

## WEAVING AND TRIUMPHAL SHOUTING IN PINDAR, *PYTHIAN* 12.6–12

‘Flute’, as Jenny Strauss Clay notes, is a mistranslation of αὐλός since the ancient Greek *aulos* consisted of ‘two reed mouthpieces and two pipes, sometimes of different lengths, played simultaneously. Its dual structure permitted antiphonal execution; one pipe could produce the melody, the other, some sort of accompaniment or perhaps a drone.’<sup>1</sup> She believes (perhaps correctly) that the dual structure and dual sound of the *aulos* are implicit in the following passage in which Pindar describes Athena’s invention of the art of playing this instrument (*P.* 12.6–17).

... τέχνη, τάν ποτε  
Παλλὰς ἐφεῦρε θρασειᾶν <Γοργόνων>  
οὐλίον θρήνον διαπλέξαις Ἀθάνα·

τὸν παρθενίοις ὑπὸ τ’ ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς  
ᾄε λειβόμενον δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ,  
Περσεὺς ὁπότε τρίτον ᾄυσεν κασιγνητῶν μέρος  
ἐναλίᾳ Σερίφῳ λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων.  
ἦτοι τό τε θεσπέσιον Φόρκοι’ ἀμαύρωσεν γένος,  
λυγρόν τ’ ἔρανον Πολυδέκτα θῆκε ματρός τ’ ἔμπεδον  
δουλοσύναν τό τ’ ἀναγκαῖον λέχος,  
εὐπαράου κράτα συλάσαις Μεδοίσας  
υἱὸς Δανάας, ...

According to the traditional view, Athena here imitates the wailing of the two surviving Gorgons when they mourn for the dead Medusa, and weaves together on the *aulos* a sound similar to theirs. Clay offers a different interpretation, that Athena rather imitates both the sound of the two surviving Gorgons and that of Perseus’ victory shout, and ‘interweaves’ these two sounds on the *aulos*. She translates lines 6–12 of the passage thus:

... the art, which Athena once discovered as she interwove the dread lament of the Gorgons that she heard pouring from the unapproachable snaky heads of the maidens with mournful suffering when Perseus shouted his third cry as he brought a portion of the sisters as doom for sea-girt Seriphos and its people.

Segal agrees with Clay about what sounds Athena imitates and interweaves but disagrees with her about some other aspects of the passage. Most importantly, whereas Clay, following Köhnken, takes *τρίτον* (11) as adverbial,<sup>2</sup> Segal accepts the traditional (and, in my opinion, correct) view of it as an adjective modifying *μέρος*. He translates the passage thus:

... (the art) which Pallas Athena once invented, weaving together the bold Gorgons’ dirge destructive, which she heard dripping from the maidens’ unapproachable heads of snakes with grievous suffering when Perseus shouted as he brought the third part of the sisters to sea-girt Seriphos and its people as (his share and) its doom. Truly did he dim the [monstrous] race of Phorkos, and he made his banquet-contribution and his mother’s long-endured enslavement

<sup>1</sup> J. S. Clay, ‘Pindar’s Twelfth *Pythian*: reed and bronze’, *AJPh* 113 (1992), 519–25, at 520.

<sup>2</sup> A. Köhnken, ‘Two notes on Pindar’, *BICS* 25 (1978), 92–6, at 92, believes that *τρίτον ᾄυσεν* refers to a cry for help, Perseus’ third and crucial cry for help to Athena, when he is trying to defend himself against Medusa’s sisters.

and her forced bed grim for Polydectes, having stripped off lovely-cheeked Medusa's head, he the son of Danae.<sup>3</sup>

What is remarkable about these translations is that neither makes the point that the sound which Athena produces on the *aulos* is a combination of the sound of the two Gorgons and that of Perseus. The reason is that the translators are truer to the Greek in their translations of the passage than in their interpretations of it. The Greek simply affords no basis for the conclusion that Athena imitates and reproduces any sounds other than those of the two surviving Gorgons, for their lament (*θρήνον* 8) is the only object of her 'weaving' or 'interweaving' (*διαπλέξαισ'* 8). If *ἄνυσεν* is read in line 11 (on the emendation *ἄνυσσεν*, see below), the passage does imply that another sound occurs while the two Gorgons are mourning, but it in no way suggests that Athena tries to imitate this other sound on the *aulos*.<sup>4</sup>

I will consider the meaning of *διαπλέξαισ'* more closely below, but, assuming that it means 'interweave', the singular number of *θρήνον* may seem to conflict with my interpretation and to support that of Clay and Segal. One does not 'interweave' one thing alone, but always a plurality of things with each other. The singular number of *θρήνον* may seem to imply that the Gorgons produced a single strain of sound, which, if interwoven, might be so with only some other sound. Clay and Segal do not comment on the singular number of *θρήνον*, but their thinking seems to run along these lines. Their interpretation implicitly attributes a monophonic quality to the Gorgons' lament, for only thus might Athena imitate it using just one reed of the *aulos*. But the singular number of *θρήνον* no more implies that the sound to which it refers is monophonic than does the singular number of the same noun in the following Pindaric passage which describes the funeral of Achilles: ἀλλὰ οἱ παρά τε πυρὰν τάφον θ' Ἑλλικῶνιαι παρθένουι στάν, ἐπὶ θρήνόν τε πολύφαιμον ἔχεαν (*I*. 8.57–8). The adjective *πολύφαιμον* ('many-voiced': W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* [Berlin, 1969]; LSJ wrongly equates *πολύφαιμος* with *πολύφατος*, 'much-spoken of, famous') entails that *θρήνον* here denotes a polyphonic, not a monophonic, sound. Sound words, like *θρήνος*, often constitute collective nouns: only the context can determine how mono- or polyphonic is the sound to which they refer. If the context entails that Athena is interweaving two distinct strains of sound, there is then no reason why the singular *θρήνον* might not contain both of these strains, thus making it superfluous to find another object, explicit or implicit, for *διαπλέξαισ'*.

But does the context entail that Athena is interweaving two distinct strains of sound? I think that it suggests this but does not necessarily entail it.<sup>5</sup> It does neither, however, for the reasons cited by Clay and implicitly accepted by Segal. Clay argues thus:

<sup>3</sup> C. Segal, 'Perseus and the Gorgon: Pindar *Pythian* 12.9–12 reconsidered', *AJPh* 116 (1995), 7–17, at 7. The word in brackets is not in Segal's translation; the omission of it or of an equivalent was surely an oversight.

<sup>4</sup> Clay (n. 1), pp. 522–3, maintains that Perseus' victory cry does not occur until after he gets to Seriphos, i.e. significantly after the Gorgons' lament. She does not explicitly state when and where Athena invents the art of playing the *aulos*. But her theory entails that this too does not occur until after Perseus' return to Seriphos. By Clay's theory, then, the sounds that Athena produces simultaneously on the flute she herself never hears simultaneously. Segal holds that Perseus' victory cry occurs when and where he kills Medusa. I am not sure that there is any such shout, but if there is, I am sure that Segal is right about when and where it occurs.

<sup>5</sup> Some, I suspect, would hold that it does not even suggest it. If they are right and if therefore the dual structure of the *aulos* is irrelevant, then *διαπλέξαισ'* carries the meaning which Boeckh gives it: *artificiosis nexibus flexibusque componens*. See A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* vol. II, part 2 (Leipzig, 1821), p. 544.

The key word here is the participle *διαπλέξαισ'*, which has been ignored by commentators. It means 'to interweave' and implies two objects that are woven together. Thus, for example, Hermes weaves tamarisks and myrtle branches together to construct his wondrous sandals (*H. Hermes* 79–81; cf. *Nemean* 7.99–100). To invent this new musical art, Athena does not simply weave a *thrēnos*, but she *interweaves* (*διαπλέξαισ'*) two very different sounds: the Gorgons' mournful song of loss and Perseus' triumphal shout of victory.<sup>6</sup>

Let us first correct Clay on a minor point, already touched on above. 'Interweave' implies not 'two objects' but two or more. The *OED* does not make this point clear in its definition of 'interweave', but it does so in its first and principal definition of the similar word 'intertwine': 'To twine (two or more things) together, or entwine (one thing) with another.' 'Interweave' means to weave two or more objects together. If *διαπλέξαισ'* in our passage means 'interweave', the meaning of the verb itself does not limit the number of its objects to two. It is rather the dual structure of the *aulos* which entails that Athena, if she uses an *aulos* to interweave sounds, can interweave at most two simultaneously. The dual structure of the *aulos*, the duality of the surviving Gorgons, and the presence of the idea of interweaving which is at least latent in *διαπλέξαισ'* (and in every usage of *πλέκω* and its cognates), together suggest that Athena is indeed interweaving two sounds when she plays her new-found instrument. But the passage conveys this idea despite the fact that neither in it nor in the other two cited by Clay above does *διαπλέκω* actually mean 'interweave'. In all three and usually elsewhere it means rather 'weave'.

'Weave' has two basic meanings: (i) to fashion material into a product (e.g. to weavethreads into a rug); and (ii) to create a product (e.g. to weave a rug). Only in the first of these two senses is 'weave' synonymous with 'interweave'. 'Interweave' cannot carry the second sense: it takes as its object only the material, not the product, woven. *διαπλέκω* in Greek is used like 'weave' in English: it can carry both of the above senses, but usually carries the second. In fact, in the extant texts it seems to carry the first sense in only a few instances (and perhaps in only one) up until the fifth century A.D.<sup>7</sup>

Let us consider the two passages cited by Clay.

#### *H. Hermes* 79–81:

σάνδαλα δ' αὐτίκα ῥιψὶν ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις ἀλίησιν,  
ἄφραστ' ἤδ' ἀνόητα διέπλεκε, θαύματα ἔργα,  
συμμίσγων μυρίκας καὶ μυρσινοειδέας ὄζους.

#### *Pi. N.* 7.98–100:

εἰ γάρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοντον ἀρμόσαις  
ἦβα λιπαρῶ τε γήραϊ διαπλέκοις  
εὐδαίμων, ἔοντα . . .

In the first passage the object of *διέπλεκε* is the sandals (the product), not the tamarisks and myrtle branches (the material). The verb which describes the

<sup>6</sup> Clay (n. 1), p. 523. Her italics.

<sup>7</sup> Besides *Hdt* 4.67.2, cited below, the only passage (to my knowledge) in which *διαπλέκω* certainly means 'interweave' is from the love letters by the fifth-century A.D. rhetorician Aristaenetus: *διαπλέξασθαι κώμας* (1.25). The verb does not occur in Homeric epic or the extant works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Thucydides, Lysias, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes, or Isaeus.

interweaving of the latter is the participle *συμμίσγων*, not *διέπλεκε*. The second passage (a prayer to Herakles on behalf of the victor and his father) is more difficult to construe.<sup>8</sup> W. H. Race in the recent Loeb edition translates it thus: 'I pray that you may match a steadfast life to their youth and splendid old age and weave it to a happy end.' *βίοτον* is the object of both the participle *ἀρμόσαις* and the finite verb *διαπλέκοις*. The usage of *διαπλέκω* in this passage is similar to that in the following four passages: *διαπλέξαντος τὸν βίον εὖ* (Hdt. 5.92.); *ἀσκητικὸν δέ τινα βίον . . . διαπλέκειν* (Pl. *Lg.* 806a); *διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν* (Ar. *An.* 753–4) and *ὁ δ' ὄλβος, ὅστις εὐφρων/ ἀμέραν [δι]απλέκει ἄκλαυστος* (Alcm. *Parth.* 37–9). In all these passages the object of *διαπλέκω* is a word denoting a period of time (a day, a life, the rest of one's life).<sup>9</sup> The image behind this usage of *διαπλέκω* seems to be that of weaving many moments of time (the material) into a period of time (the product).<sup>10</sup> In all of them, however, the object of *διαπλέκω* is the product, not the material, woven. Pindar's usage of this image differs from that found in the other passages in one respect: in the others the subject of *διαπλέκω* is the persons who actually live the period of time which is the object of *διαπλέκω*; in Pindar it is someone else, Herakles, who is asked to weave together a period of time for others to live.

*Διαπλέκω* is also clearly used with an object of the product in the following passage where Plato describes the structure of the throat: *διπλᾶ . . . ἐγκύρτια . . . , ὦν θάτερον αὖ πάλιν διέπλεξεν δίκρουν* ('two passages, one of which he made moreover in turn with two openings': *Tim.* 78b.4–6; my translation). It seems to be used similarly in Pindar's comment about the 'crafty citizen': *ὁμως μὰν σαίνων ποτὶ πάντα ἅταν πάγχυ διαπλέκει* (*P.* 2.82)—at least if Heyne's widely accepted emendation *ἅταν* is read in place of the MSS's *ἄγαν*. Without that emendation *διαπλέκω* here possibly does mean 'interweave', but the sentence as a whole then is more difficult to construe.

Plato uses *διαπλέκω* in one other passage of the *Timaeus*, that in which he describes the interrelationship between the world-soul and the universe: *ἡ (ψυχὴ) δ' ἐκ μέσου πρὸς τὸν ἔσχατον οὐρανὸν πάντῃ διαπλακεῖσα κύκλῳ τε αὐτὸν ἔξωθεν περικαλύψασα* (36e2–3). LSJ cites the passage and comments on *διαπλακεῖσα* thus: 'interwoven [with matter]'. But that is obviously what it cannot mean. That is, Plato cannot have meant that strands of soul are everywhere coiled around and intermixed with strands of matter. Plato here expresses the relationship between the world-soul and the universe in metaphorical terms. The relationship and the metaphor are problematic no matter how one conceives the former or translates the latter.<sup>11</sup> Even so, it seems to me, that *ψυχὴ* here is better understood as the product, not the matter, of this metaphorical weaving. *διαπλακεῖσα* accordingly means 'made', 'established',

<sup>8</sup> Some follow Maas in reading *σύ ἰν* in place of *σφισιν*, which would entail that the prayer is for only the victor. But the additional dative *ἰν* hardly makes the passage any easier; cf. C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (Salem, NH, 1981), p. 176.

<sup>9</sup> In the citation from Aristophanes *διαπλέκειν* is perhaps used without an object, *τὸ λοιπόν* being adverbial and perhaps dependent on *ζῶν*. The participial phrase, however, seems to me to function in place of a direct object. I therefore consider this usage of *διαπλέκω* to be essentially the same as that in the other passages where its object is a word denoting a period of time.

<sup>10</sup> This is in fact the most common usage of *διαπλέκω*, which justifies Carey's comment on *διαπλέκοις* in *N.* 7.99: 'usually a virtual synonym of *διάγω*'. See Carey (n. 8), p. 176.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. A. E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 174–5: 'The complete domination of the cosmic soul over "its" body... is expressed by saying that the soul is everywhere inwoven into the texture of the body... If we tried to take the imagery *au pied de la lettre*, we should have to suppose that the *ψυχὴ* was already a *ψυχὴ* before its body existed, a

'produced' (i.e. throughout the *ouranos*), not 'interwoven'.<sup>12</sup> Where all is so metaphorical and metaphysical, however, the issue is perhaps moot. In any case, there is at least one passage from the Classical period in which *διαπλέκω* clearly means to weave material, not a product, that in which Herodotos describes how some Scythian prophets weave and unweave strips of bark while prophesying: *ἐπεὰν τὴν φιλύρην τρίχα σχίσῃ, διαπλέκων ἐν τοῖσι δακτύλοισι τοῖσι ἑαυτοῦ καὶ διαλύων χρᾶ* (Hdt. 4.67.2).

Our survey, which (to the best of my knowledge) has encompassed all of the occurrences of *διαπλέκω* up to Hellenistic times, has established that *διαπλέκω* most frequently means to weave a product, not to interweave material. There seems to me no doubt that it carries this sense also in *P.* 12.8. The Gorgons' 'deadly lament' is there the product woven; it is not itself interwoven with anything else. What Athena actually produces, of course, is an imitation of their lament. It is the Gorgons themselves who *produce* their 'deadly lament'; Athena *reproduces* it on the flute. This fact is obvious enough from the purport of the relative clause in lines 9–10, but is made even clearer in lines 18–21:

ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων  
ἐρρύσατο, παρθένος αὐλῶν τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος,  
ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρυάλας ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων  
χρημθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον.

In these lines Pindar tells us explicitly what Athena imitated, and no mention is made of any victory shout from Perseus. Surely this is inconvenient for Clay's and Segal's interpretation of lines 6–12. More importantly, the loud groaning (*ἐρικλάγκταν γόον*) of one of the two Gorgons is here singled out and Athena is explicitly said to imitate it. The singling out of one of the Gorgons implies the singling out of the other. The fact that they are here distinguished from each other leads naturally to the conclusion that, if Athena's lament is woven from two distinct strains of sound (as suggested in lines 6–12), one of the two strains corresponds to the groaning of one of the Gorgons, and the other strain corresponds to the groaning of the other Gorgon. Clay and Segal elude the implications of lines 18–21 by taking *ἐρικλάγκταν γόον* to refer to the communal groaning of both the Gorgons together, by assuming that *πάμφωνον* implies sounds of joy, by exaggerating what little suggestion of victory may lie in the passage as a whole and particularly in the phrase *πόνων ἐρρύσατο*, and by confusing what needs to be 'juxtaposed' (or 'counterpoint[ed]') in this passage for it to support their interpretation of lines 6–12: 'Even here the joy of victory and the sadness of the victim's defeat are closely interwoven in the juxtaposition of the Gorgons' "wail" and the diapason of the goddess's flute (*ἐρικλάγκταν [γόον]*, 21; *πάμφωνον μέλος*, 19).'<sup>13</sup> Athena's *πάμφωνον μέλος* is indeed 'juxtaposed' with

*ψυχή* which was not the *ψυχή* of anything, and yet that it only *began* (*ἤρξατο*) to live when God had conjoined it with its later-formed body (and therefore was, till that time, a *ψυχή* and yet not alive). These contradictions ought to save us from understanding the creation of the *ψυχή* as a beginning in time' (his italics).

<sup>12</sup> Martin captures this sense in translating *διαπλακεῖσα* as 'répandue'. See Th. H. Martin, *Etudes sur Le Timée de Platon* vol. I (Paris, 1841), p. 99.

<sup>13</sup> Segal (n. 3), p. 14. The word in brackets is not found in Segal's text, but I suspect was accidentally omitted. Cf. Clay (n. 1), p. 523: 'At the moment of victory, when the goddess has rescued her favourite from his toils, *ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων ἐρρύσατο*, the *πάμφωνον μέλος* of the *aulos* counterpoints the joyful achievement with the resounding dirge (*ἐρικλάγκταν γόον*) of the Gorgons.'

Euryale's ἐρικλάγκταν γόον, but the passage makes the former an imitation of the latter. Their juxtaposition therefore provides no basis for concluding that Athena's μέλος, even if it should contain sounds of joy, is an imitation of such sounds made by Perseus. The passage as a whole is not designed to emphasize anyone's victory, certainly not Perseus'. πόνων ἐρρύσατο no more points to his victory than 'you were saved by the bell' points to your winning the fight. The *aulos* was associated with victory and the games, and Pindar recalls and celebrates this association in the phrase: εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόων μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων (24). But he leaves the relationship between the original *aulos* and Perseus' victory over the Gorgons as purely temporal and coincidental.<sup>14</sup> The purpose of πόνων ἐρρύσατο is to emphasize the difficulties that Perseus faced and thus to enable his example to illustrate and justify the subsequent gnome: εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου/ οὐ φαίνεται (28–9).<sup>15</sup> πάμφωνον need not imply sounds of joy: taken simply in the context of these lines, one would most naturally understand it to refer merely to a wide variety of sad sounds.

The issue, however, is not quite so simple, for in the context of the poem as a whole πάμφωνον carries somewhat more significance. Although the application of this adjective to Athena's original μέλος does not, as I see it, entail that her μέλος contained sounds of joy and victory, it does point to the capacity of the *aulos* to produce a broad range of sounds. This naturally suggests that it might be used to express a wide variety of emotions, and thus looks forward to its later usage by others, including the *laudandus* for this broader purpose. πάμφωνον eases the transition from the old to the new. It creates a link between the origin of the *aulos* and its contemporary usage. Pindar creates another such link with κεφαλᾶν πολλὰν νόμον (23). Athena ostensibly so names her melody because it resembles the sounds issuing from the Gorgons' heads; but Pindar has her give this name to her melody because it resembles the name of a melody or mode of playing which existed in his own day, πολυκέφαλος νόμος.<sup>16</sup> But the links he creates between the old and the new are purely verbal—and for good reason.<sup>17</sup> The inconcinnity of playing simultaneously a lament and a victory song (or shout) and the absurdity of imitating grieving Gorgons in order to celebrate a hero's victory may be lost on some of his interpreters, but were not lost on Pindar. One ought to interpret poems so that they carry more, not less, significance. But in the course of doing this one ought not to distort their clear meaning. To interpret this poem as saying that Athena used the *aulos* to imitate a victory shout made by Perseus or that she imitated sounds made by the Gorgons in order to celebrate

<sup>14</sup> ἐπεὶ (18) means simply 'when', not also 'since', as A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin, 1971), p. 141, holds.

<sup>15</sup> δυσπενθεῖ σὺν καμάτῳ (10) refers to the Gorgons' grief, not Perseus' troubles, as Köhnken maintains. See Köhnken (ibid.), p. 131; and 'Perseus' Kampf und Athenes Erfindung (Bemerkungen zu Pindar, Pythien 12)', *Hermes* 104 (1976), 257–65.

<sup>16</sup> The explanations of πολυκέφαλος νόμος found in the scholia and in Plutarch, *De Musica*, ch. 7, may all be inaccurate, but there can be no doubt that the phrase refers to something familiar to Pindar's contemporaries.

<sup>17</sup> C. Segal, 'The gorgon and the nightingale: the voice of female lament and Pindar's Twelfth Pythian Ode', in L. C. Dunn and N. A. Jones (edd.), *Embodied Voices: The Representation of Female Vocality in Western Culture* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 17–34, argues that *Pythian* 12 also creates links between the old and the new in a different way—by linking the beautiful, 'non-maternal, virginal, sister-figure' (p. 20) Athena to the ugly, 'Evil-Mother' (p. 20) Medusa: 'In the logic of the myth, Athena . . . acquires Medusa's attributes and transforms her monstrous maternity into a safer form' (p. 26). As I see it, the 'logic' by which Medusa is transformed into Athena is the logic not 'of the myth' or of Pindar's poem but of Segal's own structuralist thought.

Perseus' victory is simply to distort its clear meaning. Athena plays the *aulos* after Perseus' victory, and therefore at a time when in a later age one might well have played it to celebrate his victory. People of a later age (i.e. Pindar's audience) might well have associated her playing with a victory celebration. The poem allows for such a loose association between her playing and a victory celebration, but it allows no more.

Dissatisfaction with Boeckh's emendation *ἄνυσσεν* (based on *ἄνυσεν*, an alternative reading found in the scholia) has led scholars back to the MSS's *ἄυσεν*. There is certainly a basis for dissatisfaction: the one passage cited by Boeckh to illustrate this usage of *ἀνύω* (*H. Hermes* 337: *πολὺν διὰ χώρον ἀνύσσας*, 'having finished off [i.e. crossed] much territory') provides no real parallel. As Clay notes, *Odyssey* 24.71, where a pyre 'finishes off' Achilles' body (*σε φλόξ ἤνυσεν*), provides a closer but still insufficient parallel.<sup>18</sup> But Clay ignores a passage, first cited by Dissen,<sup>19</sup> which provides a very close parallel—if only with a compound form of the verb: *ἦ θήν σ' ἐξανύω γε καὶ ὕστερον ἀντιβολήσας* ('I will surely finish you off if I encounter you again': *Il.* 11.365 [= 20.452]; my translation). Wilamowitz cites this passage in his discussion of *P.* 12.11 and clearly recognized that it provides the best support for *ἄνυσσεν*. Despite his awareness of this parallel, Wilamowitz preferred *ἄυσεν* for two reasons: (i) if Perseus 'finished off a third part of the sisters', then he must have wanted to finish off all of them—which is not right; and (ii) the wordplay on *μέρος/μοῖρα* is lost if they are not both objects of *ἄγων*.<sup>20</sup> Neither reason seems to me valid. If 'finished off a third part of the sisters' entails having wanted to finish off all of them, why does not 'carrying away a third part of the sisters' entail having wanted to carry away all of them—an eventuality which would also be neither ethically nor aesthetically right? The difficulty which Wilamowitz raises (were it not wholly illusory) would not be solved by reading *ἄυσεν* and thus making *τρίτον κασιγνητῶν μέρος* an object of *ἄγων*. Wilamowitz's objection to *ἄνυσσεν* is in fact perverse since this verb can much more appropriately govern *τρίτον κασιγνητῶν μέρος* as its object than can *ἄγων*, since Perseus does not strictly speaking carry away 'a third part of the sisters' but just the head of one of them.<sup>21</sup> He does, however, finish off (i.e. kill) 'a third part' of them. The first of Wilamowitz's two reasons is patently illogical, and has not been repeated by others as grounds for reading *ἄυσεν*.

The second reason is not illogical if only because the issue in this case involves a matter of opinion rather than logic, but it seems to me to have no more merit than the first. It has been repeated by Köhnken.<sup>22</sup> I think the wordplay is neither lost nor diminished if *μέρος* is in strict grammatical terms an object of only the main verb

<sup>18</sup> Clay (n. 1), p. 521.

<sup>19</sup> L. Dissen, *Pindari Carmina* Part II (Gotha, 1847), p. 373.

<sup>20</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), p. 146: 'Schön wäre es nicht, wenn Perseus "den dritten Teil der Schwestern erledigte", denn dann müßte er das Ganze gewollt haben. . . . Nun beachte man, daß *μόρος* [sic] und *μοῖρα* nicht ohne Bedacht nebeneinander stehen werden. Der seltsame Ausdruck "der dritte Teil der Schwestern" ist eben deshalb gewählt, und sobald man die Worte nur richtig verbindet, ergibt sich das Trefflichste, "er brachte den dritten Teil der Schwestern als *μοῖρα* für Seriphos".'

<sup>21</sup> Köhnken (n. 2), p. 92, makes this point in defending his idea that *τρίτον* is adverbial. Segal (n. 3), p. 11, argues to the contrary: 'A synecdoche of this kind is not difficult or uncommon in Pindar, particularly as the head in early Greek literature often stands for the person (see LSJ s.v. *κεφαλῇ* I.2) and in Medusa's case particularly is closely identified with her whole figure.' I think that the synecdoche is not impossible, but still counts against any interpretation which makes *μέρος* an object of *ἄγων*.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Köhnken (n. 2), p. 92: 'syntax and effect of the *μέρος-μοῖρα* clause is impaired by *μέρος* being entangled with the preceding part of the sentence'.

since it is also inevitably at least an understood object of ἄγων. Pindar's audience knew that it was by carrying in some sense 'a part (μέρος) of the sisters' to the people of Seriphos that Perseus was able to bring them his/their contribution/fate (μοῖρα). The wordplay is more subtle if μέρος and μοῖραν are not both objects of ἄγων, but is by no means lost. In this regard, the hyperbaton of τρίτον is noteworthy. As already observed, it is strictly speaking only a 'part of the sisters' (i.e. the head of one of them) which Perseus brings to Seriphos, but he does kill a full third of them. Pindar conveys exactly this idea by placing τρίτον before the main verb: this serves to separate τρίτον from the subsequent participial phrase and to isolate κασιγνητῶν μέρος as a distinct unit. κασιγνητῶν μέρος does double duty: it is first and foremost part of the main clause, but it is also an implicit (but only implicit) part of the subsequent participial phrase. τρίτον, however, does just single duty: it is part of only the main clause. The reading ἄνυσεν, by forcing τρίτον into the participial phrase (unless one adopts Köhnken's and Clay's very unlikely thesis that τρίτον is adverbial), upsets the effect of Pindar's subtle word placement and produces, it seems to me, less interesting wordplay on μέρος/μοῖρα and a clumsier sentence on the whole—which is why I would read ἄνυσεν.<sup>23</sup>

Schadewaldt seems to have been the first to interpret ἄνυσεν as a victory shout ('Triumpfschrei'), but the passages he cites from Homer to illustrate this usage of the verb (*Il.* 2.334, 13.409, 15.321, 20.48, 51; *Od.* 6.117) hardly serve this purpose,<sup>24</sup> as is evident from the fact that Segal includes none of them among the four Homeric passages which he cites to illustrate this usage of the verb: *Il.* 5.101 (= 5.283), 5.347, 14.147.<sup>25</sup> The passages cited by Segal do serve their purpose, but only to a limited extent, for the usage of ἀύω in them differs considerably from that in the Pindaric passage: in none of them is it used absolutely to mean to shout for the joy of victory. In all four it is modified by an adverb or adverbial phrase and, more importantly, introduces or follows direct speech. The first three passages contain the formula: τῷ (or τῇ) δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἄνυσεν, in which the dative singular pronoun τῷ/τῇ refers to a person wounded by the speaker (or thought by him to be wounded).<sup>26</sup> In the second and third it is this person whom the speaker addresses in the following direct speech. In the first he rather (somewhat peculiarly, in view of the preceding dative singular pronoun) goes on to address his comrades. In the fourth passage, a speech of encouragement by Poseidon to Agamemnon, when Greek fortunes are at their lowest ebb (the Trojans are attacking the ships) and Agamemnon has suggested that they give up and go home (14.75–81), is followed by the line: 'Ὡς εἰπὼν μέγ' ἄνυσεν, ἐπεσσύμενος πεδίοιο. In his speech Poseidon prophesies the Greeks' eventual rout of the Trojans (144–6), but, even so, can he already be celebrating it? In short, in none of these passages does a victor stand over a slain opponent and celebrate by shouting. In at least the first three ἀύω is used as a verb of speaking and introduces direct speech. This is by far the most common usage of the verb in Homeric epic (twenty-nine instances in all by my count).<sup>27</sup> In this usage ἀύω seems to mean 'to shout the

<sup>23</sup> Despite Köhnken (ibid.), the syntax is easier if μέρος in strict grammatical terms is part of only the main clause.

<sup>24</sup> W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle, 1928), p. 308, n. 1.

<sup>25</sup> Segal (n. 3), p. 10, n. 6. Segal also refers us to *Il.* 8.160, 15.321, 18.217, 21.328, but these passages are no more useful than those cited by Schadewaldt. Clay cites no passages at all.

<sup>26</sup> The addressee is in no case severely wounded or down. τῷ in the first two passages refers to Diomedes, who in the second passage has been merely struck but not wounded. τῇ in the third passage refers to Aphrodite, who has merely been nicked on the wrist.

<sup>27</sup> The three passages under discussion, and *Il.* 3.81, 4.508, 784, 6.66, 110, 8.160, 172, 227,



following words'; that is what I take it to mean in the first three of Segal's four passages, not 'to give a victory shout'. In Homeric epic, when *αὐῶ* is used absolutely (*Il.* 2.334 [= 16.277], 18.217, 20.48, 51) or when it is modified by adverbs but does not govern a direct or indirect object (actual or understood) or introduce direct speech (*Il.* 11.10, 14.401, 15.321, 16.566, 20.50, 21.238), it means to give the battle cry or to shout while fighting, but Homeric characters give such cries and make such shouts only before or during battle, not after it.<sup>28</sup> The only time in Homeric epic when a form of *αὐῶ* is used to describe sounds made by combatants after a battle while standing over the bodies of the slain, the combatants are mourning the slain (*Od.* 9.65). Of course, there is no reason why Pindar need be restricted by Homeric usage and custom, and therefore no reason why he could not use a form of *αὐῶ* to describe Perseus giving a battle cry or celebratory shout after having slain Medusa. But Pindar nowhere else uses *αὐῶ* for any purpose, and if he used it here for the stated purpose, he would not be following as much in Homer's footsteps as Segal implies.

One last point. The present participle *ἄγων* (12) has caused unnecessary trouble: witness Wilamowitz's desire to treat it as an infinitive (while taking *ἄῤσεν* as a verb of speaking)<sup>29</sup> and Clay's desire to locate the action of the participle and that of its main verb in Seriphos (see n. 4 above). The time-span of this participle includes that of its main verb (whatever form one chooses) but is not coterminous with it. Its action begins before that of the main verb and continues after it. The participial phrase means 'when he was in the process of bringing [the third part of the sisters and] their fate/his contribution to sea-girt Seriphos and its people'. That process begins when Perseus leaves Seriphos and continues through his episode with the Gorgons and his return trip to Seriphos, and lasts until he finally turns the people of Seriphos into stone. This explanation obviates any need to emend the participle or locate its action and that of its main verb in Seriphos.

Essex, Vermont

GEORGE F. HELD  
villedieu@aol.com

11.275, 285, 585, 12.439, 13.149, 413, 445, 14.453, 478, 15.364, 424, 485, 16.268, 17.183, 247, 21.307, 582; *Od.* 24.530. A subsequent direct statement is also at least implied in *Il.* 22.294.

<sup>28</sup> I take Poseidon's shout in *Il.* 14.147 to be of this type. It is more of a battle cry than a victory shout.

<sup>29</sup> Wilamowitz (n. 18), p. 146: 'Sehen wir nun *ἄῤσεν*, Perseus rief. Was rief er? Leuchtet nicht ein, daß er rief "Jetzt bekommen die Seriphier in einem Drittel der Gorgonen ihre *μοῖρα*." Mit anderen Worten, *ἄγων* ist *ἄγειν*.' It is often said that Wilamowitz wished to emend *ἄγων* to *ἄγειν*; cf. Segal (n. 3), p. 8; R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford, 1962), p. 28; D. E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar: 1513-1972* (Amsterdam, 1976), p. 96. If I understand Wilamowitz correctly, he merely wished to treat the participle as if it were an infinitive—but on what philological principle he does not say.