Transactions of the American Philological Association 125 (1995) 177–206

The Song of the *Iynx*: Magic and Rhetoric in *Pythian* 4*

Sarah Iles Johnston
Ohio State University

In the middle of his fourth *Pythian*, performed in honor of Arcesilas IV of Cyrene in 462 B.C.E., Pindar describes how Jason used a tool called the *iynx* to cause Medea to fall in love with him and follow him back to Hellas (213-19):

πότνια δ' ὀξυτάτων βελέων
ποικίλαν ἴυγγα τετράκναμον Οὐλυμπόθεν
ἐν ἀλύτῳ ζεύξαισα κύκλῳ
μαινάδ' ὄρνιν Κυπρογένεια φέρεν
πρῶτον ἀνθρώποισι λιτάς τ'ἐπαοιδὰς
ἐκδιδάσκησεν σοφὸν Αἰσονίδαν·
ὄφρα Μηδείας τοκέων ἀφέλοιτ'αἰ-
δῶ, ποθεινὰ δ' Ἑλλὰς αὐταν
ἐν φρασὶ καιομέναν δονέοι μάστιγι Πειθοῦς.

And the mistress of swiftest arrows, Cyprogenia,
bore from Olympus the dappled *iynx*, having yoked it, four-spoked,[1]
to an inescapable wheel,
the bird of madness,
[giving it] to mortals for the first time. And prayers and charms
did she teach to the wise son of Aeson,
so that he might steal from Medea all respect for her parents,
and so that Hellas, the longed-for, might arouse her with the
whip of Persuasion, as she burned in her heart.

So far as we know, only Pindar portrayed Jason as using an *iynx* to win Medea's heart and help. Other ancient authors state that Aphrodite—perhaps in cooperation with other gods—simply caused her to fall in love with him, with-

* The initial development of this article benefited greatly from discussions with Kathryn Morgan and Dolores O'Higgins, and from a forthcoming article by O'Higgins. I am also grateful for suggestions made at later stages by Philippe Borgeaud, Fritz Graf, Tim McNiven, and Froma Zeitlin, and by *TAPA*'s referees, Deborah Boedeker and David Frankfurter. Pindar will be cited throughout from the Teubner edition of Snell and Maehler. Translations are my own, except where noted.

[1] The use of τετράκναμον—which properly should modify the wheel rather than the bird—is problematic; for a summary of arguments and treatments, see Braswell ad. loc.

out requiring any action on his part (e.g., E. *Med.* 526-31, Ap. Rh. 3.6-166 and 275-98, Ov. *Met.* 7.11-12; cf. n. 50 below).

In this article, I will argue that Pindar places an *iynx* in Jason's hands as part of an extensive exploration of the effects of voice—human and divine—that he pursues throughout the ode, an exploration that can be understood as one of the earliest manifestations of the fifth century's deep concern with the power of speech to effect change. In the first part of my argument, I will show that the *iynx* was understood to work by emitting a sound that was seductive and persuasive but that also—like so many seductive and persuasive sounds—was possibly deceptive, spelling ruin for its listener. In the second part, I will interpret the significance of the *iynx*'s voice with respect to scenes of speech in *Pythian* 4, particularly those that focus on Jason and Medea. In Pindar's ode, both of these characters are shown to possess powerful voices that they can use to the benefit of themselves and their comrades. When Jason resorts to a tool that represents deceptive or unfairly persuasive speech in order to commandeer Medea and her divine, remarkable voice, however, he breaks the rules of proper discourse between mortals that were beginning to be articulated in the fifth century. Moreover, by attempting to subordinate Medea's voice, Jason inverts the proper relationship that should exist between mortal male and muse-like, oracular female. Not only does Jason's use of the *iynx*, like all improper means of persuasion, bring grief to its victim, it also brings grief to Jason himself eventually. In contrast, as I will show, Pindar offers both himself and Cyrene's mythic founder, Battus, as examples of men who use speech properly, and thereby earn long-term profit for themselves and others. Finally, I will suggest that all of this deliberation on proper and improper speech contributes to the accomplishment of one of the ode's underlying goals: persuading Cyrene's current ruler, Arcesilas, to welcome home the exiled Damophilus.

Part I: The Spell of the *Iynx*

In a 1993 article, Christopher Faraone argued that "the focus of the *iunx*-spell described by Pindar, with its references to fire and whipping, was the physical torture of the victim" (2). He further suggested that this torture aligned with a practice, seen in love spells of later periods, of imposing pain upon the victim until he or she gave in to the lover's requests. Because Faraone's article offers the most recent interpretation of Pindar's *iynx*, and because this interpretation runs contrary to my own at several points, it is important to evaluate its arguments before I proceed with my own analysis.

Requests to make the victim burn until she accedes to her lover's requests are in fact found in a number of real love spells from magical papyri of the third and fourth centuries C.E., some of which Faraone cites in his notes. But the literary *topos* of "burning love" was abundantly common in poetic texts from a much earlier period: consider, for example, Sappho fr. 48.2, "my heart [was] burning with longing" (ἔμαν φρένα καιομέναν πόθῳ), which is closely similar to lines 218-19 of our passage, and also fr. 31.10, "all at once a fire has crept under my flesh" (δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν).[2] It seems simpler to understand Pindar's description of Medea "burning in her heart" as a use of this common *topos* than as an oblique reference to magical practices attested only in later sources.[3]

It is even more difficult to understand Peitho's *mastix* as an allusion to magical practices. For, unlike the request to make a lover burn, which is fairly common in later magical texts, there are only two Greek love spells, both from the fourth century C.E., in which a lover asks that a victim be whipped so as to be driven to his embrace (*PGM* XVIIa.16 and 25 [cited by Faraone, n. 26] and XXXVI.142). To my knowledge, there are no love-spells from any period that describe the victim as being yoked to a wheel, even symbolically through the agency of a "sympathetic" animal or doll, as Faraone would like to understand the yoked *iynx*-bird to symbolize and thus to yoke Medea. Therefore, it is only in very broad terms that the yoking and whipping of the bird—and through the bird, of Medea—could be understood to align with love spells of any period, early or late. Faraone, recognizing this, suggests that Pindar borrowed the specific images of being yoked to a wheel and whipped from non-erotic contexts: he cites ancient sources that tell of this being done to criminals, particularly in Athens. However, it seems unlikely that Pindar would have incorporated such non-erotic images into his description of Medea's love. Such criminal *comparanda* would have encouraged Pindar's audience to identify Medea with a far

[2] Some other examples of "burning love" are: Ar. *Lys.* 9, Pl. *Lg.* 783a, Hermesian. 7.37, Call. *Epigr.* 27.5 and 45.2, Anacreont. 11.13-15. For more on the literary *topoi* describing the "pains of love" in general, see O'Higgins 1990 and Carson, esp. 148-49.

[3] The earliest attestation I know for a burning spell is Theocr. *Id.* 2.23-26. Winkler ch. 3, esp. 96-97, suggests that the physical discomforts that magicians attempted to inflict by means of love spells were intended to make the victim feel what she would feel if she were to fall in love *without* the help of magic—feelings expressed by literary *topoi* such as the one I am considering here. The idea was not to "punish" the victim until she gave in to the lover, but rather to induce in her artificially the "symptoms" of love in hopes that the "disease" itself would follow. An interesting support for Winkler's analysis is the fact that Theocritus has Simaetha describe herself as "burning with love" for Delphis shortly after she has described her magical "burning spell" (40-41). She is attempting to inflict on him what unrequited love has inflicted on her.

from romantic group of criminals. Pindar gives no indication within the ode that this is the context in which we are meant to be working.

I would also note, finally, that the Pindaric passage stands almost alone in describing an *iynx*-bird as being yoked to a wheel. Other than this passage, I know of only three, late descriptions of the magical wheel that mention a bird being attached (Σ *P.* 4.381a, Σ Theocr. 2.17 and Suda s.v. *iynx*), all of which possibly drew on the famous Pindaric passage itself. I know of no artistic representation of the wheel that shows a bird attached. The *iynx*-bird and the *iynx*-wheel shared two important features—their connection with sound, which I will examine shortly below, and their ability to help arouse lust[4]—but we need not suppose that the bird was ever attached to the wheel outside of Pindar's imagination. I suspect that Pindar used poetic license to "double-up" items that were independently associated with love magic—the wheel and the bird—in order to magnify the power of the forces brought to bear on Medea.

Iynges and Sound

Most scholars who interpret the Pindaric passage have assumed that the wheel to which the *iynx*-bird was bound would be made to turn by either Aphrodite or Jason. In making this assumption, they have drawn on later passages that describe *iynx*-wheels as being turned or moved.[5] They also have noted vase paintings from the fourth century onwards that show what are usually assumed to be *iynx*-wheels being manipulated by *erotes* in the presence of lovers, or being manipulated by lovers themselves. Greek jewelry of the classical and Hellenistic periods also shows *erotes* manipulating such wheels.[6] These wheels resemble a long-favorite child's toy. A cord is passed through two holes in the middle of a wheel, which sometimes has spokes, and the ends are tied together

[4] Passages stating that the bird (or part of the bird) was used in love magic include: Σ Pi. *P.* 4.381a and *N.* 4.56a; Σ Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 182.11; Σ Ar. *Lys.* 1110 (lit. "bad magic" not "love magic"); Σ Opp. *Hal.* 1.565 and 4.132; Σ Theocr. 2.17; Suda, Hesych., Phot. s.v. *iynx*. The word *iynx* eventually became synonomous with homosexual seduction in particular: in later antiquity it was used as a synonym for κιναίδιον: e.g., Suda, Hesychius and Photius s.v. *iynx*, Σ Plat. *Grg.* 494e.

[5] Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 182.18; Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.33.6.3 and 7.10.3.4; Σ Pi. *P.* 4.381a; Σ Theocr. 2.17; Marinus *VProc.* 28; Sud. s.v. *iynx*; Psellus, *Exegesis of the Chaldaean Oracles* = *PG* 122, 1133a4-b4. Faraone 11-16 argues that, unlike these, the Pindaric *iynx*-wheel was not to be moved, as the passage does not mention it being moved, but this seems like an *argumentum ex silentio*.

[6] Reproductions of some of these vase paintings can be found in Gow, and in Daremberg-Saglio s.v. *rhombus* (Daremberg calls them *rhomboi*; cf. the following note). Gow's illustrations and another vase painting of the *iynx*, connected with Aphrodite and Adonis, are reproduced in Detienne 1972: 71. For examples of the jewelry, see Williams and Ogden 96-97.

so that the cord forms a loop. The wheel is spun round by hand a few times to put kinks into the loop and then, by alternately pulling and releasing the loop from either end, the child makes the wheel spin rapidly.[7]

Tavenner assumed that the magic of both the Pindaric and other *iynx*-wheels lay in their ability to sympathetically "whirl" victims to lovers, and therefore interpreted the verb δονέοι in *Pythian* 4.219 to describe Medea as being "whirled" or "turned" with longing that sets her in motion towards Jason's Greek homeland; some translators and commentators have followed his lead (e.g., Braswell and Nisetich ad loc.). More in accord with the usual meaning of δονέω, however, is "agitate" or "shake"; in an erotic context, "arouse" or "excite" might be appropriate.[8] The *iynx* enables Hellas or Jason to arouse longing within Medea. As both Segal and I pointed out in earlier publications, there is no reason to assume that the victim of any other *iynx*-wheel is to be imagined as sympathetically whirling, either.[9] Indeed, the verb that is used in the overwhelming majority of cases to describe the power of the *iynx* to bring

[7] Roman poets mention magical tools that similarly work by being whirled or spun, usually calling them *rhombi* (e.g., Prop. 2.28.35, Mart. 9.29.9). Greek authors, too, occasionally mention these. Indeed, Theocritus' Simaetha uses a *rhombus* as well as an *iynx* to cast her spell on Delphis (2.30). There is some debate regarding the difference between an *iynx* wheel and a *rhombus*. The problem is discussed well by Gow, who concludes that the *iynx* is a wheel on a loop of string, similar to a child's toy, whereas a *rhombus* is what anthropologists call a "bull-roarer" (a carved piece of wood, usually oblong, attached to a cord and whirled around the head to produce a "roaring" noise). This is probably correct, although it seems that Roman poets also used the term to refer to the *iynx*-wheel. When Propertius says, for example, "staminea rhombi ducitur ille rota" (3.6.26), it is easier to picture the *iynx* than a bull-roarer (cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.8.7). Cf. Detienne 1972: 84.

The word *iynx* appears only once in Roman literature with certainty and there it applies to the bird (Plin. *NH* 11.107 § 256; cf. [*dub.*] Laev. ap. App. *Mag.* ch. 30 where the text gives *ungues*, but *iunges* has been conjectured); perhaps the Romans, for whatever reason, did not adopt the Greek word for the wheel and simply used what became a generic word for any whirling magical tool that made noise: "rhombus." Tavenner hypothesizes, with little good evidence so far as I can see, that the magical tools called *"iynx"* and *"rhombus"* both refer to spinning tops. He suggests that the wheels we see in *erotes'* hands on vases are simply toys and have no magical force. I do not agree with Nelson that a terracotta object from the geometric period that looks like a *kernos* ornamented by birds is an *iynx*-wheel.

[8] Cf. e.g., the use of the verb at Sapph. fr. 130.1 (Campbell), Ar. *Ec.* 954, Bion fr. 6.5, Theocr. 13.65. Faraone 3-4 n. 6 suggested translating the verb as "strike," which aligns with the overtones of torture that he would like to see in the ode but which has no *comparanda*, so far as I know, in other ancient uses.

[9] Johnston 1990: 95 n. 19; Segal 1973: 36. Segal does note, rightly, that the "spinning" could be metaphorical; cf. our own phrase, "my head spins."

the desired person closer is ἕλκω (draw).[10] This implies, if anything, a linear rather than a whirling motion.

Moreover, the power of the *iynx*, bird and wheel alike, lay not in any motion that they made *per se,* but rather in their voices (the wheel, when spun rapidly, makes a humming or a whistling sound).[11] The very name of the *iynx* bespeaks the importance of its sonority, for it is cognate with words such as ἰύζω (shout, cry out), ἰυγμός (a shout or cry) and ἰυκτής (singer). Most other evidence for *iynges'* connection with sound is late, as is almost all of our detailed evidence for the *iynx* in general.[12] However, the picture this evidence presents is consistent, and our small amount of earlier evidence aligns with it.

In the case of the bird, whose voice Aelian describes as sounding like the cross-flute (*NA* 6.19.18), its sonority is expressed by its mythic genealogy. According to the most common aition, the *iynx* was originally a nymph (named Iynx) who either seduced Zeus herself or helped Io to seduce Zeus. Hera punished the nymph by turning her into a bird. Callimachus (fr. 685 P.) makes the nymph's mother Echo (a reflective, almost magical sound that gives back to the speaker what he offers); Photius and the Suda (s.v. *iynx*) say that her mother was either Echo or Peitho (sound with the power to persuade). Several sources make Pan, master of the seductive syrinx, her father (sources and discussion at Borgeaud 85-86). An alternative aition also suggests that the *iynx*-bird was particularly known for its sonority: when the Emathides challenged the Muses to a singing contest and lost, they were turned into birds, one of which was the *iynx* (Nic. ap. Ant. Lib. *Meta.* 9).

[10] To cite but a few instances: Pi. *N.* 4.35, Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.18, *AP* 5.205, Theocr. 2 *passim,* Luc. *de Domo* 13., Plut. *Non Posse* 1093d2, Ael. *NA* 1.23.23, 2.9.5, 2.21.17 (and virtually every other time that he refers to an *iynx*; cf. other citations of Aelian in this article).

[11] On the sound made by an *iynx*-wheel, see n. 14 below. I have also discussed the important link between *iynges* and sound in my earlier publication (Johnston 1990: ch. 7), which did not mention or analyze all the ancient passages included here. It did, however, include a detailed survey and analysis of sources discussing the importance of the *iynx*'s sound in theurgy, a form of Platonic mysticism that arose in the second-century C.E.: the sounds produced by *iynges* whirled by the theurgists were understood to affect and influence not only individuals and objects on earth, but the heavenly bodies as well. See also Borgeaud 85-86, who discusses the *iynx*'s magical voice in connection with Pan's association with the compelling, seductive sound of the syrinx. Pirenne-Delforge 285 and Detienne 1972: 84 briefly treat the *iynx's* sound as well.

[12] Early sources refer to the *iynx* in a way that suggests its magical properties were well known, but they give few specifics. Pindar (*P.* 4.214, *N.* 4.35, fr. 128a and possibly fr. 52i) and Aeschylus (*Pers.* 988) are our earliest mentions; *"iynx"* is used by only five other classical and Hellenistic authors: *AG* 5.205, Ar. *Lys.* 1110, S. fr. 474; Theocr. *Id.* 2, Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.18. (I exclude Aristotle's description of the bird's physiognomy at *HA* 504a11-12 and *PA* 695a23-24).

About the wheel's connection to sound, we have one very clear statement, taken from the scholia to Oppian *Hal.* 1.565. Following a description of the *iynx*-bird, the scholiast goes on to say "and it is also a kind of musical tool, which enchantresses use for love" ([ἴυγξ] ἐστι δὲ καὶ εἶδος ὀργάνου μουσικοῦ, ᾧ χρῶνται αἱ φαρμακίδες εἰς φιλίαν). The scholiast seems to be referring to the wheel's capacity to make the humming or whistling noise that I mentioned above.[13]

In the case of other evidence for the *iynx's* sound, it is difficult to be certain whether an author is referring to the bird or to the wheel, although phrases that describe the practitioner as "moving" the *iynx* suggest the wheel (cf. n. 5 above). The question of whether a bird or wheel is meant in any given passage is really immaterial to the more general point I am making at the moment, however: that there is a strong connection between *iynges* of both types and sound.

Several authors compare the *iynx* to people famous for their ability to make a mesmerizing or persuasive sound. Origen claimed that Christ's words had an *iynx* so strong that not only men but even women—overcoming the physical weaknesses of their gender—were drawn to join him in the wilderness (*Con. Cels.* 3.10.11-15). On the pagan side, Aelius Aristides argued that the power of the Eleusinian *logos* was greater than that of any ἐπῳδή, greater even than the power of *iynges* in motion (*Panath.* 182.13-20). Diogenes Laertius said that the words of Diogenes the Cynic had an *iynx's* power (*Vit.* 6.76.2-3), and the scholiast on Oppian said that the words of the sophists possessed *iynges* (ad *Hal.* 1.565). The Byzantine historian Theophylactus described the divine Logos as producing music that, by means of "the *iynx* of resonance," had the ability to charm (κατακηλῶν) and attract (μεθελκόμενος) the human soul.

Animals, too, could make *iynx*-like sounds. Aelian compared the cry by which the hen partridge attracts the cock to "some *iynx*" (*NA* 4.16.24). Elsewhere, he used the same comparison for the music by which fishermen lure crabs from their sandy holes (*NA* 6.31.6) or fish from the deep (*NA* 17.18.8), the music by which huntsmen lure boars from their lairs (*NA* 12.46.20), and the shouts by which a stableman rouses a stallion to gallop (*NA* 6.10.30).

Then there is the evidence concerning the *iynx's* sound itself. Philostratus, describing the judgment hall of the Babylonian King, as visited by the sage

[13] In addition to designating a specific type of musical instrument used in magic, the term *iynx* apparently could refer to parts of other musical instruments: "some call a very melodious string on a cithaera an *iynx*," (Σ Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 182.11; cf. Tzetzes, Σ Lyc. *Alex.* 309, who says *iynx* was a term for the lyre). It was also apparently a term for the "single-stemmed flute" (Σ Opp. *Hal.* 1.565; cf. *Et. Mag.* loc. cit.).

Apollonius of Tyana, tells us that suspended from the majestic ceiling were four golden *iynges* (*VA* 1.25). The Magi attendant upon the King continually "tuned" or "harmonized" (ἁρμόττεσθαι) these *iynges,* and referred to them as "tongues of the gods." Clearly, these *iynges* made some sounds that could be interpreted by the Magi as divine voices. Clearly, also, they were sounds of a type that could be altered and brought into harmony with one another. Given this, it would be easiest to understand these *iynges* as golden versions of the *iynx*-wheel rather than as statues of *iynx*-birds. The noise made by such a tool can, in fact, be altered by changing the diameter, thickness and material of which the wheel is made, the contours of its spokes and rim, the length and material of the attached cord and the speed at which it is turned.[14] It is difficult to see how a statue of a bird, in contrast, could be "tuned" so as to produce various sounds.

In another passage, Philostratus mentions that golden *iynges* also were hung up in one of the early temples of Apollo at Delphi, which, he continues, were said to have the persuasive power of the Sirens (*VA* 6.11). I will return to the issue of *iynges* and *peithô* shortly; for now, let it be noted that Philostratus' comparison of the *iynges* to Sirens suggests that, as in the case of the Sirens, the essential feature of the *iynx* was its ability to make a mesmerizing sound. Pausanias, also discussing one of Apollo's early temples at Delphi, quotes a fragment of Pindar that describes it: "Golden were the *kêlêdones* singing from the pediment" (10.5.12 = Pi. fr. 52i.70-71). Both Pausanias and Athenaeus, who also quotes the fragment (*Deipn.* 7 290e), go on to compare these singing *kêlêdones,* whose name connects them to κηλέω, "to charm or persuade through song," to Sirens. Several other passages also describe the *iynx*'s attractive power with a form of κηλέω.[15] It seems likely that the golden Delphic *iynges* that Philostratus credited with sirenic powers of persuasion were nothing other than the golden Delphic *kêlêdones* mentioned by Pindar so many centuries before. It is interesting in this respect that the word fragment ἴυγ[appears at the beginning of fr. 52i.62 (ἰυγ[γ is printed in Snell-Maehler). It is possible that Pindar mentioned one or more *iynges* only ten lines before he described the Delphic *kêlêdones.*

[14] My own experimentation has shown, for example, that a small one, made from a plastic button one inch in diameter and a foot-long loop of embroidery floss, produces a rhythmic, throaty "chirp" much like the call of a bird. A three-inch wooden disk strung with a foot-long loop of heavier nylon cord produces a deeper "hum."

[15] Ael. *NA* 12.46 (the music played by hunters to lure boars); Suda s.v. *iynx* (enchantresses are described as κατακηλούμεναι their victims by turning the *iynx*); the Byzantine historian Theophylaktus describes music as κατακηλῶν the soul like an iynx.

It is tempting to understand the Delphic *iynges,* in contrast to those in the Babylonian judgment hall, as decorative statues of birds, since they were attached to the pediment of a temple. But the pseudo-Aristotelian *Mechanics* (1.848a 24) mentions "wheels of brass and iron that they make and dedicate in temples," and the second-century B.C.E. grammarian Dionysius of Thrace mentions "wheels that turn in the precincts of the gods" (ap. Clem. Al. *Str.* 5.45.4). There are, moreover, a number of fourth-century B.C.E. Apulian vase paintings that show four-spoked wheels hanging from the ceilings of temples, including a volute krater in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli (ca. 370-360 B.C.E.) that shows two hanging from the roof of Apollo's temple in Delphi: dare we assume that these are *iynx*-wheels?[16] But in any event, whether the Delphic *iynges* were wheels or birds, what I wish to emphasize is that they produced a persuasive, seductive sound like that of Sirens or *kêlêdones*.[17] Lucian also compares *iynges* to Sirens, referring to the power of *peithô* that each possessed (*de Domo* 13).[18]

The idea that the *iynx* magically affected people by means of sound should not be surprising, for the ancient Greeks assumed that both verbal and non-verbal sounds had powerful magical effects. We see this as early as *Odyssey* 19.437-38 where Odysseus' uncles sing incantations over the wound in his thigh to stanch the flow of blood. Aristophanes mentions "clicking the tongue" to ward off bad luck (*Vesp.* 626). The spells of the magical papyri often instruct the practitioner to "whistle," "make a popping noise," "groan," imitate various animal cries and recite magically significant combinations of alphabet letters—as well as chant more or less coherent phrases of recognizable words (e.g., *PGM* VII.756-94, XIII.734-1077, XIII.343-646). At least one spell tells the practitioner to "make a noise like the sounding wind" and then

[16] The vase is reproduced in *Enciclopedia dell' arte antica* (Rome 1963) vol. 5, pl. following p. 742. The temple can be securely identified by the presence of the omphalos, to which Orestes clings, an Erinys, the Pythia, and Apollo himself. It seems to be a scene from Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. (I thank Tim McNiven for bringing this vase to my attention.) Photographs of other Apulian vases showing these wheels can be found, for example, in Schmidt Tav. 7 and 13; Trendall and Cambitoglou pls. 165.3, 194 and 199. (Plate 180.1 of Trendall and Cambitoglou is also of interest because it shows an example of a smaller *iynx*-wheel lying in the field between figures—the scene portrays the rape of Chrysippus by Laius; Eros and Aphrodite look on.) The suggestion that the temple wheels are *iynx*-wheels was also made by Cook 258-60, who cites further examples.

[17] Another reference to the *iynx*'s ability to persuade or enchant through sound comes from the third-century B.C. grammarian Aristophanes (*Epit.* 2.565.15-16), who describes the *iynx* as ἀναπειθούσα and connects it closely with music that is καταγοητεύσας.

[18] Of course, it is also interesting, with respect to the relationship between *iynges* and seductive sounds, that when Virgil reworks Theocritus' second *Idyll* in his eighth *Eclogue*, the *iynx* becomes a song.

"make a wind-creating sound," which could in fact have been accomplished by manipulating an *iynx*-wheel (*PGM* VII.775-76). These examples, early and late, could be multiplied several times. Recently, indeed, Frankfurter has argued that aurality was one of most distinctive features of ancient Greek magic, in contrast to ancient Egyptian magic, for example, which understood power to be concentrated in *written* words or pictures. Burkert has reminded us that the very word for "magician" in Greek attests to this, for γόης is cognate with γοάω: the magician was one who knew how to invoke powers through his voice. Sounds that we might not call strictly "magical" were also thought to affect people and the cosmos in powerful ways. Orpheus' music stirred animals, trees, stones, and even the gods of the dead. The Sirens of *Republic* 10 produced harmonious tones that reflected the order of the Cosmos and perhaps helped to retain it as well (616d-617d). Even the ordinary human voice, as Gorgias and Plato knew, was able to stir the passions.

Iynges and Peithô

The *iynx* was connected with *peithô* by several of the authors just discussed.[19] Broadly speaking, this implies that the *iynx's* enchantment could cause someone to do something that he or she would not have otherwise done. This broad interpretation also works fairly well for the *iynges* hung inside temples and the Babylonian judgment hall, which seem to have functioned as instruments of divine voice, for the commands of the gods are by definition difficult for mortals to resist.

Notably, however, this *peithô* exerted by the *iynx* is often compared to that of the Sirens: attractive, but also potentially deceptive and dangerous to the listener—or at least so mesmerizing as to make the listener forget all his other concerns. The connection between the *iynges* and the *kêlêdones* suggests the same idea, as κηλ- cognates regularly describe situations in which one is mesmerized or irresistibly persuaded by the promise of great pleasure, often against one's better judgment. For example, Hecuba warns Menelaus that there are κηλήματα in Helen's eyes that will lead to further disaster (E. *Tr.* 893). Socrates uses the verb to describe the way that Protagoras lures young men to his sophistry (*Prt.* 315a8 and b1; cf. 328d4) and the way that victims of sorcery are forced to do things against their will (*R.* 413c2).[20] Aelian compared

[19] To the examples cited in the text and notes above, where I discussed the connection between *iynges, peithô,* and sound in particular, I would add Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.33.6.5-7: Σοφίαν τινὰ καὶ ἴυγγα κίνησον ἐπ'αὐτὴν Αἰγυπτίαν· πεῖσον ἢ λόγοις ἢ ἔργοις. . . and 8.5.7.5-6: μεγάλην εἰς πειθὼ κέκηται πρὸς ἄνδρας ἴυγγα τὰ γυναικεῖα καὶ σύνοικα βλέμματα.

[20] Plato is especially fond of using κηλέω and its cognates this way: *Lys.* 206b2, *R.* 358b3, 411b2, 601b1, *Leg.* 885d4 and 906e11, *Phdr.* 259a3, 259b1 and 267d1, *Crat.* 403e1. Also,

the power of the *iynx* to sounds capable of luring animals into being captured, killed and consumed. An ancient tradition said that Cleopatra had used an *iynx* to seduce both Caesar and Anthony.[21] This anecdote aligns with Segal's observation that the *iynx* is usually connected with love affairs that are doomed to end unhappily.[22] Even when the circumstances are not particularly dangerous, ancient sources imply that the *iynx*'s force is utterly irresistible, capable of drawing its victim into a situation that he or she would otherwise avoid; this is the point, for example, of Origen's statement about Christ's words and the women who heard them, of the scholiast's description of sophists' words as having *iynges*, and of Heliodorus' humorous comment that wifely *iynges* can compel husbands to do what they otherwise would not (*Aeth.* 8.5.7.5-6; the Greek is given in n. 19 above).[23]

The idea that a persuasive voice can attract a victim against his or her better judgment goes back a long way, as the Homeric Sirens demonstrate. For a time, however, this potentially dangerous side of *peithô* was downplayed in favor of another paradigm, as Buxton has discussed in depth (see esp. 54-63). In the fifth century, as the city-state continued to develop into its ideal democratic form throughout much of the Greek world, *peithô* was frequently presented as a desirable means of effecting change within civilized human relationships, and the ability to speak persuasively was held up as the mark of the cultured man. Politically, *peithô* became a skill necessary to advancement in many city-states: once Cleisthenes had increased the power of individual

---

Od. 11.334, Ib. fr. 287.3 Campbell (cf. Pl. *Parm.* 137a), Arist. *EE* 1230b35; Aelian *NA* 12.46. The implications of κηλέω and its cognates in the second half of the fifth century are well discussed by Romilly ch. 2.

[21] Ael. fr. 57; the passage is repeated almost verbatim in the Suda s.v. *iynx*. (The same tradition said the *iynx* had failed against Augustus.) Cf. also Josephus *BJ* 2.154 (the flesh has an *iynx*-like power to seduce the soul into incarnation); Ael. *NA* 13.2, 15.2, 15.19, 16.16 (various ways of luring animals to their death are compared to *iynges*; 15.19 in particular, describes male tortoises luring female tortoises into intercourse, which will kill them). Interestingly, Aelian also describes irresistible *smells*, in particular, as having an *iynx*-like power to attract a victim into a dangerous situation: *NA* 1.23, 2.9, 2.21, 5.40, 13.10.

[22] Segal 1973. Cf. also Detienne 1972: ch. 4, who discusses the *iynx* in the context of his analysis of the myth of Mintha, a nymph who tries to seduce Hades away from Persephone and is punished severely by the goddess; the Alexandrian librarian Zenodotus of Ephesus says that Mintha was also called Iynx (*FGrH* 19 F 4). Detienne also notes that Ixion, doomed to whirl forever on a four-spoked wheel like a living *iynx*-wheel, receives this punishment because he embarked on an improper love affair.

[23] E.g., Pi. *N.* 4.35; Ar. *Lys.* 1110 (it has the power to draw enemies together); Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.17-18; Plu. *De Sera* 568a and *Non Posse* 1093d; Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.33.6.5-6; 4.15.2.6-9. Cf. also *Orac. Chald.* 223 (the magician uses *iynges* to invoke gods against their wills). The association in later sources between the *iynx* and κίναιδοι (see n. 4 above) suggests the same idea, as the κίναιδος lures his partner into an alliance that is socially demeaning.

demesmen, an Athenian nobleman had to persuade the public of any proposal he wished to implement. At the same time that *peithô* became the mark of a civilized life, rule by violence (*bia*) was censured; indeed, it became one of the stereotypical traits of barbarians and animals.

This binary opposition between *peithô* and *bia* could serve as an important conceptual aid to the *polis'* evolution, but it was simplistic. In the early fifth century, as Buxton shows, it was challenged by a resurgence of interest in *peithô's* ability to mesmerize or even deceive its victim. Previously, literary explorations of deceptive *peithô* had been primarily concerned with its use in erotic or seductive situations.[24] Now, there was new interest in the damage that deceptive *peithô* could cause in other contexts, particularly political.

The *Oresteia*, performed just four years after *Pythian* 4, offers one of the best developed manifestations of this interest. In the trilogy, *bia's* ability to effect change is represented by the repeated acts of violence that occur in the first two plays, each of which leads to further violence. In contrast, socially desirable *peithô*—the sort of *peithô* that reflects the democratic methods by which the successful city state operates—is represented by Athena's persuasion of the Erinyes at the end of the *Eumenides*. But significant events are also effected by the socially undesirable, delusive form of *peithô*, represented most prominently in three important scenes. First, the chorus associates it with Paris, stating that it was wretched Peitho, daughter of intolerable Delusion (Atê), that drove him to violate the civilized rules of *xenia* and kidnap Helen (*Ag.* 385-86). So distant is this deceptive, dazing sort of *peithô* from socially desirable *peithô* that Aeschylus implies its identification with *peithô's* traditional opposite: the chorus says that wretched Peitho "forced" (βιᾶται) Paris to kidnap Helen. In our second example, Clytemnestra employs deceptive *peithô* against Agamemnon, dazing his wits in order to lure him into a deadly situation. "Be persuaded!" (πιθοῦ, *Ag.* 943) she cries to him at the culmination of their long discussion about walking into the house on the carpet, and persuaded he is, against his better judgment, and to his doom. Thirdly, we see destructive *peithô* at work during Orestes' and Electra's deadly deception of Clytemnestra. Indeed, as the plot to deceive Clytemnestra gets under way, we finally hear a name for this new and disturbing form of persuasion that is

[24] Although Buxton never explicitly makes this point, it can be derived from his survey of the uses of *peithô* in archaic and early classical sources at 29-57 and seems implied by much of his discussion throughout the first half of the book. As examples, we might consider Peitho's participation in the decking-out of Pandora (Hes. *Op.* 73-74), and the portrayal of Peitho as present at the seduction of Helen by Paris on a vase dated to 490-480 (discussed by Buxton 45-46). Another example, which does not explicitly mention *peithô* but which clearly involves persuasion is the *apatê Dios* from *Iliad* 14.

abroad in Mycenae, for the chorus sings out that *peithô dolia*—"*peithô* that tricks"—must now be at hand (νῦν γὰρ ἀκμάζει πειθὼ δολίαν ξυγκαταβῆναι, *Cho.* 726-27).

By the time we reach the end of the *Oresteia*, it is clear that not only *bia* must be exorcised from human relationships if the state and the family are to survive, but also *peithô dolia*, a form of compulsion just as destructive as physical force, even if it is draped more attractively. We also realize that *peithô dolia* carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction: those who use it, like Clytemnestra and Orestes, will bring ruin upon themselves as well as others. Like all powerful tools, persuasive speech is now seen to have potential for good but also for ill, and thus must be controlled if it is to bring social and political benefits. The problem of persuasive speech continued to challenge Greek thinking. Half a century after the *Oresteia,* Sophocles stages a battle between lying *peithô* and her forthright sister in the *Philoctetes,* representing them in the persons of Odysseus and Neoptolemus. Persuasion's magical potential to work both good and ill provides the theme of many Platonic dialogues as well, including the *Gorgias*, named for an accomplished persuader who rejected the assumption that *peithô's* use required any ethical guidelines at all.[25]

Peitho's Mastix

It is as an emblem of this newly recognized sort of persuasion—*peithô dolia* if I might continue to use Aeschylus' term for it—that we can best understand Pindar's *iynx,* for as I discussed earlier, the *iynx*'s voice was particularly associated with the sort of persuasion that mesmerized its victim into doing something against his or her natural judgment. Pindar's description of the *iynx* as ποικίλη underlines this quality, for ποικίλος and its cognates frequently are associated in archaic and classical sources with verbal deception and misrepresentation; indeed, at *Olympian* 1.29, lies themselves are called ποικίλα.[26]

[25] Romilly ch. 2, with particular attention to Plato's use of terms connected with magic (e.g., κηλέω, θέλγω, γοητεία) to describe the effects of speech on its listeners. More broadly on the very complex topic of speech's powerful, magical effects, see Detienne 1967 and Lain Entraglo.

[26] Other examples include: *Il.* 11.482, *Od.* 3.163 and 13.293 (all of Odysseus); Hes. *Th.* 511 (of Prometheus); *h.Merc* 155 (of Hermes); A. *Pr.* 310 (of Prometheus); E. *Med.* 300 (of the person of *sophia* who becomes suspected by his or her neighbors), *Andr.* 937 (the talk of ποικίλοι σοφόι is compared to the Sirens' song) and *IA* 526 (of Odysseus). See also discussion in Pucci 59-60. Pirenne-Delforge 278-83 highlights another aspect of the *iynx*'s description as ποικίλη, noting that the word is often associated with seductive clothing such as Aphrodite's magical *kestos,* which Hera borrows in *Iliad* 14 (see lines 215, 220). He makes a good point. Considering the role that this *kestos* plays in Hera's deception of Zeus, however, I would emphasize that there is a strong association between ποικίλος and trickery even here. Cf. also Detienne 1967: 62-66. Segal 1986, esp. 26-28, discusses more broadly Pindar's own

Understanding the *iynx* as an emblem of *peithô dolia* has implications for our interpretation of *Pythian* 4 that I will explore in the second half of this article. First, however, I would like to return briefly to the imagery of lines 218-19. Peitho herself, as well as the *iynx*, figures largely in our Pindaric scene of magic, for it is her *mastix* that Hellas or Jason uses to arouse desire within Medea. Commentators have frequently noted the oddity of this connection between Peitho and the physical violence that a *mastix* usually represents, pointing to the traditional opposition between *peithô* and *bia* discussed above. Buxton built on this by arguing that Pindar intended the phrase μάστιγι Πειθοῦς to generate a satisfying "frisson of oxymoron," and suggesting further that the same effect was intended by the Aeschylean βιᾶται δ' ἃ τάλαινα Πειθώ. Faraone, as I noted earlier in this article, took the word *mastix* literally.

There is, however, another interpretation of μάστιγι Πειθοῦς that aligns better both with the significance of the *iynx* developed earlier in this article and with the idea of destructive *peithô* that I have just examined. To begin with, it is likely that what Pindar refers to as the *mastix* of Peitho is not a whip *per se* but rather the cord used to set the *iynx* in motion. Two ancient sources describe these cords in detail. An epigram from the Greek anthology mentions one made of lamb's wool dyed purple (*AG.* 5.205.5). A late commentary on second-century C.E. magical texts, which describes the workings of the *iynx* in detail, mentions one made of a "rawhide strap" (ἱμὰς ταύρειος; Psell. *Exeg. Chald.Or.* = *PG* 122, 1133a4-b4). It is probable that an *iynx*'s cord could be made from a variety of materials, perhaps depending on its size, its weight, and the sort of noise that the practitioner wanted it to produce, but the fact that such cords could be made of rawhide brings us very close to what the ancients would have called a *mastix*. Interestingly, the same commentary goes on to describe the magicians as "whipping the air" (ἀέρα μαστίζοντες) as they used the *iynges*—a good description of the way in which a *iynx's* cord rapidly twists and snaps through the air as the wheel turns, but also, perhaps, a reflection of the essential identity between that rawhide cord and a *mastix*.

Pindar's portrayal of Hellas using the *mastix* of Peitho to arouse Medea is synecdochic; in saying that Peitho possessed the cord by which the *iynx* was worked, he signals that Peitho possessed the *iynx* itself. The *iynx* was one of Peitho's "tools," one of the means by which she enabled Jason to enchant Medea. This is a poetic inversion of the frequent attribution of *peithô* to the *iynx*, which I examined above. The fact that it is Aphrodite who gives the *iynx*

---

avoidance of *dolos* in his art and his statements about the dangers of *dolos* to poetry (e.g., *O.* 7.53).

to Jason reflects its close connection with *peithô* as well, for Aphrodite was frequently associated or even identified with the goddess Peitho in archaic and classical sources (Buxton 30-48; also Farnell 1896: 664-65). Divine Peitho gives Jason a tool that will enable him to wield *peithô*.[27]

To savor Pindar's use of the term *mastix* fully, however, we must remember what sort of *peithô* was wrought by this *iynx*. Typical of the *iynx*'s nature, it brought improper and self-destructive behavior in its wake, compelling Medea to leave her home and betray her parents. *Mastix* can accurately describe the cord by which the *iynx* was turned, but Pindar chooses this, like all of his words, as far more than a simple identifier. In juxtaposing with Peitho a term that was usually associated with force, Pindar suggests the compulsive effects of the *iynx's* form of *peithô* in much the same way as Aeschylus does by juxtaposing Peitho with βιᾶται.

Part II: The Voices of *Pythian* 4

Pindar is a poet intensely aware of speech and the roles it has to play in his society. He frequently reminds us of how poetic speech guarantees the memory of a man's deeds and invigorates the man, his family, and his city.[28] Frequently, too, he considers what sorts of things should and should not be said, both by the poet and by people in general.[29] He is particularly concerned with the dangers of statements that are likely to arouse excessive envy or cause undesirable dissension, and with the power of lies or deceptive speech to ruin hopes or cheat men of their just rewards. Speech, he knows, can topple as well as build alliances, and can obscure as well as celebrate accomplishments.[30] In all these interests, Pindar stands at the beginning of the fifth century's growing awareness of the potential power of the human voice to effect change.[31]

[27] Deborah Boedeker suggests to me that πειθοῦς in line 219 might be a genitive of material rather than of possession; the *mastix* might be "made of *peithô*" rather than belong to Peitho. This is, of course, a valid alternative, and it seems impossible to me to determine which use Pindar had in mind. Understanding πειθοῦς as a genitive of material would not significantly affect the overall point of my interpretation of μάστιξ πειθοῦς; either way, the cord of the *iynx*, and thus the *iynx* itself, is being associated closely with persuasion. One important ramification of Boedeker's suggestion, however, is that when the *goddess* Peitho is removed from the picture, the *iynx* becomes the sole possession of Aphrodite among divinities. If one is unwilling to assume (as I do here) that Aphrodite and Peitho are to be identified, then Boedeker's suggestion simplifies interpretation of the passage considerably.

[28] *O.* 7.1-14, *N.* 4.1-8, *N.* 6.36-8, *N.* 7.12-17, *N.* 8.6-7, *I.* 1.50-59, *I* 4.41-7., *I.* 7.16-21.

[29] *O.*1.28-9 and 52-3, *O.* 9.35-39, *N.* 8.50-2.

[30] *O.* 12.5-6, *P.* 2.81-2, *N.* 7.61-3, cf. 68-82, *N.* 8.21-34.

[31] Cf. Farenga, esp. 19-21 and 29, who sees in Pindar's work early signs of what would later be Gorgias' "pharmacological strategy for rhetoric."

Pindar particularly focused on the power of the voice in *Pythian* 4. Oracular speech, magical speech, human rhetoric, and poetry all have their part in the two tales that Pindar weaves together: Jason's quest to regain his throne and the foundation of Cyrene.[32]

Oracular Voice

Oracular voice plays an especially important part, appearing eight times in the poem. The ode opens with the first of several Delphic oracles that impel developments in the two narrative strands: the Pythia commands Battus to leave Thera and found Cyrene, home of the victor whom Pindar now celebrates. As we follow the complex course of *Pythian* 4, we realize that this divine act of speech, which took place many generations before Pindar's song, provides for that song in several ways. Indirectly, it provides an occasion for the song: without the oracle, no Cyrene, without Cyrene, no Battiad dynasty and therefore no Arcesilas to celebrate. It also provides one of the song's narrative themes, for Pindar briefly returns to the founding myth of the Battiad dynasty later in the ode (254-62). This would, of course, be a theme particularly pleasing to his audience.

In the hands of a skilled poet like Pindar, however, the Pythia's command to Battus also provides a segue to the second and lengthier narration in the poem, for Pindar tells us that the Pythia's command worked to fulfill another prophecy, which Medea had delivered to the Argonauts seventeen generations earlier (13-56). Just as the Pythia's command was presented as working to fulfill Medea's earlier prophecy (8-9), so Medea closes her own prophecy by foretelling the Pythia's command (53-54). Pindar himself describes the Pythia's proclamation of Battus' kingship immediately afterwards (59-62). This circling from the prophetic Pythia to prophetic Medea and back again to the Pythia makes for neat ring-composition within the ode, but its effect is more than stylistic, for in closing with the Pythia, Pindar briefly refocuses our attention on the real world of Cyrene and the significance of oracular speech within *it* before he launches on the extended narration of Jason's mythic quest (70-259). In the first quarter of the ode, then, Pindar repeatedly invites us to consider the power of voice, within both the mythical world and the real world in which the Pythia still speaks. He also encourages us, through his early intertwining of the

[32] Pindar's interest in speech as displayed in *Pythian* 4 has also been fruitfully discussed by Segal 1986, esp. 30-51, and Farenga. My conclusions intersect with theirs at several points but differ at others; more generally, because our reasons for examining speech in the ode are different, we take different paths through the material.

voices of Medea and the Pythia, to listen to the rest of Jason's tale with our own world in mind.

Twice again the Pythia's voice drives human action, although in these instances she operates within the mythical world of Jason and Medea. We learn at 159-64 that it was from the Pythia that Pelias heard he was destined to die at the hands of a son of Aiolos; thus, it was the Pythia, indirectly, who motivated Pelias to send Jason on a dangerous voyage to Colchis. We also learn that Pelias himself took care to sanction this demand by means of the Pythia (as well as by a daemonic voice), telling Jason that the ghost of Phrixus commanded him to recover the Fleece in a dream, and that this dream's validity was confirmed at Delphi. Divine, oracular voice, in the person of the Pythia, reverberates throughout Jason's tale.

Medea's prophecy does not drive the action of the story to quite the same extent that the Pythia's prophecies do. Her only direct command to the Argonauts is to guard the clod of earth that Poseidon's son gave Euphamus, which they fail to heed. And yet her voice is highly privileged in Pindar's ode. Not only is it placed early, but its length is remarkable: at 44 lines, it consumes 15 percent of the 299-line ode, more than any other direct speech in Pindar. The prophecy of the Pythia—representing the greatest of all Greek oracles—is subordinated to Medea's: the Pythia commands Battus to *fulfill* Medea's earlier words, almost as if she acts as Medea's agent (5-9). Medea's corresponding foreknowledge of the Pythia's remarks to Battus similarly suggests that Medea's knowledge is superior (53-57). Moreover, as O'Higgins (forthcoming) has shown, the phrase ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος, "breathing forth [words] from an immortal mouth" (11) marks Medea as an extraordinary speaker. Ἀπέπνευσα recalls the inspirational breath of Hesiod's Muses (ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδήν, *Th.* 31). In Homer, the phrase ἀπὸ στομάτων is used only of the Sirens (typically, the tongue is singled-out as the Homeric organ of speech). It should also be noted that, like the Sirens, Medea strikes her listeners dumb when she speaks (57-58). Finally, Medea prophesies not only what *really* is or will come to be, as the Pythia regularly does, but also what *would have* happened (43-49), a feat that further sets her apart among speakers of superhuman ability.[33] Why all this trouble for a voice that does not move the plot of the myth to any significant extent?

[33] Burton 152 notes that there probably were two different foundation stories, which Pindar combines here. This may be true, but his decision to combine them by portraying Medea as prophesying in this remarkable way is nonetheless striking. Cf. also the discussion of Cyrenian foundation myths in Farnell 1932: 144-47.

O'Higgins suggests that we are to understand Medea as a Muse, whom Pindar must tame into giving him help with his song. This he accomplishes, for, as we have noted, her remarkable voice narrates one of the themes of his song: the foundation of the Battiad dynasty. We should also note that, within the myth, too, Medea's divine voice benefits the mortal man who wins her to his service, for it is by Medea's spoken prayers or commands (ἐφετμαῖς), as well as her ointments, that Jason can approach the fiery breaths of Aeetes' bulls without flinching (233).[34]

Yet in speech, just as in all else, the essence of the female is to be deceptive and dangerous as well as attractive and helpful. Hesiod's Muses speak lies as well as the truth. The singing Sirens seduce men to their deaths. The Pythia, too, speaking as she does in riddles, threatens to deceive even as she reveals. Indeed, as O'Higgins notes, even the pleasure and temporary oblivion brought by the Muses' songs can spill over into a dangerous intoxication that makes men forget *aidôs*. The inherent danger of Medea's great voice is clearly implied by her alignment with the Sirens through the phrase ἀπέπνευσ' ἀθανάτου στόματος and her power to strike her listeners dumb, for dumbness, especially in Pindar, implies impotence (cf. *P.* 9.92 and also Pelias' dumbness at lines 95 and 156 and Aeetes' "wordless cry" at 237; cf. also Farenga 14). Also suggestive is the way Medea is described as she speaks to protect Jason against the bulls' breath: the ἐφετμαί of a παμφάρμακος ξείνα save him. Braswell and others have argued that at the time of Pindar, ξείν- words did not yet carry the sinister meaning that they later did. This may be correct, although the use of ξείνα at Bacchylides 11.85 to describe the sort of urgings that drive a man to suicide suggests that at the very least, ξείν- compounds could convey the idea of "strangeness" or "abnormality." But whatever one concludes about ξείνα, about παμφάρμακος there is no room for debate: it was intended to echo Homeric and Hesiodic descriptions of Circe as πολυφάρμακος. Thus, παμφάρμακος calls to mind the dreadful threat that a woman knowledgeable in magic could pose to men who come seeking her help.[35] At the very moment that Medea's ἐφετμαί aid Jason, we are reminded that she also possesses the means to harm him.

More generally, Pindar's decision to emphasize Medea's sonority is itself significant. As his audience knows, Medea will indeed prove to be far more of

[34] By her counsels (appropriately called *mêdea*, 27), too, the Argonauts carry the Argo over land to Lake Tritonis, where the clod of earth is received from Poseidon's son.

[35] Cf. Braswell ad loc., with citations of the word's frequent uses throughout classical literature to describe Medea, Circe, and, once each, Paeon and Dionysus (Sol. 13.57 W, Nonn. *D.* 40.57). Cf. also Bowra 220, who calls it a "tremendous word."

a hindrance than a help; Pindar himself foreshadows her role in Jason's exile from Iolchus by describing her as the murderer of Pelias (τὰν Πελίαο φόνον 250).[36] This creature, who excels even the Pythia in divine speech, has the ability to serve but also to destroy. Are we not to conclude the same about speech itself? The power of a great voice must be skillfully handled by the man who would use it.[37]

Jason's Rhetoric

Everything significant that happens in the world of *Pythian* 4 is tied to divine voice, but human voice also has its roles to play. Jason makes two speeches in the ode, together totalling 37 lines (101-19 and 138-55). The first replies to questions asked by Pelias, although it seems directed more towards the citizens of Iolchus. The second is spoken to Pelias himself, and receives a reply, also in direct discourse. In between Jason's two speeches, we hear of two other speeches, which he makes to his uncles and cousins (128 and 132).

I will interpret the descriptions of Jason's speaking ability and the content of his speeches shortly, but first I want to emphasize the more general fact that Pindar has chosen to present Jason's return to his ancestral land through a series of speeches, and specifically to present the initial meetings between Jason and Pelias through extensive direct discourse. He could have sketched their encounters (and much of the information they reveal during those encounters) more briefly and in the third person. Here, at the beginning of his story, Pindar takes pains to present Jason as a *speaker*, just as he has presented Medea as one. Jason's later, more famous physical deeds such as the yoking of the bulls, the plowing of the field, and the retrieval of the Fleece, are certainly not ignored (224-46); he does display the athletic prowess of the traditional hero. But, as other scholars have noted, more could have been said, both about these deeds and about another that Pindar leaves out altogether (the battle with the

[36] O'Higgins (forthcoming) argues that by putting the Argonauts' visit to the husband-killing Lemnian women after the visit to Colchis and therefore with Medea on board (all other versions put the Lemnian visit before events at Colchis), Pindar foreshadows the trouble Medea herself will cause for her husband. Whether the story of Medea's Corinthian murders, which also caused problems for Jason, was known in Pindar's time remains an open question. I think it was; see discussion and references to other treatments in Johnston (forthcoming).

[37] Three more instances of prophetic "voice" should be considered briefly. I already have mentioned Phrixus, whose daemonic voice speaks to Pelias in a dream. Zeus rings forth approval through his "voice" of thunder twice in the poem: once (within Medea's own prophecy) to approve Euphamus' acceptance of the clod of earth (23) and once to approve the Argonauts' departure for Colchis (197). These oracular voices, which duplicate the voices of Medea and the Pythia, do not carry the interpretive significance that Medea's does, but they do further point up the authority of voice that exists within the mythical world of *Pythian* 4. Cf. Segal 1986: 45-46, who rightly notes the appropriateness of a prophecy from the dead to Pelias.

Spartoi, which was mentioned by Eumelus, ap. Σ A.R. 3.1354-56a and Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 22). Our acquaintance with the hero of this story comes first and primarily through his own voice.

Jason is represented as an adept speaker, able to convey his points in a manner both authoritative and pleasing. In the first speech, he uses words that are ἀγανοί, "gentle" (101). This adjective seems intended at least in part to set up a contrast with Pelias' rather nasty preceding statement, which assumes that Jason intends to hide the truth ("Don't defile your birth by telling me loathsome lies" 99-100).[38] Also notable is the fact that in Homer, ἀγανός frequently is used to describe the words of a speaker who is attempting to persuade or sooth his audience (*Il.* 2.164, 180 and 189; 24.772). Jason intends to win over to his own side those who have gathered to listen, and he uses the appropriate mode of speech. Jason himself is described as being "confident" in what he says (θαρσήσαις, 101). The overall picture is of a practiced rhetorician, capable of persuading his audience through both the force of his argument and the subtler charms of his words themselves.

The speech itself also displays Jason's rhetorical skills. He arranges his answer dramatically to leave the revelation of his name to the very end. This itself is not unprecedented; we recall, for example, Glaucus' reply to Diomedes' inquiry in *Iliad* 6. Yet in contrast to the long speech before Glaucus' revelation of his name, which was intended to glorify his family heritage, Jason's speech works to persuade his listeners of the inherent rightness of his case before they even know who he is. He initially emphasizes his own maturation into a man of proper behavior, who never embarrassed his adoptive family in either word or deed. This is set in sharp contrast to the phrases that immediately follow, which brand Pelias as lawless, "pale with lust for power,"[39] and which describe the threatening circumstances that led to Jason's being raised outside his family's home. Jason's habit throughout his speech of referring to Pelias in the third person, rather than in the second, further works to direct his words to the people of Iolchus rather than to the man who has asked him the questions. We come away with the impression of a man who knows that, whatever he may have to do to surmount his immediate problem—Pelias—his success as ruler of Iolchus will in the long run rest upon his ability to rally and control his subjects.

Jason's speeches to his uncles and cousins, which fall between his two meetings with Pelias, are described rather than directly quoted, but those de-

[38] Cf. Segal 1986: 7; Burton 155-59 and 168; and Farnell 1932: 155.

[39] The translation is Nisetich's. On this problematic phrase, see most recently Braswell ad loc., who cites earlier treatments. Burton 157-58 and Farnell 1932: 156 are also useful.

scriptions also suggest a man adept at using different modes of speech in their proper contexts. During the first part of the relatives' reunion, which is spent in feasting and other pleasant entertainments, Jason speaks to them with *logoi* that are "gracious" or "mild" (μειλίχιοι, 128). On the sixth day, however, when it comes time to challenge Pelias' claim to the throne, he changes his tone and addresses them with a *logos* that is σπουδαῖος, "earnest" or "serious" (132), to which they all give heed. Jason knows how to use speech to build unity within a group, but also how to use it to rouse that group into action.

In his second conversation with Pelias, Jason "sheds a soothing song of gentle sound" that "lays the groundwork for wise discourse," πραΰν δ' Ἰάσων μαλθακᾷ φωνᾷ ποτιστάζων ὄαρον βάλλετο κρηπῖδα σοφῶν ἐπέων (136-38). Together, the two phrases present Jason's speech as having both a graceful, flowing technique and practical, well-considered content (cf. the remarks of Segal 1986: 24-25). The participle ποτιστάζων, "shed," deserves some further comment. Elsewhere in Pindar, στάζω and its compounds are associated with liquids that vitalize. At *P.* 9.63, the Seasons and Gê drip (στάζω) nectar and ambrosia onto the lips of the heroic infant Aristaeus, feeding him in his mother's absence. Στάζω has a similar force elsewhere in archaic poetry: *Iliad* 19, for example, uses it three times to describe goddesses pouring nectar and ambrosia into a mortal's body to nurture or preserve it. At line 39, Thetis does this to Patroclus' corpse, and at lines 348 and 354 Athene's nurture of Achilles is thus described. At *N.* 10.82, στάζω is used of semen poured into a mother's womb to create a child. Cognates of στάζω twice are used of athletic victory and glory that it brings, glory that "vitalizes" the victor and his homeland. *Olympian* 6.76 tells us that Charis "sheds," ποτιστάξῃ, bright beauty on a victor in the games. Ἐπιστάζω is similarly used in *I.* 4.72 to describe the *charis* that an epinician song "sheds" on the victor.[40] Pindar's use of ποτιστάζω to describe Jason's speaking techniques, then, carries with it not only an image of speech that is as smooth and sweet as nectar, but also an implication of the speaker's vigor and force.

In this speech, which addresses Pelias in the second person, Jason first argues for dispassionate rationality, fairness, and unity amongst kinsmen. He then offers to leave the kingdom's riches in Pelias' possession, asking only for the kingship itself. This diplomatic attempt to win his aim by appealing to Pelias' higher sentiments and using reasoned negotiation stands in contrast to what the listener may well have expected. In lines 133-35, which immediately

[40] I discussed the significance of στάζω, its cognates and their portrayal of athletic victory as "vitalizing" in more detail in Johnston 1983: 21-26.

follow Jason's λόγος σπουδαῖος to his uncles and cousins and immediately precede his speech to Pelias, we hear of his kinsmen "rising quickly from the banquet room and following him in haste to Pelias' hall, where they took their stand." A physical attempt to seize the throne seemed likely to follow, as Braswell has noted (ad loc.). Jason's willingness to try persuasion before the force that we expect once again marks him as man who places his faith in words.

Jason and Medea

Two impressive voices echo throughout the first two thirds of *Pythian* 4. By the time they meet, in the lines with which I opened this article (213-19), the audience has heard each of them in its own way demonstrate voice's power. It is only appropriate, then, that they be brought together by an act of voice itself. As the first portion of this article showed, the power of the *iynx* lay in its sonority, its ability to produce a seductive, persuasive song. Jason, master of human language, deploys magical sound to gain control of Medea, mistress of divine speech.

What does it mean for Jason to use this tool? Is it just another way of representing him as a master of persuasive language, of suggesting that he can come out ahead even in a conversation with divine voice? The answer can hardly be a simple "yes." The *iynx*'s sound, as I emphasized in the first section of this article, is usually associated with persuasion that deceives its victims, draws them into a situation against their better judgment, and stuns their wits. Its effects approach the *bia* that *peithô* was expected to oppose, as the word *mastix* suggests.

In the world of the fifth century, such a tool could scarcely represent a speech-act that brought enduring success—and indeed it does not. For although the relationship wrought by the *iynx* initially proves advantageous to Jason, we know that in the end it fails dismally and destroys him in the process, just as Clytemnestra, another deployer of deceptive *peithô,* was destroyed, and just as Orestes was nearly destroyed by his use of it, saved only at the last moment by Athena's proper use of forthright *peithô* to convince the Erinyes that it was in their own interest to retreat.[41] The message seems clear: the polished wielder of speech will be the new hero in the political and social world of the fifth century, but he must keep to the rules of this new "heroism," if his success is to be long-lived and fruitful for all concerned. He must reject the sort of *peithô* that takes unfair advantage of its victims, stunning or deceiving them into

[41] In part, this failure reflects something that Segal 1973 already has noted: the *iynx* is regularly associated with unstable relationships, doomed to break-up.

actions that run counter to their own best judgment. Jason began well, both by the standards of the traditional hero and those of the new, "vocal" hero: he was first presented to us as an adept rhetorician, a skillful user of socially desirable *peithô* (101-55), who rallied others to his support and began a heroic quest that would have assured him of his rightful place as Iolchus' ruler. In the final stage of his quest, however, he found it necessary to persuade another, and stronger, ally to join his cause. Here he made his fatal error, resorting to a tool of deceptive *peithô*, bending Medea into alliance against her own advantage, and, in the long run, truncating his own hopes of kingship as well.[42]

The implications of Jason's use of the *iynx*, emblem of *peithô dolia,* go further yet, beyond the social and political worlds. As I mentioned above, O'Higgins (forthcoming) has explored in depth Pindar's use of Medea as Muse, showing that he calls upon her remarkable vatic skills, as he calls upon the traditional Muses, to aid him in telling the stories that he has chosen for the ode. Pindar successfully joins his voice to hers, producing a poem that, like all good poems, grows from a union of divine and mortal speech.

The union of divine voice and human voice finds another expression in *Pythian* 4 as well. Early in the ode, we are introduced to Cyrene's two founding heroes, whose very names connect them to the power of speech and its absence: Euphamus, the "Good Speaker" and Battus, the "Stammerer." Pindar develops their story in such a way as to suggest that human speech, however polished, must ally itself with divine voice to reach fruition. Euphamus, whose great-grandsons had been destined to found Cyrene, destroyed their birthright by ignoring (along with the other Argonauts) Medea's instructions to protect the clod of earth given to him by Poseidon's son (38-44). "Good Speaker," then, having disregarded Medea's divine voice, became incapable of fulfilling his heroic program. Seventeen generations later, when Euphamus' descendant Battus approached the Delphic Oracle, asking for help with his defective speech, he was ordered by the Pythia to found Cyrene, and did so successfully.[43] Even a poor speaker, when he allowed himself to be guided by divine voice, became capable of accomplishing what a better speaker alone could not.

[42] Jason is not the only hero whom Pindar presents as using speech to succeed in his quest. At *O.* 3.16, Heracles persuades the Hyperboreans to give him olive trees for Zeus' grove at Olympus.

[43] Interestingly, Pausanias tells us that in the act of settling the city, Battus was in fact cured of his disability when he was frightened by local lions (10.15.6-7). This varies somewhat the tale implied by *P.* 5.55-59, according to which the lions fled because of the strange sound of Battus' speech. Cf. the remarks of Burton 145.

Jason's experiences stand in sharp contrast to those of both Battus and Pindar. He was an accomplished rhetorician in his own right, but when he met the limits of his own abilities, rather than subordinating himself to divine female voice, as Pindar and Battus did, he deployed a deceptive, magical voice to constrain the divinity within Medea. His heroic program, appropriately, fell short of completion while Pindar's and Battus' met with success. Just as *peithô dolia* is destined to fail in human relationships, so it fails to establish the proper relationship between human and divine.

Cyrenian Speech

Pythian 4 resonates with Pindar's meditations on speech. Although I have identified some of the "messages" contained within the ode, I have not exhausted the nuances of Pindar's representation of speech. What might it signify, for example, that Aeetes "shouted out an 'unvoiced' cry" (ἴυξεν δ' ἀφωνήτῳ . . . ἄχει, 237) when Jason accomplished the tasks he had assigned? Ἀφωνήτῳ may simply mean that the cry lacked articulate words, but the broader meaning of the word is "soundless," which obviously contradicts the idea of "cry." The presence of ἴυξεν, cognate with *iynx*, makes the passage still more puzzling. It would also be interesting to pursue further the significance of Orpheus' inclusion among the Argonauts (177), for which this is our first literary source,[44] and the description of Hera as παμπειθῆ as she endowed the Argonauts with a "sweet longing" for their ship and for the glory of the quest, which will provide a beautiful *pharmakon* against death (184-87). Even without going further into these passages or some of the others that I have had to leave aside for the sake of concision, we can fairly say that the audience of *Pythian* 4 is repeatedly challenged to consider the varieties of speech and the multifarious uses to which it can be put.

We now might look at what the audience heard last, after their awareness of speech had been heightened, and after Pindar had left the mythical world of Jason to return to the real world of fifth-century Cyrene. Although it is wrong to read any Pindaric ode as an encoded message, seeking tidy alignments between the mythical situations and the political or social circumstances in which the victor existed, it would also be wrong to assume that Pindar

[44] Fritz Graf reminds me that there is some artistic evidence suggesting that Orpheus was included in the Argonautica before Pindar, however. The Sicyonian Treasury at Delphi, which is dated to the second quarter of the fifth century, shows Orpheus (name inscribed) and another musician (inscription illegible) standing on the prow of the Argo. An Attic black-figure vase in Heidelberg dated to 580-570 shows a singer between two Sirens; some have interpreted him as Orpheus. For more on these representations and generally on the history of Orpheus' inclusion among the Argonauts, see Graf 95-99.

developed themes without his audience in mind. How do these deliberations on proper and improper speech apply to Arcesilas and Damophilus?

In the final portion of the ode, it is Pindar's job to praise those qualities of Damophilus that will convince Arcesilas to allow his return. Of course, this can best be done by highlighting the qualities that will serve Arcesilas himself. Prominent among them is Damophilus' ability to "deprive the evil tongue of a far-sounding voice" (283). This seems to imply that Damophilus' own tongue has the power to drown out the voices of those who would persuade others against Arcesilas.[45] Damophilus' rhetorical skills, however, shine forth not only in defense; Pindar suggests that he can play a more active role as well. For, although the phrase "a good messenger brings great honor to any endeavor" (278) may be taken to refer to Pindar's epinician role, it surely must also be understood to describe Damophilus' future role as Arcesilas' supporter, situated as it is in the middle of Pindar's plea for Damophilus' readmission to the Cyrenian court.[46] Pindar suggests that Damophilus, like Jason in the Iolchan marketplace, will be a skillful speaker, able to use persuasion in the political arena of fifth-century Cyrene on Arcesilas' behalf.

Pindar's meditations on speech may have been intended to encourage Arcesilas to consider his own role as Cyrene's ruler, too, as he strove to keep control of a situation that was far from stable. (Cf. Pindar's advice to Hieron at *P.* 1.82-100.) The monarchy held by the Battiad dynasty had been challenged repeatedly by the time *Pythian* 4 was performed in 462. During the reign of Battus III, the great-grandfather of Arcesilas IV (our Arcesilas), monarchy had given way to an oligarchic system sanctioned by Delphi (Hdt. 4.161-62). Under the rule of Battus' son Arcesilas III, there had been an attempt to reëstablish the monarchy, yet Arcesilas III was driven out and eventually murdered (Hdt. 4.162-64). With the help of the Persians, the monarchy was finally revived and passed into the hands of Battus IV (Hdt. 4.200-204), but it too was destined to fall, during the reign of his son Arcesilas IV. We know that by 440 at latest, Cyrenian monarchy was gone forever. Although we cannot say exactly what was going on in Cyrene in 462, certain phrases in both *Pythian* 5 and *Pythian* 4

[45] I disagree here with Burton 171: "[In using the phrase, Pindar] means no more than that [Damophilus'] behavior will give no cause for calumny, though the phrase is somewhat forced and obscure."

[46] *Pace* Braswell ad loc., who argues against this because, since Damophilus is not yet present in Cyrene, the statement cannot apply to him. I do not understand the logic of this argument: aphoristic statements typically take little notice of exact time and place. The scholiast ad loc. also interpreted the *angelos* as meaning Pindar, but there is no reason it cannot refer to both Pindar and Damophilus. Braswell mentions that Frider 720 suggested that the passage referred to Damophilus (*non vidi*).

suggest that the anti-Battiad faction was stirring up trouble even then. For example, the recent "storms" that Arcesilas is congratulated for having weathered in lines 10-11 of *Pythian* 5 can scarcely represent anything other than political problems (cf. 117-21).[47]

The Cyrenian monarchy, as Braswell has observed, was an anachronism in the Greek world of its time, which had by and large turned to various versions of democracy or oligarchy. We know that Arcesilas was pressured by nobles who desired a hand in Cyrenian government. Under these circumstances, he might be willing to mollify them by allowing them greater participation. Other scholars have suggested that Jason was intended to serve as a model for Arcesilas in various ways.[48] Although any absolute and exclusive equation between the two figures misrepresents Pindar's intentions (indeed, I have already noted that Damophilus, as well as Arcesilas, could be compared to Jason), it is possible to understand Jason's portrayal as a man who speaks persuasively to the people of Iolchus, soliciting their support and good favor, as he does in lines 101-19, as providing a paradigm for Arcesilas' consideration. It would have been ridiculous for Pindar to suggest, however subtly, that Arcesilas actually give up his monarchy in favor of making Cyrene a democratic city-state. But if monarchy were to survive in fifth-century Cyrene, Arcesilas at least would have to adopt some of the skills of a "democratic" ruler, acknowledging and accommodating the power of the aristocracy by winning it over through the tools of good speech and allowing it, in turn, to speak out as well upon occasion. Lines 127-33, in which Jason uses words to rally his uncles and cousins behind him, may also have been directed towards the king. The scene would have been particularly appropriate to the hoped-for relationship between Arcesilas and Damophilus, whom a scholiast identifies as relatives (ad. *P.* 4.467). Certainly, *Pythian* 4, with its myth of Cyrene's foundation by Arcesilas' ancestors, was intended to validate the Battiads' right to rule, but it would have been possible for Pindar to advise subtly how they might retain that right at the same time (cf. Farenga's remarks *passim*, but esp. 6-9, 11-12 and 31).

Of course, in suggesting that Arcesilas might follow Jason's example, especially in a situation where Arcesilas is being asked to accept a potentially

[47] The political situation in Cyrene during the sixth and early fifth centuries is discussed in more detail by Braswell 1-6, Segal 1986: 13-14, and Chamoux 144-201 and 210.

[48] Examples are cited by Braswell, comm. ad. 270 (b). Braswell himself argues against any equation between Jason and Arcesilas (30). Cf. also the good remarks of Segal 1986: 130-32, generally, on the ways in which this and other Pindaric odes comment on contemporary situations.

dangerous "outsider" into his home, Pindar had to avoid suggesting that he was doomed to finish as Jason did. Here again the *iynx* scene is important. As an emblem for *peithô dolia*, the *iynx* not only provided a reason for Jason's failure that made sense within the thematic programs of the ode, but it also offered a gap in the implicit comparison between Jason and Arcesilas, thus providing an "escape clause" for the listening king. Arcesilas could be encouraged to adopt the hero's positive behavior—perhaps even be flattered into assuming a comparison between the hero and himself—and yet be able to reassure himself that his own story would not end in the same way as Jason's had, so long as he resisted the temptation to resort to disreputable speech. The implication that Arcesilas could become a skilled and admired practitioner of the civilized and very Greek art of rhetoric undoubtedly would have appealed to this Cyrenian king, who was striving to legitimate himself and his reign within Greek culture.[49]

Summation

Using speech as a theme for *Pythian* 4 may first have occurred to Pindar as he ruminated on the names of Cyrene's mythical founders, Euphamus and Battus. From this story, in particular, he may have derived the idea of treating the importance of the link between the human and divine voices in heroic (and poetic) endeavors. The traditional picture of Jason as a hero who had collected around himself the other heroes necessary for completion of his quest may have suggested to Pindar the further idea of treating persuasive speech, which was important in the political and social arenas of the fifth century, where the new "hero" was the man who could win the support of others. The state of affairs in Cyrene may also have suggested that persuasive speech would be an appropriate theme.

Having decided to treat these ideas, Pindar then had to unify and develop them within the framework of the traditional myths. The picture of Medea as a *pharmakeutria* was old. It was Pindar, however, who made her a prophetess, emphasizing the power of her divine voice above all her other characteristics. This enabled him both to display his own skill as a poet who wins divine voice to his aid and also to show Jason as a hero who—despite his own rhetorical skills—fails to treat divine voice appropriately.

[49] On this topic see O'Higgins (forthcoming), who points to their extensive building program in the sixth and fifth centuries, their willingness to accept Delphic arbitration in political affairs, their participation in major athletic competitions, and their commissioning of Greek poets to compose epinician odes. She particularly notes Arcesilas' mixed ancestry and suggests that there is some irony in Pindar's treatment of Medea—one of the "black-faced Colchians"—in this ode to a king who was part Libyan.

Old, too, was the tradition that Medea had helped Jason because she loved him. And also old, probably, was the tradition that Aphrodite had helped to induce this love. Although Aphrodite's direct involvement cannot be traced back further than Pindar, there are traces of it in fragmentary remains of earlier versions,[50] and it is prominent in later Greek versions such as Euripides' *Medea* (526-31) and Apollonius Rhodius' epic (3.25-153). What we fail to find in other versions, however, is any sign of Jason using magic, divinely bestowed or otherwise, to win Medea's love. This element was probably borrowed by Pindar from *Odyssey* 10, where Hermes gave Odysseus advice and a magical tool (the plant called *môly*) that would enable him to control and eventually seduce Circe, another dangerous παμφάρμακος ξείνα whose aid he needed to overcome the challenges that awaited him.[51] Having used the Odyssean scene as a model, Pindar then altered it to suit his own program. The replacement of Hermes—a god closely associated with magic in Greek belief—with Aphrodite undoubtedly was motivated by what I have suggested was Aphrodite's traditional connection with Jason's story, but the additional introduction of Peitho helped to signal that the scene was to be read as part of the ode's larger meditation on persuasive speech and its dangers.

The choice of magical tool was even more important, and Pindar's choice in this matter was brilliant. By bestowing on Jason the *iynx*, which was, as I have shown in the first part of this article, an aural tool whose voice was associated with deception, danger, and ultimately, the destruction of those it affected, Pindar once again underlined the reasons that Jason had failed to control Medea, but also intimated something larger about persuasive speech in general: persuasion that tricked—*peithô dolia*—had no place in the "quest" of the fifth-century hero or ruler. In this belief, as I suggested earlier, Pindar aligned with his contemporaries, most notably Aeschylus, and stands at the beginning of a long Greek debate about *peithô*, good and bad.

It is interesting that when we next meet Medea, she is the one who wields *peithô dolia*. The heroine of Euripides' play—a play that is deeply concerned with the power of language, as Boedeker has recently discussed—is forced to become a mistress of tricky, self-serving persuasion because neither desirable *peithô* nor *bia* will be of any avail in her situation (cf. esp. Boedeker 99-100

[50] In earlier sources, Aphrodite is portrayed as supporting the lovers once they have met. The late archaic Cypselid chest showed Jason wedding Medea "at the command of Aphrodite" (Paus. 5.18.3). In the late archaic *Naupactia*, Aphrodite distracted Aeetes by arousing in him a desire for his wife, so that Medea could escape with Jason (fr. 7A Davies).

[51] Cf. Duchemin 104. For other possible echoes of the *Odyssey* in *Pythian* 4 see Segal 1986: 15-17 with notes.

and Buxton 154). She uses it to fool Creon, Jason, and Aegeus into agreements that they will deeply regret.

Even in this play, however, it is Jason's speech that is presented as first causing the trouble, as Boedeker points out (95-98; cf. Buxton 161-64). Indeed, Medea herself recognizes this fact when she realizes, as if for the first time, what led to her predicament, "I went wrong when I left my father's house, having been persuaded by the words of a Greek man" (800-802). Now her only recourse is to learn to use deceptive persuasion herself. Once Jason had set *peithô dolia* in motion, it became impossible to stop, ricochetting from deceiver to victim and back again against the deceiver. The victim's only defense was to shut out all speech, good and bad; as Boedeker notes (108), by the end of the play, Medea is refusing to hear even Jason's heartbreaking pleas to touch his children's corpses (μάτην ἔπος ἔρριπται, 1404).

Aeschylus optimistically presented a world in which socially desirable *peithô* could put an end to the chain of destruction that *peithô dolia* had wrought, but in Euripides there seems to be no end at all. Even the *bia* of her children's deaths does not terminate Medea's new career as a practitioner of *peithô dolia,* for we know that she will use it again to wreak havoc in Athens. We can perhaps understand how Euripides, writing in the late 430s, when the Athenian situation was quite different from that of 458, could present deceptive rhetoric as such a strong force. Pindar's outlook seems to fall between those of the two tragedians. His myth does not present us with the "happy ending" that Aeschylus' does. And yet Pindar's ode does provide examples of properly oriented speech and the success that it brings: Jason's early rhetoric in Iolchus, Battus' guidance by the Pythia's words and, by implication, the benefits that Arcesilas will derive from Damophilus' speech. In Pindar, deceptive *peithô* is strong, yet not insurmountable for the man who, like Damophilus, knows how to "deprive the evil tongue of a far-sounding voice."

Works Cited

Boedeker, Deborah. 1991. "Euripides' Medea and the Vanity of Λόγοι." *CP* 91: 95-112.
Borgeaud, Philippe. 1979 (Eng. trans. 1988). *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece.* Chicago.
Bowra, C. M. 1964. *Pindar.* Oxford.
Braswell, Bruce K. 1988. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar.* Berlin and New York.
Burton, R. W. B. 1962. *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation.* Oxford.
Burkert, W. 1962. "ΓΟΗΣ: Zum griechischen 'Schamanismus'." *RhM.* n.s. 105: 36-55.
Buxton, R. G. A. 1982. *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge.
Carson, Anne. 1986. *Eros the Bittersweet.* Princeton.
Chamoux, F. 1953. *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades.* Paris.
Cook, A. B. 1914 (rpt.1964). *Zeus* I. New York.

Detienne, Marcel. 1967. *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*. Paris.
_____. 1972 (rev. trans. 1994). *The Gardens of Adonis*. Princeton.
Duchemin, Jacqueline. 1967. *Pindare, Pythiques*. Paris.
Faraone, Christopher A. 1993. "The Wheel, the Whip and Other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar *Pythian* 4.213-19." *CJ* 89.1: 1-19.
Farenga, Vincent. 1977. "Pindaric Craft and the Writing of *Pythia* IV." *Helios* 5: 3-37.
Farnell, L. R. 1932. *The Works of Pindar*. London.
_____. 1896. *Cults of the Greek States* II. Oxford.
Frankfurter, David. 1994. "The Magic of Writing and the Writing of Magic: The Power of the Word in Egyptian and Greek Traditions." *Helios* 21.2: 189-221.
Frider, Theoph. Lucas. 1824-27. *Dilucidationum Pindaricarum volumina duo: Pindari Olympia et Pythia*. Berlin.
Gow, A. S. F. 1934. "Ἴυγξ, Ῥόμβος, Rhombus, Turbo." *JHS* 54: 1-13.
Graf, F. 1987. "Orpheus, A Poet Among Men." In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. Jan Bremmer. London and Sydney. 80-106.
Johnston, S. I.. 1983. "The Role of the Charites in Pindar's Odes." Master's Thes. Cornell.
_____. 1990. *Hekate Soteira*. American Classical Studies 21. Atlanta.
_____. Forthcoming. "Corinthian Medea and the Cult of Hera Akraia." In *Medea: Essays on Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art*, eds. J. J. Clauss and S. I. Johnston. Princeton.
Kirkwood, Gordon M. 1982. *Selections from Pindar*. Chico, CA.
Lain Entraglo, P. 1970. *The Therapy of the Word in Classical Antiquity*. New Haven.
Nelson, Grace W. 1946. "A Greek Votive Iynx-Wheel in Boston." *AJA* 64: 443-48.
Nisetich, Frank, trans. and comm. 1980. *Pindar's Victory Songs*. Baltimore.
O'Higgins, Dolores. 1990. "Sappho's Splintered Tongue: Silence in Sappho 31 and Catullus 51." *AJP* 111: 156-67.
_____. Forthcoming. "Medea as Muse: Pindar's *Pythian* 4." In *Medea: Essays on Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art*, eds. J. J. Clauss and S. I. Johnston. Princeton.
Pirenne-Delforge, P. 1993. "L'Iynge dans le discours mythique et les procédures magiques." *Kernos* 6: 277-89.
Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the* Iliad *and* Odyssey. Ithaca.
Romilly, Jacqueline de. 1975. *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, MA.
Schmidt, M. 1978. "Orfeo e Orfismo nella pittura vascolare." *Atti del 14. Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Graecia*. Naples. 116-27.
Segal, Charles. 1973. "Simaetha and the Iynx." *QUCC* 15: 32-43.
_____. 1986. *Pindar's Mythmaking: the Fourth Pythian Ode*. Princeton.
Snell, B. and H. Maehler. 1982. *Pindaros*^{7}. Leipzig.
Tavenner, Eugene. 1933. "Iynx and Rhombus." *TAPA* 64: 109-27.
Trendall, A. D., and Alexander Cambitoglou. 1982. *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia* II. Oxford.
Williams, D. and J. Ogden. 1994. *Greek Gold*. New York.
Winkler, John J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York and London.