



Olympian 7: The Toast and the Future Prayer

Author(s): Nancy Felson Rubin

Source: *Hermes*, 1980, 108. Bd., H. 2 (1980), pp. 248-252

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4476164>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hermes*

JSTOR

Einen völlig anderen Weg hat neulich BOLLACK eingeschlagen, welcher im Text²⁴ ἔστε αἶαν zwischen Cruces setzt und im Kommentar²⁵ zwei Möglichkeiten in Erwägung zieht: daß TEAIAN eine Korruptele ist »et cacherait un mot désignant l' éther ou la voûte à laquelle la lune retourne sa lumière«, und daß EC richtig ist, oder aber daß man an ein Wort wie ἀστράπιος denken müßte – im Sinne von »brillant en haut«. BOLLACK denkt nämlich, daß καθύπερθεν dem γαίης so gegenübergestellt sei, daß sich ein Kontrast zwischen der Helligkeit der oberen und der Dunkelheit der unteren Regionen ergäbe. Aber ich habe bereits bemerkt, daß BOLLACKS Gedankengang in Empedokles keinen echten Anknüpfungspunkt findet. Jedenfalls scheint mir die im übrigen nur mit Bedenken vorgetragene Konjektur nicht eben glücklich, und auch eine Unterscheidung zwischen einem richtigen EC und einem zur Unkenntlichkeit entstellten Wort, das TEAIAN ergeben hätte, hilft nicht viel weiter.

GALLAVOTTI hingegen hat in seiner Ausgabe²⁶ ἔστ(ε)᾽ αἶαν beibehalten. Dies scheint mir die korrekteste Art vorzugehen (auch wenn GALLAVOTTI keine Erklärungen hinsichtlich der Berechtigung des Gebrauchs von ἔστε als Präposition gibt). Aber leider verschließt sich GALLAVOTTI die Möglichkeit, das Fragment richtig zu verstehen, indem er das an und für sich klare καθύπερθεν als »dal di sotto«, also »von unten«, übersetzt (im Sinne, daß der Mond »von unten« die Sonnenstrahlen abfänge).

Tatsächlich ist es jedoch schwierig, καθύπερθεν von ἔστ(ε)᾽ αἶαν zu trennen, und die beste Lösung wäre es, καθύπερθεν als zusätzliche Bestimmung der abschirmenden Wirkung des Mondes auf die Sonnenstrahlen aufzufassen, die sich bis auf die Erde erstreckt.

Göttingen

OTTA WENSKUS

DERS γαῖαν, das von KARSTEN a. a. O. akzeptiert wird (vgl. S. 110 sowie S. 221 f.) paläographisch und vom Sinn her völlig unwahrscheinlich ist STEINS ἰσταμένη (Empedocles Agrigentini fragmenta, Bonn 1852, S. 50).

²⁴ A. a. O., Bd. II, SS. 121 f.

²⁵ A. a. O., Bd. III, SS. 292 f.

²⁶ A. a. O.

OLYMPIAN 7: THE TOAST AND THE FUTURE PRAYER

I would like to interject an observation into the current controversy over the meaning of vv. 5–6 in Olympian 7¹. To my knowledge, no one has yet pointed out the thematic, semantic and syntactic parallels between the father-in-law's toast in the first term of the simile (str. α) and Pindar's future prayer (FP) at the end of the ode (espec. 87–90). The relevant passages from the

¹ Textual references are to C. M. BOWRA, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford 1947). This controversy was recently aired in *Mnemosyne*, Vol. XXIX, Fasc. 3, pp. 233–254, between Bruce Karl BRASWELL (Notes on the Prooemium to Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode) and W. J. VERDENIUS (Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode: Supplementary Comments). VERDENIUS' earlier

proem and the FP are given below, with the two terms of the simile designated as B (*comparée*) and A (*comparant*), respectively.

	στρ. α'	Φιάλαν ὡς εἴ τις ἀφνεᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἐνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζοισαν δρόσῳ δωρήσεται
	B	νεανία γαμβρῶ προπίνων οἰκοθεν οἴκαδε, πάγ – χρυσον κορυφάν κτεάνων 5 [συμποσίου τε χάριν, κᾶδός τε τιμά- σαις ἑόν, ἐν δὲ φίλων παρεόντων θῆκέ νιν ζαλωτὸν ὁμόφρονος εὐνᾶς.]
	ἀντ. α'	καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτὸν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, ἰλάσκομαι,
	A	10 Ὀλυμπία Πυθοῖ τε νικῶντεσσιν· ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὄν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί. ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζω- θάμιος ἀδυμελεῖ θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισι τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν.
		[ἀλλ' ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, νό- τοισιν Ἀταβυρίου μεδέων, τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν, FP ἐπ. ε'
	90	ἄνδρα τε πύξ ἀρετὰν εὐρόντα, δίδοι τέ οἱ αἰδοίαν χάριν καὶ ποτ' ἀστῶν καὶ ποτὶ ξεί- νων.] ἐπεὶ ὕβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδὸν εὐθυπορεῖ, σάφα δαεῖς ἅ τε οἱ πατέρων ὀρ- θαὶ φρένες ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἐχρεον. μὴ κρύπτε κοινὸν σπέρμ' ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος· Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσιν ἔχει θαλίας καὶ πόλις· ἐν δὲ μιᾷ μοίρα χρόνον 95 ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι διαιθύσσοισιν αὖραι.

Thematically, a father-in-law's toast to his prospective son-in-law parallels a poet's prayer on behalf of his victor in that both situations, implicitly or explicitly, involve a three-way bond extending into the future. This triple bond is implicit but unmistakable in the toast. According to Greek custom, the one offering a toast at a symposium always began with libations to the gods, Dionysus in particular: »one drank a little unmixed wine and spilt the dregs on the floor, invoking the deity as one did so«². Thus PW: »Jedes Symposion begann mit einer Trankspende an einen Gott«³. Hence the three-way link in the toast is between father-in-law, son-in-law, and a deity.

commentary, Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode: A Commentary, Meded. Kon. Ned. Akad. v. Wet., afd. Lett. N. S. 35:2 (Amsterdam 1972), deals with some of the issues raised in the 1976 Mnemosyne exchange, and also provides a thorough account of the literature on Olympian 7 up to 1970.

² Robert FLÁCELIÈRE, *Daily Life in Ancient Greece at the Time of Pericles* (NY 1966, trans. Peter Green from 1959 orig.), p. 180ff.

³ PW, s. v. 'Symposion'; concerning the format of a Greek symposium, s. v. 'Comissatio'; concerning the libation to Dionysus, s. v. 'Agathodaimon'.

A bond between poet and victor results from the obligation (χρέος) generated by the victor's victory and the poet's fulfillment of that χρέος through the composition and delivery of the victory ode. In his FP Pindar as poet explicitly invokes Zeus on Diagoras' behalf, requesting divine sanction for his poem and for the victor. Hence a triple link again exists, this time between the poet, the victor, and a deity.

Since the opening simile already establishes a close comparison between father-in-law and poet⁴, it makes sense that this comparison is sustained in the future prayer. The most concrete and literal tie between the simile and the FP is in the person of the poet, who figures in A as he does in the FP. There are verbal echoes as well: the χάρις repetitions (συμποσίου τε χάριν, 5; Χάρις ζωθάλμιος, 11; αἰδοίαν χάριν, 89; Ἐρατιδᾶν τοι σὺν χαρίτεσσι, 93)⁵; the collocation of χάριτες and θαλία (93–94) which seems to echo Χάρις ζωθάλμιος (11)⁶; the expression ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοῖαι (95) which echoes ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον (11). Both Χάρις ζωθάλμιος in A and Zeus in the FP look down from above, distilling favors. Moreover, the argument in the FP seems to depend on a logical connection posited in the simile, especially in the δλβιος maxim (10), between victories, epinicia, and ultimate blessedness. Thus in language and sense the FP is reminiscent of the simile, and the comparisons established in the simile between three »characters« and their interactions are sustained for the FP.

In syntax the opening lines of the FP (87–90) parallel a portion of the toast (5–7). These syntactically parallel passages are indicated in the Greek text quoted above by square brackets. Note that, just as τιμάσαις in the first term of the simile takes a double direct object (χάριν and κᾶδος), so also τιμα (88) takes two direct objects, τεθμὸν and ἄνδρα in the FP. Both prior direct objects (χάριν and τεθμὸν) are abstract qualities, while both second objects (κᾶδος and ἄνδρα) are specific persons. Moreover, the prior direct objects in both passages are preceded and governed by a genitive (cf. συμποσίου and ὕμνου)⁷; and both the toast and the FP, which conclude their respective episodes, occur amidst a crowd of onlookers. The words denoting the spectators are in each instance expressed in the genitive plural, however for different syntactic reasons: in the toast, φίλων παρεόντων is a genitive absolute; in the prayer, the crowd of citizens and strangers is genitive after ποτὶ (= πρός).

⁴ For a full discussion of the correspondences between the two terms of the simile see Gilbert LAWALL, *The Cup, the Rose, and the Winds in Pindar's Seventh Olympian*, Riv. Fil. 39 (1961), 33–47; David C. YOUNG, *Three Odes of Pindar* (Leiden 1968), espec. pp. 73 ff; and C. M. BOWRA, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964), pp. 24–26. With this passage cf. Isth. 6, 1–9

⁵ I tend to agree with P. H. SCHRIJVERS, quoted by VERDENIUS (Supplementary Comments, p. 245), that the four instances of χάρις (or Χάρις) are »somehow interrelated within the framework of this poem«. VERDENIUS affirms this relationship, but denies its structural importance. In a later, more extensive analysis of the narrative and semantic structures of Olympian 7 I hope to clarify two axes of unity in this poem, and to show how repetitions at multiple levels (phonetic, metric, morphemic, semantic, thematic) contribute to unity.

⁶ So YOUNG, *Three Odes of Pindar*, p. 97, where he argues that »the collocation of χάριτες and θαλία, perhaps again suggested by the name of the Grace, Thalia, indicates that the χάριτες Ἐρατιδᾶν are substantially the victory of Diagoras and the resulting, current song; for these were the subjects which first brought about the unusual phrase in v. 11, Χάρις ζωθάλμιος«.

⁷ This syntactic parallel argues against BRASWELL's suggestion to restore the dative συμποσίῳ (preserved in the oldest mss. tradition, A) for the genitive συμποσίου; see BRASWELL, p. 237 ff. In response to BRASWELL's suggestion VERDENIUS, Supplementary Comments, p. 245, states: »The reading συμποσίῳ seems to me a mere scribal error: ου and ω are easily confused in minuscule script«. My analysis would support VERDENIUS' view.

This parallel in the arrangement of grammatically and phonetically similar words in the two passages supports the thematic and semantic parallels noted above. The overall effect on the listener or reader is complex. A subtle similarity between »ordinance of song« (ὕμνου τεθμόν) and »grace of the symposium« (συμποσίου χάριν) emerges: both poetry and drinking party follow a prescribed format. Since τεθμός is defined (LSJ, s. v. θεσμός) as »that which is laid down, law, ordinance«, it can apply equally to composition of epinicia according to set rules and to celebration through a toast and gift according to set rules. The word τεθμός emphasizes continuity with tradition, conformity to a pre-established and ritually sanctioned format. That such continuity and conformity are important to Pindar is a familiar enough observation: VERDENIUS, in his note on τεθμός, states that »Pindar is strongly conscious of the fact that his profession is subject to strict rules«⁸. Moreover, as regards the symposium (no matter its occasion), numerous ancient sources attest to the strict sequence it must follow⁹. Here, where the occasion is clearly a marriage agreement or ἐγγύησις¹⁰, performing the ritual as prescribed is crucial.

Of the ἐγγύησις ceremony FLACÈLIÈRE writes: »The *engyésis*, then, was a promise of marriage, but an extremely binding one: it established strong links between the suitor and his future bride long before they were actually married. . . . any solemnly pronounced statement or ritual gesture. . . , even if no formal oath was involved, they regarded as fraught with most serious consequences, and one could not repudiate any engagement entered upon under conditions of this sort without exposing oneself to the possibility of divine retribution. It was not only a prayer or curse that possessed this unequivocally magical power: any formula by which one bound oneself in the presence of the gods had a similar efficacy, and there is reason to suppose that the ceremony of *engyésis* took place in front of the domestic altar« (p. 61).

The solemnity and ritual nature of the celebration that opens Olympian 7 is possibly underscored by the somewhat unusual use of τεθμόν with ὕμνου; though Pindar uses τεθμός elsewhere in connection with poetry (Isth. 6,20: τεθμόν μοι φαμί σαφέστατον ἔμμεν; Nem. 4,33: τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός)¹¹, and also in connection with the institution of the Olympian and Isthmian games (Nem. 10,33 and Ol. 13,40), the expression nevertheless seems to have ritual connotations¹². Thus it belongs to the same semantic category as ἰλάσκομαι, »I propitiate, pay homage to« (9)¹³. Both words emphasize the solemn, quasi religious nature of the bond between poet and victor.

⁸ Pindar's Seventh Olympian: A Commentary, p. 122.

⁹ PW (note 3 above) provides a full list of ancient references.

¹⁰ So BRASWELL, p. 241, note 27, citing in particular W. ERDMANN, Die Ehe im alten Griechenland, Münchener Beitr. z. Papyrusforsch. u. antiken Rechtsgeschichte XX (Munich 1934) pp., 225 – 249 and 250 – 266.

¹¹ Cf. also Ol. 13, 29, στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν, and Ol. 6, 69, τεθμόν μέγιστον ἀέθλων.

¹² RUECH's translation of this line (»cet hymne, dû, selon le rite, au vainqueur olympique«) emphasizes the ritual connotation. Thus Pindar sees his obligation to the victor as religious in nature, and comparable to the bond between father-in-law and son-in-law pledged by the toast and the gift of the drinking cup.

¹³ For a brief review of the controversy over the meaning of this verb, see VERDENIUS, Supplementary Comments, p. 245; Pindar uses such ritual vocabulary in a figurative sense, in order to convey his wish to immortalize the victor by his song.

In various ways, then, the relationships established in the simile – between a father-in-law and Pindar; a son-in-law and the prize-winning athletes; a god, Dionysus, whose gift is wine, and the Muses, whose gift is poetry – are revitalized through the echoes in the FP. However, what was a *fait accompli* for the prize-winners (11) is only requested (cogently, to be sure) for the special victor Diagoras. Having received $\phi\tilde{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota$, they gain blessedness, according to the logic of the $\delta\lambda\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ maxim; by this same logic, Pindar implicitly argues, Diagoras too should become blessed. The quality of Pindar's ode will have some effect on his victor's future »olbosity«, and hence in the FP the poet requests honor for the victor's *ode* as well as for the victor. The ode and the victor are intimately joined, like the $\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\eta$ and the bridegroom-to-be. By implication, the connection between Pindar's »house« and that of the victor is pledged and sealed through the victory ode¹⁴, the sweet fruit of Pindar's mind. If the fate suggested for the son-in-law in the simile – the harmony, fecundity, future blessedness – is any indication, a positive divine response to Pindar's future prayer is felt in Olympian 7 despite the usual precariousness of the human condition¹⁵.

Athens, Georgia

NANCY FELSON RUBIN

¹⁴ Included among the toasts in ancient literature cited by PW (note 3 above) is the following passage from Plut., *quaest. conv. iv. 3*, which stresses the connection between houses at wedding feasts. Here Theon is contributing to a discussion of 'Why it is customary to invite the most guests to wedding suppers': »But add, if you will, a further point, that these particular banquets are not merely friendly entertainments but important family occasions, which solemnize the incorporation of a new set of relatives into the family. What is more important than this, at the union of two houses, each father-in-law regards it as a duty to demonstrate good will to the friends and relatives of the other, and so the guest-list is doubled.« (Loeb trans.)

¹⁵ This view of the vicissitudes maxim is consonant with YOUNG's conclusion (There Odes of Pindar, p. 99): »In this poem, obviously, shifting winds need not be a bad omen; they can, and do, bring good as well as bad.« However, I have reached my conclusions from a different line of reasoning than Young, who has perhaps overemphasized the connection of the maxim to weather imagery. I concur on this matter with VERDENIUS, who states (Pindar's Seventh Olympian: A Commentary, p 125): »The last sentence simply means: 'Remember that human fortune is changeable'«.

THE MEANING OF 'CHOEPHOROI' 827 – 830

As Orestes prepares to kill his mother, the chorus stand by with advice, encouragement, and appropriate mythical paradigms for emulation (Cho. 827 – 837). Yet the import of mesode γ , indeed of the entire surrounding stasimon, is difficult to make out because of corruption in the text and condensed, cryptic lyricism, puzzling even by Aeschylean standards. Page reads the following:

σὺ δὲ θαρσῶν δταν ἦκη μέρος ἔργων,
ἐπαύσας θροεούσα
»τέκνον«, »ἔργω πατρός« αὐδα,
καὶ πέραιν' ἀνεπίμοφον ἄταν.

[μεσῶδ.γ