

HERACLES, THE HYPERBOREANS, AND THE HIND: PINDAR, OL. 3

EMMET ROBBINS

I THE STRUCTURE OF THE NARRATIVE

THE THIRD OLYMPIAN tells of the olive-tree, source of the victor's crown, which Heracles brought from the land of the Hyperboreans to Zeus' precinct at Pisa. This myth includes the further information that Heracles visited the Hyperboreans when he went to fetch the hind customarily called "Cerynean" or "Cerynitian" because of accounts in Callimachus and Apollodorus.¹ There is no unanimity on the question whether Pindar is telling of one or two trips on the part of Heracles. Most editors of Pindar since Boeckh assume that Heracles' trip to fetch the hind preceded that on which he brought the olive to Olympia.² But many

¹Pindar's is the first literary version of this myth. Euripides, *Her. Fur.* 375 ff., places the labour at Oenoe (in the Argolid). Callimachus, *Hymn* 3.109, places the hind in Achaea (Cerynia). There has been much debate as to which is the earlier tradition: see O. Gruppe in *RE Supp.* 3 (1918) 1039–1040. The version given by Apollodorus (2.5.3) is confusing: the hind is Cerynitian but is at home at Oenoe. C. Pschmidt, *Die Sage von der verfolgten Hinde* (Greifswald 1911) 26–27, advances the hypothesis that the hind is in origin an import from the Semitic East and that its horns represent the moon, with the Greek name concealing the Hebrew *qeren* (both "horn" and "ray of light"): lack of understanding of the non-Greek name led Callimachus to associate the hind with Cerynia. For a not dissimilar line of approach, see P. Friedländer, *Herakles* (Philol. Unter. 19, 1907) 126 note 2, who, following Curtius, thinks that the association with Cerynia was made because of the similarity of the name to the Greek word *κέρας*. Pschmidt eliminates the confusion in Apollodorus' account by claiming that *κερυνήτιον* (mss *κερνήτην* or *κερνήτιον*) is an inherited non-Greek appellation and not a geographical reference. In any case, there is no justification for speaking of the "Cerynean" hind in the Pindaric account.

²A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* 2.2 (Leipzig 1821) 139; L. Dissen, *Pindari carmina quae supersunt* 2 (Gotha and Erford 1830) 47; F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880) 174; G. Fraccaroli, *Le Odi di Pindaro* (Verona 1894) 214; B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (London 1885) 156; H. Jurenka, *Pindars erste und dritte olympische Ode* (Vienna 1894) 22; J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar*² (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1919) 35; L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* 1 (London 1930) 20; J. T. Kakridis, "Die Pelopssage bei Pindar," *Philologus* 85 (1930) 475 note 50 (repr. in W. M. Calder III and J. Stern, eds, *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [Darmstadt 1970] 189 note 50); A. Puech, *Pindare 1: Olympiques*² (Paris 1931) 50; M. Fernandez-Galiano, *Pindaro: Olimpicas* (Madrid 1956) 165; B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1960) 352; G. Méautis, *Pindare le dorien* (Paris and Neuchâtel 1962) 65; R. Hamilton, *Epinikion* (The Hague and Paris 1974) 61; F. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore and London 1980) 92; A. Jaufmann, "Interpretation einer Pindarode," *Jahresber. des Bismarck-Gymnasiums Karlsruhe* 1977–1978, 35 note 14; L. Lehnus, *Pindaro: Olimpiche* (Milan 1981) 66 (with reservations).

others hold, implicitly or explicitly, that Heracles brought the hind back to Eurystheus and the olive-tree back to the racetrack at Olympia on the same trip.³ Illig is alone among the latter group in providing the grounds for his belief. Pindar, thinks Illig, returns with *θάμβαινε* (32) to the moment previously mentioned with *αἵτει* (17): the two verbs refer to one occasion, with *αἵτει* reporting the event ("der äussere Vorgang") and *θάμβαινε* giving its psychological motivation ("der innere Vorgang"). The wonder of the hero leads directly to his request.⁴ Following this line of argumentation one might, I suppose, further argue that the references to *θυμός* (25) and *ἀνάγκα* (28) provide an example of the familiar phenomenon of "overdetermination:" the same action is product of both an inner impulse and an external force.⁵

Illig's argument is attractive, but a heavy price must be paid for the advantage gained. Pindar stands convicted of a certain sloppiness for having fused two stories, that of the olive-tree and that of the hind, somewhat imperfectly. Tell-tale details have been left lying about carelessly, for we are told that Heracles proceeded from Arcadia, in bondage to Eurystheus, when he went for the hind (27), whereas we know that he came from Olympia for the olive (23–25).⁶ And, presumably, we must not analyse other elements in the narrative too closely. By line 26 we have learned that Heracles, having set up altars and founded the games at Olympia, wished to protect the precinct from the glare of the sun.⁷ It was on this occasion (*τότ'*, 25) that he set out to the land of the Hyperboreans

³Before Boeckh: C. G. Heyne, *Pindari carmina ex interpretatione latina emendatiore* (Göttingen 1798) 12. After Boeckh: T. Mommsen, *Des Pindaros Werke in die Versmasse des Originals*³ (Leipzig 1852) 14; M. C. van der Kolf, *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractaverit quidque in eis mutarit* (Rotterdam 1923) 39; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1932) 238; L. Illig, *Zur Form der Pindarischen Erzählung* (Berlin 1932) 58 note 2, 66 note 2; K. Fehr, *Die Mythen bei Pindar* (Zurich 1936) 37–39; W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (London 1950) 76; C. P. Segal, "God and Man in Pindar's First and Third Olympian Odes," *HSCP* 68 (1964) 235; G. Devereux, "The Exploitation of Ambiguity in Pindaros O. 3.27," *RhM* 109 (1966) 295; J. Duchemin, "Pindare et la Sicile; réflexions sur quelques thèmes mythiques," *Hommages à Marie Delcourt* (Collection Latomus 114, 1970) 81; G. Arrighetti, "Mito e realtà nell'Olimpica III di Pindaro," *Ricerche di filologia classica 1: studi di letteratura greca* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 34, 1981) 89.

⁴Illig (above, note 3) 66 note 2.

⁵Cf. E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951) 16.

⁶In the sequence given by Apollodorus (2.7.2), the killing of Augeas, necessary preliminary to the establishment of the games, is subsequent to the completion of the twelve labours. We cannot assume, however, as does Mezger (above, note 2), that Pindar knew the events of Heracles' career in the order to which we have become accustomed. Heyne (above, note 3), *ad* 29 ff., realizes that if there is a single trip it presupposes a sequence unlike the familiar one: "post ludos actos ad Cervam aripedem capiendam profectus est: qui fuit proximus ab Augea labor secundum Nostrum; diversa narrat alii."

⁷And of the full moon, according to the scholiast on 19–20 (Drachmann 1.115).

to acquire the tree. He must, thus, have known of the existence of the trees and this is most easily accounted for if we assume that he had been among the Hyperboreans on a previous occasion.

Kakridis has called attention to a difficulty in the two-trip hypothesis (above, note 2). We are forced to assume that *δέξατ'* (27) functions as a pluperfect and mentally to supply a *ποτέ*, the usual sign in Pindar that an aorist introduces an anterior stage of the narrative. But the problem is more apparent than real. The pluperfect, never common in Greek, is all but non-existent in Pindar,⁸ who is generally content to use the simple aorist of past action and to supply other temporal indicators to locate events in a narrative in relation to each other. In this case *ἐλθόντ' Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ δειρᾶν . . . εὐτέ νιν* (27–28) is an elaborate specifying phrase that clearly shows this to be not the occasion of the founding of the games but an earlier trip.

The ancients knew a division of the exploits of Heracles into *ἄθλοι*, performed at the behest of Eurystheus, and *πράξεις*, undertaken voluntarily.⁹ This division corresponds nicely to a distinction between the *ἀνάγκα* of the quest for the hind and the *θυμός*-prompted voyage for the tree. And these two trips provide a parallel with the normal Pindaric progression of the victor from *πόνος* (analogous to *ἀνάγκα*) to the victory in which he can indulge his *θυμός* (cf., e.g., *Nem.* 7.74, *εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται*). On another level the two trips correspond to the poet's own progression from *ἀνάγκα* to *θυμός* in the course of his song. The first thirteen lines of the poem are a prayer for grace amidst the sense of compulsion (*χρέος*, 7) generated by the crowns that demand praise of the victor.¹⁰ Grace and joy are present subsequently in the return of Heracles (*ἵλαος*, 34) and in the feast which the poet's own *θυμός* (38) now prompts him to celebrate.

In Pindar's narrative, then, *ἤδη γάρ* (19) introduces the occasion on which Heracles decided to obtain the olive-tree for Olympia. This *ἤδη γάρ* is picked up by *δὴ τότε* (25), a reference to the same occasion and a marker that, conjoined with *ἤδη γάρ*, binds 19–26 into a unit. What is subsequent in the narrative is anterior in time, i.e., is an earlier visit of which the narration ends at *σταθείς* (32). *ἕμερος* (33) harks back to *θυμός* (25): what intervenes is a digression that introduces (a) the earlier visit in pursuit of the hind, and (b) Taygete's dedication of the animal on a still earlier

⁸*κέκρυπτο*, *Ol.* 6.54, is, I think, the only instance.

⁹The division between voluntary and involuntary is given by Pausanias (3.17.3) as part of a description of the Temple of Athena Chalcioecus (ca 500 B.C.). C. Robert in Preller-Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage*⁴ (Berlin 1921) 429, thinks the distinction goes back to Pherecydes.

¹⁰On this motif, see W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*² (Tübingen 1966) 20 [278] note 1. Arrighetti, (above, note 3) 90–91, calls attention to the parallel between the poet and Heracles, both of whom act to enhance the Olympic victory.

occasion. But lines 32–34 have bothered commentators. Hamilton (above, note 2) finds that τῶτι (32) with its reference to χθόνα (31) and the first trip is confounded by τῶν (33), which appears to continue the reference to the sighting of the trees on the trip for the hind, but is found, as the sentence unfolds, to refer to a second trip, since the racecourse did not exist on the earlier visit. Lehnus (above, note 2) finds that τῶν, if taken to refer to the second trip, introduces “un violento calo cronologico.” I detect neither confusion nor violence. The article in Pindar is regularly a hinge. Most frequently it opens a door onto the past (e.g., τάν, 13), but the door can also swing forward and propel the story ahead. In this passage τάν (31) moves the narrative from the point most remote in time (Taygete’s dedication) to Heracles’ first visit to the Hyperboreans while τῶν (33) advances it a step further to the time of the second trip. And the two references to desire (ἔμερος and θυμός) secure the backward reference of 33 to 25 before mention of the racetrack corroborates it.

The sentence δὴ τότε ἔς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμός ὥρμα/Ἰστρίαν νιν (25–26) has a pivotal position in the narrative. ἔμερος (33) refers back to it, closing a ring. But this sentence itself closes a ring which began at 14, for Ἰστρίαν νιν clearly picks up Ἰστροῦ ἀπὸ . . . παγάν (14). The extended backward movement of the myth is temporarily broken by a return to the point of departure. This is something not without parallel in Pindar.

H. J. Rose observed that in the Seventh Olympian, “the myth of Helios’ acquisition of Rhodes and of the birth of Athena are thrust into . . . Apollo’s advice to Tlepolemos,” i.e., that lines 34–76 are a sort of digression in the structure of the poem.¹¹ We have something remarkably similar in the Third Olympian, with a digression that also includes two distinct steps backwards. In the Seventh Olympian the digression which begins at ἐνθα (34) comes after the story of Tlepolemos, itself contained within the verbal frame Ἀσίας . . . νᾶσον πέλας/ἐμβόλῳ . . . Ἀργεῖα σὺν αἰχμᾷ (18–19, mention of Argos and periphrastic description of Rhodes) and Λερναίας ἀπ’ ἀκτᾶς . . . ἐς ἀμφιθάλασσον νομόν (33, oracular description of Argos and Rhodes). In the Third Olympian the story of the olive-tree is interrupted by a digression, introduced by ἐνθα (26), which likewise includes two earlier events—Heracles’ first visit to the Hyperboreans and, still more remote in time, Taygete’s dedication of the animal to Orthosia. In both poems the receding perspective, slightly foreshortened by a verbal echo, moves insistently back to an ἀρχή. In the Seventh Olympian the poet dwells expansively on the earliest episode in the triptych (the marriage of Rhodes and the Sun) whereas in the Third he gives the ἀρχή (Taygete’s dedication) only briefly. But the poems are alike in their

¹¹H. J. Rose, “Iolaos and the Ninth Pythian Ode,” *CQ* 25 (1931) 159. Rose actually claims that the digression is lines 32–77, but this is surely just a slip—it begins at 34. ἐνθα is not part of the oracle: see W. J. Verdenius, *Pindar’s Seventh Olympian Ode: A Commentary* (Amsterdam 1972) 16 (108).

sustained backward motion followed by an abrupt return to the present. There are other poems (e.g., *Pyth.* 4) where the poet cuts short a long narrative to return to the addressee, other poems (e.g., *Pyth.* 3) where extended movement backwards is followed by a corresponding forward progression and the closing of many rings. *Olympians* 3 and 7 are unique in having a dominant central section, essentially tripartite, which moves slowly backward and then leaps forward.¹² In no other poem is the backward movement so pronounced. And in both poems the most distant point in the past is connected in a particular way with the opening of the poem. The wedding of Rhodes and the Sun in the Seventh Olympian recalls the wedding-scene of the proem. Taygete's appearance in the Third Olympian is hard to explain until we remember that she is genealogically linked to the Tyndarids and Helen, with whom the poem opens.¹³

II THE STORIES

There are three myths: (a) Heracles' acquisition of the trees, (b) Heracles' labour, (c) Taygete's votive-offering.

(a) We have no other account of Heracles' winning of the olive for Olympia and so no way of knowing with certainty whether this story was current in Pindar's time or was an invention of the poet's, as some have thought (e.g., Wilamowitz, above, note 3). I suspect that the story is not original with Pindar.

Cazzaniga claims that Heracles, the olive, the hind, and the games are on the early staters of Caulonia (550–480 B.C.).¹⁴ These show on the obverse a naked archaic male figure, right arm raised and holding a

¹²In Bacchylides 11 there is regressive movement through three episodes (foundation of the sanctuary, madness of the maidens, departure of Proetus from Argos for Tiryns), but the return ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (65) is effected in a leisurely fashion.

¹³See R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, eds, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967) frs 169, 175 (with apparatus), 199.8. Apollodorus (1.7.3 and 1.9.5) accepts a different tradition, making Tyndareus a descendant of Aeolus. There is a good deal of confusion regarding Tyndareus' ancestry (see Sir J. G. Frazer *ad* Apollodorus 3.10.4). The connection between Taygete and the Tyndaridae is the earliest version we know and it appears to receive special attention in the Catalogue.

The Tyndaridae restore Helen to Sparta after her abduction to Athens by Theseus: this rescue is, in fact, the only incident in Helen's biography in which she is associated with her brothers. The scholiast (Drachmann 1.120–121) says that Taygete dedicated a hind with gilded antlers to Artemis for her help after escaping abduction by Zeus. There is a remarkable similarity between these stories of unsuccessful abduction: on the "schéma mythique caractéristique des mythes . . . du viol" see C. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* 1 (Rome 1977) 281–285.

ὀρθώσας of the opening (3) seems to find an echo in 'ὀρθώσας (30) but I am unable to see any connection other than verbal.

¹⁴I. Cazzaniga, "Il dio e la cerva nella monetazione di Caulonia e la tradizione ecistica Cauloniata," *PP* 23 (1968) 371–378. For an alternative see C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London 1976) 168–169, 174.

branch, left arm extended and bearing a small figure running, in the right field an antlered deer. These are the emblems of *Ol.* 3 and, says Cazzaniga, demonstrate that the mythical material was not new with Pindar. It is noteworthy too that Herodotus (4.34.2) mentions that an olive-tree was seen to grow over the tombs of the "Hyperborean" maidens in the shrine of Artemis on Delos. This may have been connected with the notion that the tree was Hyperborean in origin and the gift of this northern people. Had Pindar wanted to produce an original aetiology that brought from the land of the Hyperboreans a tree whose foliage was used to crown victors in the Greek contests he could have claimed that the Delphic laurel was identical with that worn by Apollo's devotees (*Pyth.* 10.40). He does not,¹⁵ nicely as it might have served his purpose in a poem where he is concerned, as Köhnken has demonstrated, to show the continuity, not the discrepancy, between the victor and the Hyperboreans.¹⁶ It looks as though Pindar exploited the connection between the olive and the Hyperboreans in the Third Olympian because it was already to hand.

Heimsoeth was, I believe, the first to suggest that in telling the story of Heracles' winning of the olive for Olympia we have the poet's correction of an old tradition in which the hero behaved badly towards this pious folk, wresting their precious tree from them against their will.¹⁷ The phrases *πίσαις λόγῳ* (16) and *πιστὰ φρονέων* (17) gain point if this insistence rebuts an incorrect version. *πειθοῖ καὶ οὐ βίᾳ* is the comment of the scholiast (Drachmann 1.113), who is aware of the special emphasis the poet places on the peaceful acquisition of the tree. The problem of presenting the savage Heracles of tradition is frequent enough in Pindar, who has to come to terms with Heracles' murder of his children (*Isth.* 3/4.79–82), Heracles' fight with Poseidon, Hades, and Apollo (*Ol.* 9.28–39), and Heracles' brutal attacks on Diomedes and Geryon (fr. 169 Snell-Maehler).¹⁸

(b) In the case of the earlier trip for the hind to the land of the Hyperboreans we have a similar problem. The pursuit of the hind is a regular labour, but did Pindar transfer this from the Peloponnese to the

¹⁵The laurel brought from Tempe to Delphi in the Festival called the Septerion (var. Stepterion), put Plutarch (*De mus.* 1136b) and Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 3.1) in mind of the Hyperboreans, but they do not claim it came thence. The earliest temple at Delphi, built of laurel from Tempe, was transported to the Hyperboreans (see Pindar *Pae.* 8.63 with Snell's supplements). For other examples of trees in sacred precincts propagated from trees elsewhere see F. Williams, *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford 1978) 16.

¹⁶A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971) 154–187.

¹⁷F. Heimsoeth, "Erklärungen zu Pindar," *RhM* 5 (1847) 6. His view is shared by, *inter al.*, Jurenka (above, note 2); F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1926) 126; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 302; G. L. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast 1975) 16.

¹⁸See F. Dornseiff, *Die archaische Mythenerzählung* (Berlin and Leipzig 1933) 72; Huxley (above, note 17) 17–18.

North? A black-figured amphora in Boulogne shows, apparently, Heracles departing from the Garden of the Hesperides, represented by a fruit-bearing tree beside which stand two maidens and under which stands a deer.¹⁹ It is not an exact parallel for the version in the poem: the genitals show that the animal is male,²⁰ and Hesperides are not Hyperboreans.²¹ But the amphora may reveal the existence of a tradition in which Heracles went for the animal to a paradise at the ends of the earth and in this story too there may be little Pindaric invention.

For this second myth, there are vase-paintings which make it clear that Heracles fought with a divinity for possession of the hind. Devereux has collected some of the evidence and proposes that, since the story of Heracles' violence was well known, the poet introduced this story with a deliberately ambiguous δέξατ' (27).²² But δέκομαι, the regular word for "welcome" in Pindar (cf. πανδόκω, 17) is hardly ambiguous. There are

¹⁹Reproduced in K. Meuli, "Herakles und die kerynitische Hindin," (*Scythica Vergiliana* Chap. 4) *Schweizer Archiv für Volkskunde* 56 (1960), repr. in *Gesammelte Schriften* 2 (Basel 1975) Tafel 38 facing page 810.

²⁰The animal of Heracles' labour is sometimes female, sometimes male. F. Brommer, *Herakles*² (Cologne 1972) 24, thinks that the artists of three famous series of metopes in the fifth century, on the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, and on the Theseum at Athens, are portraying a stag. Cf. the relief in archaizing style from the late first century B.C. (Meuli [above, note 19] Tafel 37 facing page 799), no doubt modelled on the fifth-century Greek examples: in this instance, where the relief has not been damaged, the animal is undoubtedly male. Pindar stresses the sex of the animal in his version: the relative pronoun ἃν would be sufficient to indicate the gender of ἔλαφον (29), but Pindar adds the adjective θήλειαν, showing that he is aware it is an extraordinary creature. The scholiast's comment here (Drachmann 1.120), that poets commonly give horns to the female, seems inadequate. Some see in the horned hind a significant link with the north, reindeer being the only well-known species of *Cervidae* in which the female has antlers: see W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1979) 94, who gives Meuli as his source. W. Ridgeway suggested in 1894, *PCPS* 39, 14–15, that the animal was a reindeer, but his suggestion is, curiously, ignored by both Meuli and Burkert. Taygete appears to have dedicated the hind in Arcadia, her birth-place (Apollodorus 3.10.1), whence Heracles' pursuit began; but the hind seems to be of northern origin and to be returning, in its flight to the Hyperboreans, whence it came.

²¹Though Apollodorus (2.5.11) says that these apples were among the Hyperboreans. F. Brommer, "Herakles und die Hesperiden auf Vasenbildern," *JDAI* 57 (1942) 107, thinks that the painter of this vase was mistakenly conflating motifs that belong to different stories. K. Schefold, *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (Munich 1978) 101–102, accepts a northern origin for the hind but believes that this vase shows Cerynean nymphs, not Hesperides.

²²Devereux (above, note 3) 294–295. He claims that the verb may mean "to receive as an enemy" but adduces no instance in Pindar. He argues, 293, that line 28 presents an alibi which would be unnecessary unless the preceding δέξατ' suggested hostility and thus created the need to present the extenuating circumstance: Heracles pleads compulsion and therefore personal innocence for his violent act. But line 28, the εὔτε-clause, is, as we have seen, the temporal specification that identifies, in the absence of a ποτέ, the separate trip for the hind.

versions on the vases that show Artemis acquiescing, possibly even assisting, in the performance of this labour.²³ Pindar, in this passage, is surely presenting another case in which Heracles is understood to be behaving *πειθοῖ καὶ οὐ βία*. The *δέξατ'* is not conscious ambiguity but deliberate presentation of the true version and *δέκομαι* should be allowed its normal Pindaric force. It is hard to imagine what possible reason Pindar might have had for conscious ambiguity in this passage in any case. There would be little point in his simply serving notice that he is aware of conflicting traditions. It would be more likely and more in keeping with his regular practice of interpreting myth by giving correct versions that he is here presenting an unequivocal account creditable to both divinity and hero.

(c) The third and earliest myth is presented succinctly and, for us at least, somewhat mysteriously. Taygete dedicated the hind to Orthosia. We cannot know whether the scholiast's Ovidian tale of the nymph's pursuit by an amorous Zeus, her metamorphosis by Artemis into a hind to escape him, and her grateful dedication of an animal with gilded horns was a folktale known to Pindar.²⁴ If it was, then we see once again a version which is silent about the discreditable elements in other contemporary versions.

The scholiasts and most modern commentators are correct, I think, in taking the Orthosia to whom the hind is given to be Artemis.²⁵ Identification of Orthia (= Orthosia) and Artemis seems to have begun at Sparta as early as the sixth century,²⁶ and the names Orthosia and Artemis are certainly coupled in Herodotus (4.87.2). It is most economical to believe that the goddess who gives Heracles the hind in the land of the Hyperboreans is the goddess to whom the animal was originally dedicated and who thus has the right to bestow her sacred animal as a gift.

Artemis is regularly a goddess to whom blood-sacrifice is made.²⁷ Artemis Orthia especially so, for Artemis Orthia is linked to the northern or Taurian Artemis to whom human sacrifice was offered (Her. 4.103.1): the Spartan shrine of Artemis Orthia, where boys were ritually scourged, had the best claim to possess the image of Artemis brought from the Taurians by Orestes (Paus. 3.16.7).²⁸ Since Artemis accepted a hind in

²³E.g., the black-figured amphora (Cat. No. B 231) in the British Museum.

²⁴The rape of Taygete was represented on the Amyclaeon throne (Paus. 3.18.10).

²⁵Calame, (above, note 13) 284, and Lehnus, (above, note 2) 61, think they are distinct divinities.

²⁶See A. J. B. Wace in R. M. Dawkins, ed., *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta* (*JHS Supplement* 5, 1929) 282 ff.

²⁷See W. Burkert, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977) 237: "In der Tat ist und bleibt Artemis eine Herrin der Opfer, gerade der grausamen, blutigen Opfer."

²⁸See L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* 2 (Oxford 1896) 453 note 2. Other places also claimed to have this cult-statue: see F. Graf, "Das Götterbild aus dem

place of Iphigeneia (Eur. *I.A.* 1587), whom she translated to the Taurians, it is tempting to see in the hind of the Hyperborean Artemis along the Danube in Pindar an animal substitute for human sacrifice. Mommsen suggested, in fact, that in this passage in the Third Olympian we have just such a substitute.²⁹ Perhaps, but any hint of human sacrifice is deeply submerged in Pindar's account. Pindar's point appears to be that there is no sacrifice at all. The gilded horns would normally foretoken the animal's death—gilding was traditionally put on the horns of sacrificial animals (cf. Pindar fr. 329 Snell-Maehler).³⁰ Significantly, the hind is not sacrificed but is available to Heracles when he arrives on the scene at a later date. There may be, in this, some accommodation to Acragantine sensibility and practice. There is evidence at Acragas for worship that carefully avoided blood-sacrifice, and Pindar may be respecting in the Third Olympian, as he certainly is in the Second, Theron's religious beliefs.³¹

III ACRAGAS AND RHODES

The Third and Seventh Olympians share a structure and a mood. In both there is a prolonged regressive movement and three myths; in both there is a remarkable emphasis on the goodwill governing the relation between gods and men.³² We are reminded that there is a close connection between the cities of the victors, Theron and Diagoras.

Taurerland," *Antike Welt* 10.4 (1979) 33–40. At Tyndaris in Sicily ritual abuse replaced human sacrifice, but at Halai in Attica blood was still drawn.

Northern Apollo has similar associations with human sacrifice. The scholiast on *Ol.* 10.19 (Drachmann 1.316) says that Cynus built a temple for Apollo at Pagasae out of human skulls. On Cynus as priest of Hyperborean Apollo see Farnell, *Cults* 4 (1907) 272–273. See too A. H. Krappé, "Ἀπόλλων κύκνος," *CP* 37 (1942) 353–370 on the connection between swans and Hyperborean Apollo.

²⁹Mommsen (above, note 3); so too Gildersleeve (above, note 2) 160. A. Henrichs, "Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies," *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1981 [Entretiens Hardt 27]) 203–207, warns against seeing in stories of animal substitution proof of increased moral sensitivity. After all, Iphigeneia, who is spared through the substitution of an animal, becomes the slaughterer of human victims among the Taurians.

³⁰Cf. R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*² (Cambridge 1954) 106, 236.

³¹See N. Demand, "Pindar's *Olympian* 2, Theron's Faith, and Empedocles' Kathar-moi," *GRBS* 10 (1975) 352–353. The hind dedicated with an inscription to a goddess (ἄν . . . Ταῦγέτα . . . ἔγραψεν, 29–30) is a γραπτὸν ζῶον (for γραπτός = "with an inscription" see, e.g., Achaeus *TrGF* 20 F 19.3). Empedocles says that γραπτὰ ζῶα were offered to divinity in the Golden Age when there was as yet no blood-sacrifice (Diels-Kranz 31 B 128). The but half-civilized Thessalians will have noted, on the other hand (*Pyth.* 10.33), that the Hyperboreans sacrificed hecatombs.

³²On the mood of *Olympians* 3 see esp. Segal (above, note 3) 228–252. The four poems for Hieron of Syracuse are, by contrast, remarkably sombre.

Gela, the parent-city of Acragas, was a Rhodian foundation (Her. 7.153; Thuc. 6.4.3). Memorable lines in the Second Olympian (8–12) speak of the arrival in the Promised Land in the West of the Emmenidae, the clan to which Theron of Acragas and his brother Xenocrates belonged:

καμόντες οἱ πολλὰ θυμῷ
 ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἶκημα ποταμοῦ, Σικελίας τ' ἔσαν
 ὀφθαλμός, αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος,
 πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων
 γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς.

Theron, we know from the Second Olympian, traced his line back to Thersander, son of the Polyneices who fell with the Seven against Thebes and bulwark of the expedition of the Epigoni, the Argives who later sacked the Thebes their fathers had failed to take. This Thersander, son of an Argive princess (daughter of Adrastus) and married to an Argive (daughter of Amphiarus), died in the first Trojan expedition, according to Proclus' *résumé* of the *Cypria* (Allen 5.104). His Argive descendants, the Adrastidae (*Ol.* 2.45), established themselves in Rhodes, much in the manner of Tlepolemus, who also sailed from the Argolid (*Ol.* 7.18–19, 33). Didymus, in fact, calls attention to Theron's Argive patrimony (Drachmann 1.107): he claims that the Theoxeny, which the scholiasts take as the occasion of the Third Olympian,³³ was an inheritance from Argos. The migrations of the Emmenidae brought them from Thebes and Argos to Rhodes and thence to Gela and Acragas.

Pindar is our best source for the early history of the Emmenid house. He must have got his information directly from Theron³⁴ and so will already have been contemplating Rhodian history in 476 B.C., twelve years before the Seventh Olympian. Lines 8–12 of the Second Olympian are echoed in fr. 119 (Snell-Maehler), part of an encomium for Theron and generally ascribed, like *Olympians* 2 and 3, to 476:

ἂν δὲ Ῥόδον κατ' ὥκισθεν . . . ,
 ἔνθεν δ' ἀφορμαθέντες, ὑψηλὰν πόλιν ἀμφινέμονται,
 πλείστα μὲν δῶρ' ἀθανάτοις ἀνέχοντες,
 ἔσπετο δ' αἰενάου πλούτου νέφος.

It is fascinating to see in the attendant cloud of wealth (ἔσπετο . . . πλούτου νέφος) not only an echo of the contemporary αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε . . . πλούτον ἄγων but an anticipation of the clouds of the Seventh Olympian, so crucial to the story of the Heliadae in that poem. The Emmenidae, like the Heliadae, lived under a cloud—perhaps one which had followed

³³Correctly, I believe; I hope to return to this question elsewhere.

³⁴R. van Compernelle, *Etude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliotes* (Brussels and Rome 1959) 380.

them from Rhodes.³⁵ Rhodian history was known and appreciated at Acragas and Pindar could hear it there.³⁶

Pindar's choice of Heracles as the principal subject of the mythical portion of the Third Olympian does not, as is sometimes suggested (e.g., Duchemin [above, note 3]), show his indifference to local tradition and choice of material of indiscriminate applicability. He was clearly well informed about the history of Theron's house and his city. And part of the spiritual legacy of the Acragantines included the poetry of Pisander of Rhodes, probably the first to organize the canonical cycle of the *ἄθλοι* of Heracles.³⁷ The earliest of the great succession of temples that have made the remains of Acragas among the most splendid of antiquity was a Temple of Heracles (ca 520).³⁸ The Acragantines had, in fact, an unusually strong claim on Heracles: as self-conscious Dorians³⁹ they could style themselves Heraclids (descendants of Hyllus) in the traditional manner. And there were doubtless among them descendants of another son of Heracles—the Tlepolemus who, the Seventh Olympian tells us, was the *oikistes* of Rhodes.

The Acragantines, and in particular their ruling princes, were proud of their Rhodian heritage and kept it alive. They brought their traditions to the attention of Pindar when he was at the Sicilian courts in 476. When Pindar was composing for Theron in the *annus mirabilis* of *Olympians* 1–3 he was already meditating on matters to which he would return twelve years later at the other end of the Greek world.⁴⁰

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, TORONTO

³⁵Cf. D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1968) 89 note 1. The Acragantine cult of bloodless sacrifice seems to have come from Rhodes; cf. *Ol.* 7.47.

³⁶The famous decadrachms minted at Acragas 412–410 B.C. appear to contain a reference to Rhodian history. The traditional Sicilian motif of *quadriga* with Nike-figure has been adapted to show a young male god (no Nike) driving a chariot across the vault of heaven (the ground-line has been suppressed and the chariot-wheels put on a slant). The coin may well show Helios driving through the sky: see C. Seltman, "The Engravers of the Acragantine Decadrachms," *NC Ser.* 6.8 (1948) 1–10, Kraay (above, note 14) 226.

³⁷G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London 1969) 101 ff. Friedländer, (above, note 1) 45–59, even claims that it was Rhodian epic and the importance it gave to Heracles that were responsible for bringing a non-Boeotian hero to Thebes.

³⁸See W. K. Waters, "The Rise and Decline of Some Greek Colonies in Sicily," *AncSoc* 5 (1974) 10.

³⁹Diodorus (11.48.8 and 49.3–4) says that in 476 Theron quelled a revolt by the citizens of Himera and repopulated the city with Dorians.

⁴⁰I am grateful to Professor L. E. Woodbury and Mr. C. G. Brown for much illuminating discussion. This paper also profited from the helpful comments of Professors D. E. Gerber, W. J. Slater, and of a *Phoenix* referee.