allow us to establish this with certainty.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>40</sup> P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 217 [Paris, 1970]), pp. 222ff. presents evidence for the worship of Zeus and Athene on Mt Cynthus in the so-called Kunthion, established at the start of Delian Independence (314 B.C.). That Athena was worshipped there from early times is proved by the archaic inscription from the Delion on Paros, *IG XII 5*, 210 (3): 'Αθηναίη Κυνθίη. See Bruneau, p. 232; H. Verbruggen, *Le Zeus Crétois* (Paris, 1981), pp. 200ff.; O. Rubensohn, *Das Delion von Paros* (Wiesbaden, 1962), pp. 43ff. We have no direct evidence that Zeus was worshipped there in the classical period but it is a likely inference from the fact that Zeus and Athena were joint occupiers of the Kunthion during the period of Independence.

<sup>41</sup> According to the *Deliacus* of Hyperides (Blass, *Hyperides* [Leipzig, 1917], 124ff., Suda and *Etym. M.* s. *Πρόνοια* 'Αθήνα). Snell, *H.* 90 (1962), p. 5, suggested that at *Pa.* VIII.82ff., where Athena seems to be instrumental in establishing a mechanism of prophecy at Delphi, Pindar was associating a function of Athena *Πρόνοια* with the Delphic Athena *Προναία*. There is no evidence for worship of Athena *Πρόνοια* on Delos except a dubious statement in Macrob. *Sat.* 1.17.55; cf. Bruneau, op. cit., p. 249. Still, there is a chance that in selecting the word  $\pi[\rho]ονοῖ\alpha$  at *Pa.* XII.11 Pindar was influenced by the role of Athena Pronoia in Delian myth. There is even an outside possibility that line 11 should be supplemented in such a way as to incorporate the title of the goddess, e.g.:  $\Pi[\rho]ονοῖ\alpha \sigmaὺν \text{'Αθάνῃ}$ .

<sup>42</sup> As at *O.* 3.35, *N.* 9.4.

<sup>43</sup> E.g.: scholion on *E. Hec.* 458; *h. in Apoll.* 4–5 in *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit, gesammelt und herausg. von E. Heitsch*, Abhandl. Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen, phil.–hist. Kl., 3.F, 49 (1961), p. 168.

<sup>44</sup> See n. 31. For ancient suggestions about the identity of Ortygia, see T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, E. E. Sykes, *The Homeric Hymns*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1936), *ad loc.*, J. Laager, *Geburt und Kindheit des Gottes in der griechischen Mythologie* (Winterthur, 1957), pp. 68ff.

<sup>45</sup> See conveniently *RE* 2.21–2.

<sup>46</sup> Apollod. 1.4.1; Serv. ad Verg. *Ecl.* 4.10, *Aen.* 3.73; W. Roscher, *Ausführliche Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1884–) I, 577–8. Artemis was born on the 6th of Thargelion (*D. L.* 2.44), Apollo on the 7th (*id.* 3.3).

<sup>47</sup> Laager, p. 79 with n. 1. The only 5th-century Athenian source he cites is *E. IT.* 1235ff.:  $\epsilonὐπαις \delta \text{'Αραοῦς γόνος} | \delta\alpha\nu \text{ ποτε Δηλιάσιν} | \text{καρποφόροις γυνάλοισ} | \langle \epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon \rangle \text{ χρυσο-} \\ \text{κόμαν} | \epsilon\nu \text{ κιθάρα σοφόν} \dots$ , but here the reference seems to be exclusively to Apollo, not to Apollo and Artemis.



(3) *Eileithuia and Leto's suffering*

In lines 92ff. of the *Hymn* a number of goddesses were already present when the time came for the birth – Dione, Rhea, Themis, Amphitrite and others – but Hera had made Eileithyia stay away through jealousy of Leto. Eileithyia eventually came after the goddesses sent Iris to fetch her, promising her a necklace nine cubits long. In Pindar's version the only goddesses present are Eileithyia and Lachesis, and he also includes native women or local nymphs (line 19) who answer their cries.<sup>48</sup> Eileithyia and Fate preside over birth elsewhere in Pindar also,<sup>49</sup> so that it could be argued that this is merely a conventional feature of the description of birth. But it is also possible that the point of having Eileithyia present at the birth is to imply that she did not have to be summoned and that Hera did not have a vendetta against Leto.

A related point can be made in respect of Leto's suffering during the birth. According to the *Homeric Hymn* Leto was pierced by hopeless birth-pangs for nine days and nights (91–2).<sup>50</sup> Pindar mentions a birth-pang but describes it as 'τερπνὰς', which presumably refers to the pleasant result of the birth but still has the effect of playing down Leto's suffering. Perhaps Pindar felt that if the birth of Apollo was part of Zeus' plan, bringing it about should not have involved Leto in excessive suffering.

Here, then, are three respects in which Pindar's account of the birth differs from that presented in the *Hymn* and we can add these to the differences between the second section of *Pa.* VIIb and the *Hymn* already mentioned. It adds up to a substantial corroboration of the hypothesis that lines 11ff. of *Pa.* VIIb announce a rejection of the *Hymn*. We can now see that one of the main points at issue is likely to have been the degree of involvement attributed to Zeus. Zeus is almost wholly absent from the *Hymn* but Pindar has him supervising the birth in *Pa.* XII and planning for it by preparing a place for Leto to give birth in *Pa.* VIIb. His desire to emphasise the providence of Zeus may also explain why Pindar seems to have omitted elements of the traditional story that involve suffering for Leto. We can glean a little more about the role of Zeus in the myth if we turn now to Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus*.

III. THE ORIGIN OF DELOS IN THE *HYMN TO ZEUS*

These are the two fragments from the *Hymn to Zeus* which have Delos for their subject (frr. 33c, 33d).<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> ...|εφθέγγαντο suggests a refrain: cf. ἐπίφθεγμα as a technical term for a refrain, for example παιανικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα at Ath. 15.696f. According to Hephaestion, *de poem.* 7.3 (71.21 Conbr.) ἐπιφθεγματικά differ from ἐφύμνια in so far as the former contribute something to the sense while the latter are superfluous to it.

<sup>49</sup> At *N.* 7.1, *O.* 6.41ff.; also Isyllus' *Paeon*, lines 52ff., Powell, p. 134). The fact that Eileithyia had a place in Delian cult may also have been a reason for retaining her (Olen's hymn to her: Paus. 8.21.3, 9.27.2; cf. Call. *Hymn to Delos* line 257; the second group of Hyperborean maidens brought tribute for Eileithyia: Hdt. 4.33.5; a statue of Eileithyia from Delos at Athens: Paus. 1.18.5., S. Pingiatoglou, *Eileithyia* (Würzburg, 1981), p. 33; there was an Eileithyiaion in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos, at least during the period of Independence: Pingiatoglou, pp. 33–6).

<sup>50</sup> Ἀητῶ δ' ἐννήμαρ τε καὶ ἐννέα νύκτας ἀέλπτοις, | ὠδίνεσσι πέπαρτο... She also suffers in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* (lines 63, 153, 210).

<sup>51</sup> These fragments are assigned to the *Hymn to Zeus* on metrical grounds. This current orthodoxy on the *Hymn to Zeus* appears to be unknown to A. Stéfios, *Apollon dans Pindare* (Athens, 1975), pp. 19ff.

- 33c χαῖρ', ὦ θεοδμάτα λιπαροπλοκάμου  
 παιδεσσι Λατοῦς ἡμεροέστατον ἔρνος,  
 πόντου θύγατερ, χθονὸς εὐρεῖ-  
 as ἀκίνητον τέρας, ἄν τε βροτοί  
 Δᾶλον κικλήσκουσιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ 5  
 τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον.
- 33d ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε φορητὰ \* \* \*  
 κυμάτεσσιν παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων  
 ῥιπαῖσιν· ἀλλ' ἅ Κοιογενῆς ὅπου· ὠδί-  
 νεσσι θυίοισ' ἀγχιτόκοις ἐπέβα  
 νιν, δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὄρθαι 5  
 πρέμνων ἀπώρουσαν χθονίων,  
 ἄν δ' ἐπικράνοις σχέθον  
 πέτραν ἀδαμαντοπέδιλοι  
 κίονες, ἔνθα τεκοῖ-  
 σ' εὐδαίμον' ἐπόψατο γένναν.  
 ]. . . σ[

10

Hail, O heaven-built one, most lovely branch for the children of shining-haired Leto, O daughter of the sea, unmoved marvel of the broad earth, called Delos by mortal men, but by the blessed ones of Olympus known as the far-shown star of the dark-blue earth... For before, it was tossed on the waves by the blasts of all sorts of winds. But when Leto, the daughter of Coeus, raging with the agony of imminent labour, set foot on her, then it was that the four straight pillars with adamantine bases rose from the roots of the earth, and on their capitals held up the rock, where she gave birth, and beheld her blessed offspring...

The two fragments seem to have been separated by about eight lines.<sup>52</sup> One clue about their position within the *Hymn to Zeus* is provided by the fact that fr. 33c begins with an address to a place. Addresses to places seem only to occur at the start of poems,<sup>53</sup> but the start of the *Hymn to Zeus* is already spoken for (fr. 29). Another possibility is that these fragments represent the start of a song-within-the-*Hymn*. In that case, who sings it? Snell proposes the Muses, who we know appeared at some point in the *Hymn*,<sup>54</sup> and suggests that they might have sung several songs and that the fragments represent the start of one of them. Since the *Hymn* seems to have contained a catalogue of Zeus' wives,<sup>55</sup> there is a chance that the Muses sang one song for each wife, in which case fr. 33c and fr. 33d will have come from the one about Zeus' relationship with Leto.

What fr. 33c and fr. 33d say or imply about the birth of Apollo has much in common with *Pa.* VIIb: the etymological allusion in fr. 33c.6 (τηλέφαντον is there because 'Delos' means 'clear'; ἄστρον suggests 'Asteria'); the floating island in fr. 33d.1ff.; the rooting down of the island in fr. 33d.5ff. (which must have been touched on in *Pa.* VIIb.53ff.). However, there seems to be no reference to the story of Asteria (besides the etymological allusion in ἄστρον), nor any mention of the supervisory role

<sup>52</sup> The stanza of which fr. 33c is the beginning went on for at least 6 lines more, and two lines are lost from the start of the stanza that fr. 33d belonged to.

<sup>53</sup> H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Würzburg, 1933), 56ff.; S. Radt, *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian* (Amsterdam, 1958), p. 103.

<sup>54</sup> See fr. 31 (p. 11 in Snell-Maehler); Snell, *The Discovery of Mind*, tr. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford, 1953), p. 80 (= *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*<sup>4</sup> [Göttingen, 1975], p. 88).

<sup>55</sup> See fr. 30; Snell, op. cit., pp. 75ff. (= pp. 85ff.).

that Zeus plays in *Pa.* XII, nor is the rooting down of the island attributed to Zeus, as it probably was in *Pa.* VIIb.

In fact, it is quite likely that all these were included for, since the song from which the fragments come was part of the *Hymn to Zeus*, we would expect that, whoever it is sung by, it must have had the praise of Zeus as its direct or indirect aim and so would have stressed elements in the story that reflect Zeus' providence – such as how he rooted down the island (as in *Pa.* VIIb.50ff.) and how he watched over the birth (as in *Pa.* XII.11). The rooting down of the island could have been attributed to Zeus either in the lines between fr. 33c and 33d (for example: [Zeus rooted Delos down,] for before it was tossed on the waves...) or in the lines immediately following fr. 33d (for example by way of an apostrophe with the sense: 'all this, Zeus, was your doing'), while the proper place for an account of Zeus' supervision of the birth would perhaps be later on, during the description of the birth which seems to have followed in fr. 33d.10ff. The episode of the pursuit of Asteria would fit nicely into the eight or more lines that are lost between the two fragments and could have developed smoothly from the word *ἄστρον* in 33c.6. It might be felt that there is an incongruity between Pindar's giving Zeus a responsible role in supervising the birth and his incorporating the episode of the pursuit of Asteria, which arguably reflects badly on Zeus' personal morality (hence perhaps Pindar's reservations about mentioning it in *Pa.* VIIb.45ff.). But the pursuit of Asteria also reflects well on Zeus in so far as it could be interpreted as a stage in Zeus' master-plan to create a safe place for Leto to give birth, so there is no reason to think that it was omitted in the *Hymn to Zeus*.

The fact that Pindar included an extensive account of the origin of Delos in the *Hymn to Zeus* seems to support the thesis that *Pa.* VIIb.11 announces a rejection of the version of the birth in the *Homeric Hymn*. For it suggests that for Pindar Zeus' role in planning and supervising the birth was a crucial illustration of his providence. The more importance Pindar attached to the episode in this respect, the more likely it is that he would have wanted to distance himself from the version of the birth of Apollo in the *Homeric Hymn*, in which the providence of Zeus plays no part.\*

Trinity College, Oxford

IAN RUTHERFORD

\* I would like to thank Maria Cannatà Fera, Nicholas Richardson and Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.