UDC 82-1/-9 Philologia Classica. 2016. Vol. 11. Fasc. 2

# THE CHILDREN OF MNEMOSYNE: A CONTRASTIVE METAPOETICS OF PINDAR AND BACCHYLIDES[1]

*Boris Maslov*

University of Chicago, 1010 East 59th Street, Classics 116 Chicago, IL 60637 USA

National Research University "Higher School of Economics",
17 Promyshlennaia, St. Petersburg 198099, Russian Federation; maslov@uchicago.edu

The article investigates the uses to which the figures of the Muse(s) are put in the poetics of Pindar and Bacchylides, considered against the background of their earlier employments in elegiac and melic poetry. Based on a thorough examination of the evidence, it argues that the two poets pursue different strategies: whereas Bacchylides develops a poetic mythology of named Muses (particularly, Ourania), Pindar redeploys the single unnamed Muse of the earlier hexameter and choral traditions, envisioning her as the poet's collaborator. Pindar may thus be seen to originate the notion of the Muse as a deity associated with poetic composition, as contrasted with her mnemonic-epistemic role in hexameter verse.

*Keywords*: Archaic Greek lyric, epinikion, metapoetics, authorship, the Muses, Pindar.

The epinikion is unique among Archaic Greek melic genres in that it is represented, for us, by two sizable contemporary corpora. In this regard, epinikion can be compared to Attic tragedy and the "Homeric" corpus of dactylic hexameter poetry; in the latter two cases, intensive comparative work has yielded profound insights into both the poetics of particular texts and, more generally, the evolution of the literary system in Ancient Greece. Much less work has been done on a contrastive poetics of epinikion. Since the discovery of the papyrus containing the work of Bacchylides in 1896, the tendency has been to view him as a "lesser" Pindar, similar in many respects, but not as challenging, forceful or original.[2] In fact, a systematic juxtaposition of the poetics of Bacchylides and Pindar, considered irrespective of their relative "aesthetic" value, could tell us much about the constitution of professional poetic self-consciousness at a crucial moment of transition from the Archaic period, largely dominated by the poetics of genre, to the Classical period, when authors — ranging from Aristophanes to Thucydides — were pursuing self-consciously individual projects. Significant divergences between the two epinician poets permit us to assess the areas and the extent of their individual innovation or traditionalism. The evidence of metapoetics — the manner and fashion in which texts refer to their own composition or performance — is particularly valuable for analyzing the emergent qualities of the literary.[3] As I will argue, the metapoetics of the Muses indicates an effort,

[1] At an earlier stage of my work on this paper, which goes back to my Ph.D. thesis, I have greatly benefitted from the advice of Leslie Kurke and Viktor Zhivov. I am also grateful to the two anonymous referees of *Philologia Classica* whose very generous responses to the paper aided in revising it for publication. My work on this article has been supported by Russian Science Foundation (RSF), project 16–18–10250.

[2] Symptomatic in this regard is the approach taken in Elroy Bundy's *Studia Pindarica* (Bundy 1986 [1962]), whose express aim is to reconstruct shared patterns of "enkomiastic" rhetoric; accordingly, examples from Bacchylides (or indeed other, more distantly related authors) are freely drawn to make sense of difficult Pindaric passages. The most recent monograph on Bacchylides takes a largely apologetic stance on the poet (Fearns 2007).

[3] For an extended argument along these lines see Maslov 2015.



DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2016.202 

by both poets, to develop distinctive strategies of "branding" their texts not only as specially composed for the occasion, but also as uniquely produced by a particular author. In particular, what accounts for the rise of individuating metapoetic markers is the exigency of choral (re)performance of epinikia that made the employment of author's name in a σφραγίς, as in the opening of the Theognidea, impracticable. In this respect, the late Archaic genre of the victory ode, in which the constraints of a traditional medium and collective performance practice encountered a highly innovative artistic culture, presents what is perhaps the most telling evidence of a poetics caught in a moment of transformation. Before turning to a close examination of the victory ode, however, it will be necessary to survey the appearances of the Muses in earlier elegiac and melic poets.[4]

## The Muse(s) in melic and elegiac poetry

Composers of elegiac verse, not unexpectedly, appear to be particularly dependent on uses that derive from the hexametric tradition. Notably, in the entire body of Greek elegiacs, the Muse appears in the singular only once: in a parody of an epic invocation in Hipponax fr. 128 W, which uses the form Mousa VOC + ἔννεπε + PN (familiar from the *Odyssey*), yet with an appended ὅπως-clause that is usually rendered "how he may die a wretched death … on the shore of the barren sea."[5] While idiosyncratic from the syntactic point of view, the passage reflects the original use of ἐν(ν)έπειν with an object clause. As for appearances of the Muses in the plural, they fall into two categories. First, we find two appeals to the Muses: Solon fr. 13 W (which includes a notably broad request to bestow on the speaker 'prosperity' coming from the gods), and Theognis 1.15 W, where the Muses and the Kharites, singing together at Kadmos's marriage, utter the maxim "what is beautiful is agreeable, what is not beautiful is not agreeable" (ὅττι καλὸν φίλον ἐστί, τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί). While no definite conclusions can be drawn based on just two instances of usage, these may point to an older stratum in the representation of the Muses as potent divinities whose domain was not limited to verbal art and musical performance.[6]

---

[4] The present work builds on Maslov 2016, which discusses the metapoetics of the Muses in the corpus of dactylic hexameter poetry as well as in early choral lyric. Types of usage — "the clear-voiced Muse", "the prooimial Muse" — that will be referred to throughout this article are introduced in this earlier publication.

[5] Μοῦσά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα τὴν ποντοχάρυβδιν, / τὴν ἐνγαστριμάχαιραν, ὃς ἐσθίει οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, /ἐννεφ', ὅπως ψηφῖδε < > κακὸν οἷτον ὀλεῖται. This poem was quoted by Polemon of Ilium (*apud* Athenaeum 698b) in demonstration of the thesis that Hipponax invented parody. Faraone 2004 translates ὅπως as introducing a purpose clause "in order that he may die," arguing that the Hipponax fragment is not an epic parody, but a hexametrical incantation directed at a would-be *pharmakos* represented as a famine demon. Faraone acknowledges that the invocation of the Muse presents the most serious impediment to his argument, but proposes to translate the opening request as "Muse, identify the son of Eurumedōn *as* the Sea-Monster etc." (taking ἐν(ν)έπειν to mean 'call, identify'). This is, to my mind, unlikely, since the reference to the Muse, in combination with ἔν(ν)επε, must still be a (parodic) echo of a prooimial convention. Faraone's alternative explanation — "it is sublimely fitting that a master of *iambos* should call upon his Muse" — is not supported by any parallels in iambic poets and, moreover, can be argued to be anachronistic: the poet's Muse (sing.), insofar as we can tell, does not predate Pindar. On the other hand, a parody of an epic diegetic device may not be out of place in a text that, as Faraone demonstrates, stages a *pharmakos* ritual. Faraone points out that Hipponax's use of the patronymic "son of the One-Who-Rules-Widely" identifies the *pharamakos* as an aristocrat, and there was "a tradition in scapegoat myths of connecting famine or plague with the insatiable greed of a young prince or aristocrat" (2004, 226). What appears to be an innocuous literary parody may be viewed as an important testimony to a sociopolitical dimension in the early reception of Homeric epic.

[6] Cf. Maslov 2016, 440–441.

The second, apparently more recent category comprises references to the Muses as a metonym for poetic activity broadly conceived.[7] An especially common collocation is δῶρον / δῶρα 'gifts of, things provided by' with the genitive plural Μουσέων (Μουσῶν),[8] which, contrary to modern intuitions, does not refer to an innate gift of poetic composition, but rather to *mousikē* in general, i.e. music, song, and — in the case of recited verse — any kind of verbal art that employs meter.

By the same token, the association with the Muses becomes a means of referring to a specialist in poetic craft. Uniquely within the elegiac corpus, Theognis declares that "an attendant and messenger of the Muses" should not be over-eager in sharing his knowledge with the uninitiated (Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον Theognis 1.769–772 W; cf. Hes. *Theog*. 100). Similar expressions will recur in Bacchylides.

In the scarce remains of solo melic poetry, the Muses appear several times in the vocative plural, in conjunction with the Kharites. [9] The usage in Sappho (frr. 103, 128; cf. 127 LP) is an archaism in that it retains the older meaning of the Muses as a choral group.[10] Yet there are also instances of metonymic expansion: in Sappho fr. 55 LP, we find an allusive reference to "roses from Pieria" of which the speaker claims a share; in Anacreon, fr. 346 PMG (frr. 11+3+6, lines 8–9) one encounters the familiar collocation δῶρα Πιερίδων.[11] In Stesichorus's fr. 210, reconstructed on the basis of a quotation in Aristophanes (*Pax* 775), an appeal to a single Muse may represent an independent reflex of the earlier choral convention of invoking the "clear-voiced Muse"; given an overt rejection of the topic of war, it may also be a parody of the "prooimial Muse" of the later Greek epic.[12]

It appears that, direct references to Homer aside, Archaic poets working in elegiac and melic media do not participate in the semantic developments that the metapoetics of the Muses undergoes in dactylic hexameter poetry (Maslov 2016). In addition to retaining the notion of the Muses as a choral group, this subcorpus shows an independent metonymic development 'singing-and-dancing collective of the Muses' > 'the art of poetry/music' (*mousikē*); later on, this term would develop an even broader metonymic meaning 'intellectual life, culture', equivalent to Latin *humanitas*.[13] Keeping in mind the risks of re-

[7] For the same semantic development, cf. the use of Ἀφροδίτη or Κύπρις for what is more commonly described as ἔργα Ἀφροδίτης.

[8] Already in Alcman fr. 59b PMG. Later examples: Arch. fr. 1.2 W (Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος); Arch. fr. 328 W (Μουσῶν καὶ βίου σαόφρονος); Solon fr. 13.51 W (Ὀλυμπιάδων Μουσέων πάρα δῶρα διδαχθείς); Solon fr. 26.2 W (ἔργα δὲ Κυπρογενοῦς νῦν μοι φίλα καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Μουσέων); Theogn. 1.250 (ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰοστεφάνων); Theogn. 1.1056 (Μουσῶν μνησόμεθ' ἀμφότεροι. / αὗται γὰρ τάδ' ἔδωκαν ἔχειν κεχαρισμένα δῶρα).

[9] One example of the word μοῦσα in the accusative singular is in Alcaeus 304, where the fragment provides no context; the meaning 'poem' is possible. Ibycus fr. 282.23–30 PMG includes a rehearsal of the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships: here we are dealing with a highly self-conscious sequence of allusions to *Il.* 2.484ff., as well as the *Nautilia* portion of Hesiod's *Works and Days* (see Steiner 2005 with further bibliography). I quote Campbell's text (1982–1993, 3, 222): καὶ τὰ μὲ[ν ἄν] Μοίσαι σεσοφισμέναι / εὖ Ἑλικωνίδ[ες] ἐμβαίεν λόγω[ι· / ϯθνατ[ὸ]ς δ' οὔ κ[ε]ν ἀνὴρ / διερὸς [……]ϯ τὰ ἕκαστα εἴποι, / ναῶν ὅ[σσος ἀρι]θμὸς ἀπ' Αὐλίδος / Αἰγαῖον διὰ [πό]ντον ἀπ' Ἄργεος / ἠλύθο[ν ἐς Τροία]ν / ἱπποτρόφο[ν.

[10] An extensive argument for the original chorality of the Muses is presented in (Maslov 2016).

[11] On Sappho's usage cf. Ford 2002, 14.

[12] The reconstructed text (Campbell 1982–1993, 3, 126) reads: Μοῖσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένα πεδ' ἐμεῦ / κλείοισα θεῶν τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε δαίτας / καὶ θαλίας μακάρων.

[13] On the later broadening of the sphere of the Muses' influence, see Curtius 1953, 228–246, who cites Cicero's "cum Musis, id est, cum humanitate et doctrina" (*Tusc*. 5.23, 66); cf. (Otto 1955, 36–9, 68).

lying on negative evidence, it is significant that in these texts the Muse is never associated with poetic inspiration or composition.

### Bacchylidean Muses

In both Pindar and Bacchylides, the Muse(s) are highly prominent, and both display conservative as well as innovative features in the uses to which they put these figures. In view of how little of earlier choral lyric survives, innovations often have to be speculatively deduced from differences between the two poets. On the other hand, a comparative analysis of the appearances of the Muse(s) in Pindar and Bacchylides is of great aid for understanding Pindar's distinctive contribution to the metapoetic apparatus that was inherited by the later tradition. This two-fold goal calls for detailed discussion of the relevant usage in both poets. I begin with Bacchylides's corpus, which, due to its smaller size,[14] can serve as a testing ground for the investigation of the Pindaric usage. An overview of the evidence is presented in Table 1. Out of 30 total instances, there are 4 examples of the Muse in the singular, 16 of the Muses in the plural, 10 mentions of three particular Muses by name (all in the singular), in particular Ourania (4), Kleiō (4), and Kalliopa (1).

*Table 1:* **Muse(s) in Bacchylides (30 total)**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SINGULAR (*Mousa*) **4** | **1** | voc. | DF 1 (diegetic frame deriving from catalogue poetry)[15] | 15.47 |
| | **3** | nom. | (generic) 'musical performance, song' | 2.11, 3.92, 21.4 |
| PLURAL (*Mousai*, *Moisai*, *Pierides*) **16** | **5** | nom., voc., acc., dat., nom./voc. | choral divinities | 1.1–7, 13.189, 19.35–6, 28.9, 65.13–14 |
| | **8** | gen. | = (met.) *mousikē* ("gifts/adornment/etc. of…"); 'poet's competence' (2) | 3.71, 5.4, 9.87, 10.11, 20b4, 20c3; 19.3, 55.2 |
| | **3** | gen. | "servant etc. of…" = 'poet' | 5.193, 9.3, 63.1 |
| NAMED (*Ourania* 4, *Kle[i]ō*[16] 4, *Kalliopa* 2) **10** | **6** | 3 voc., 2 nom., 1 gen. | modifications of the prooimial Muse [*Ourania* 2, *Kle[i]ō* 3, *Kalliopa* 1] | 6.10, 16.3, 3.3; 12.2, 13.195; 5.176 |
| | **1** | gen. | (met.) "honor from…" [*Kalliopa*] | 19.3 |
| | **2** | gen. | "servant etc. of…" [*Ourania*] | 4.8, 5.13 |
| | **1** | nom. | ? no context [*Kleiō*] | 12.43 |

The grammatical case in which the Muse(s) appear can give us important indications about diachronically distinct patterns of usage,[17] some of which recur in Pindar. The absolute majority of examples in Bacchylides are in the nominative (the Muse(s) as the agent), genitive (the Muses as an attribute), and vocative (Muse(s) addressed). Practically

[14] The corpus of Bacchylides includes 11,171 words, including dubia (vs. 31,052 words in Pindar). Data is based on Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, whose text is based on Irigoin 1993 for Bacchylides, Snell and Maehler 1987, 1989 for Pindar.

[15] DF is short for "diegetic frame." The abbreviations — DF 1 (catalogue poetry) and DF 2 ("the clear-voiced Muse") — used in the Tables are explained in (Maslov 2016).

[16] Form without iota printed *metri gratia* in 3.3 (papyrus reads ΚΛΕΙΟΙ).

[17] Restrictions on case usage can provide important information on the history of concepts. To give an example from a different historical period: in Machiavelli's Italian, *lo stato* 'state' is generally used in the accusative, and only very rarely in the nominative, because, in contrast to later political theory, it cannot as yet be thought of as an agent of action (Hexter 1973, 187–8). A similar disproportion in case usage has been observed for Latin *res publica* (Stark 1937, esp. 35).

all of the genitive uses are to be explained by the kind of metonymic expansion observed in elegy and solo melic poetry, which equates the Muses with the 'domain of *mousikē*' (this usage accounts for about half of all instances: 14 out of 29). Nevertheless, a shift in emphasis may be detected in what phenomena Bacchylides assigns to that domain.

First, Bacchylides uses the attributive genitive of the Muses (or of a name of a particular Muse) five times to create an ad-hoc meaning 'specialist in poetic craft' and (possibly) 'performer': Bacchylides's speaker refers to Hesiod as an "attendant of the Muses" (πρόπολος Μουσᾶν 5.193) and to himself as a "divine spokesman of the violet-eyed Muses" (Μουσᾶν γε ἰοβλεφάρων θεῖος προφ[άτ]ας 9.3) and a "sweet-speaking rooster of Ourania of the lordly φόρμιγξ" (ἁδυεπὴς ἀ[ναξιφόρ]μιγγος Οὐρ[αν]ίας ἀλέκτωρ 4.8), as well as a "famous [or: new?] attendant of golden-frontletted Ourania" (χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας κλεινὸς [καινὸς?] θεράπων 5.13; cf. also: [Πιερ]ίδων θερα[π] 63.1). In the last passage, the reference is unmistakably to the poet Bacchylides, which suggests that other instances also refer to the composer of the text, not its performer.

The redeployment of this construction to describe the poet is a distinctive feature of Bacchylidean metapoetics. The nouns used are in part traditional — θεράπων, πρόπολος (cf. Hes. *Theog*. 100, Theogn. 1.769: Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον) — and in part unexpected, such as ἀλέκτωρ 'rooster'. The use of προφάτας to refer to the poet can be paralleled in Pindar[18]; it has no mantic connotations and is equivalent to ἄγγελος 'messenger' in Theognis 1.769.

The general idea of Theognis 1.769–772 — poetic σοφία is not something that is or should be shared indiscriminately — recurs in Bacchylides's fr. 55, where the familiar collocation "the gifts of the Muses" has a more restricted meaning: the gift given by the Muses to the poet. The same shift in meaning can be observed in Bacchylides 19 (Dith. 5).1–14, where the Athenian chorus seems to address the poet as the "much-praised Cean toiling mind (εὐαίνετε Κηΐα μέριμνα)." After stating that the one who "has obtained [λάχησι] the gifts of the Pierian Muses" can travel "a myriad of roads of immortal songs" (μυρία κέλευθος ἀμβροσίων μελέων), the chorus urges the addressee "to take the best road, the one that has obtained [λαχοῖσαν] the foremost honor from Kalliopa." The poet now lays a claim to an intimate, personal relationship with the deity.[19] More specifically, in this passage, the mastery of the poet is expressed by the topos of ἀφθονία 'abundance' or εὐπορία, which is also quite prominent in Pindar.[20]

[18] Of the poet: Pai. 6.6. The morphologically transparent etymological meaning of the word in the Archaic period is 'one who speaks out'; in N. 9.50 Pindar uses it of a mixing bowl which "proclaims" the celebration. Elsewhere, he applies it to μάντεις who announce the gods' will (Teiresias, Teneros, and Amphiareus) and in fr. 150 Pindar boldly puts the speaker in the position of a spokesman of the prophesying Muse. Fuller discussion in Maslov 2015, 188–201.

[19] Contrast Archilochus (fr. 1 W), whose speaker deems himself "an attendant of the lord Enualios, skilled in the lovely gift of the Muses" (εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος): the speaker did not receive a special gift, but rather claims expertise in the domain of the Muses. It is also worth pointing to the Aeolic form of the participle λαχοῖσαν — an *unicum* in Bacchylides, who otherwise uses only Ionic dialect participial forms (Verdier 1972, 49) — which here seems to lend a lofty air to the metapoetic statement.

[20] In Greek, εὐπορία 'resourcefulness' is the opposite of ἀπορία. While Pindar does not use this word, it has already been applied to his poetics (Kurke 1988, 113; cf. Miller 1979, 184–5 on the topos of εὐπορία in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo). This idea may have originated in the notion of the Muses as agents of divine omniscience, as they figure in catalogue poetry. Yet whereas in the *Iliad* the Muses serve as a source of narrative detail to an otherwise incapable narrator, in Bacchylides and Pindar they guarantee availability of a variety of poetic resources from which the poet can freely choose. The linkage of poetic vocation and

A further peculiarity of the Bacchylidean usage consists in his fondness for individual Muses, and in particular for Ourania, whose prominence in Bacchylides in not matched by any other poet (Pindar never even mentions Ourania). While it is not clear why Bacchylides favored Ourania, what seems certain is that frequent mentions of this figure were intended as markers of the Bacchylidean poetic brand.

Given the prominence of particular Muses in Bacchylides, the relative dearth of references to the single unnamed Muse is worth our attention. The only instance of vocative use is a reminiscence of the metapoetic frame associated with catalogue sections in Homer, with the singular Muse substituted for the plural Muses (for the substitution cf. already *Il.* 2.761): "Muse, who was the first to begin the righteous words?" (Μοῦσα, τίς πρῶτος λόγων ἄρχεν δικαίων; 15[Dith. 1].47). As in the case of Ibycus fr. 282 PMG, this reflex is in all likelihood mediated by the *Iliad*. The three other uses represent the generic employment of the noun μοῦσα to refer to 'musical performance, song': "sweet Muse" (Μοῦσά τε γλυκεῖα) is mentioned along with "sweet wine in Boiotian cups" (καὶ Βοιωτίοισιν ἐν σκύφοισιν οἶνος ἡδύς fr. 21.4), the Muse — in this case, referring to remembrance through musical performance — is said to nourish "the light of accomplishment" (ἀρετᾶ[ς … φέγγος 3.92); finally, there is "the Muse born on the spot" — i.e. song performed at the site of the victory (Μοῦσ' αὐθιγενής 2.11; on this epinikian sub-genre, see Gelzer 1985). Bacchylidean usage thus offers further support to the argument (advanced in Maslov 2016) that the solitary Muse (without appellative) is a result of later semantic development and cannot be claimed to have predated the Muses as a dancing-and-singing collective.

It is significant that the widest distribution of grammatical cases — i.e. of different syntactic, as well as semantic, functions — is attested for the plural Muses. They carry traditional epithets describing their appearance (ἐρασιπ[λοκ 28.9, χρυσάμ[πυκες] 65.13–14, φοινικοκραδέμνοις 13.189), in contrast to the adjectives with abstract meaning 'sweet' and 'born on the spot' in the case of the single Muse. Similar kind of distribution is found in Pindar, again pointing to the primacy of the choral Muses. Two further examples of the plural Muses represent likely survivals of pre-epic usage. Bacchylides's *Epinikion* 1 begins with a cultic appeal to the Pierian maidens to come and praise Poseidon (the patron deity of the Isthmian festival), and 19(*Dith.* 5).35 refers to the ability of the Pieridai to provide "a respite from grief." While the former points to the original choral aspect of the Muses, the latter may be either an allusion to *Theogony* 98–103 or (more likely) a reflection of a broader set of beliefs about the healing (*epaoidic*) capacity of the Muses.

It is noteworthy that Bacchylides never (and Pindar only rarely) employs the prooimial "clear-voiced Muse" that was prominent both in the early choral poets and in the more recent hexameter corpus.[21] This metapoetic device, a common feature of poetic culture of the seventh-sixth centuries, apparently became outdated by the time of Bacchylides and

---

the Muses is, of course, already present in the proem to Hesiod's *Theogony*, but Hesiod's encounter with the Muses should probably be read as a document of the putative poetic culture of θεσπιαοιδοί (Koller 1965; Maslov 2016, 418–419). Moreover, the notion of poetic professionalism consistently expressed in Bacchylides (or Pindar) is couched in terms that are different from Hesiod's.

[21] The dactylic hexameter corpus, as it is here construed, encompasses the Homeric Hymns, which display a diachronically stratifiable set of metapoetic patterns, some of which predate the *Odyssey* proem, as well as attest to the influence of the early choral appeal to Μοῦσα λίγεια. Complete list of occurrences of this collocation: *Od.* 24.62, Hes. *Scutum* 206, *Hom. Hymn to Mother of the Gods* 2, *Hom. Hymn to Dioscuri* 1, *to Hephaistos* 1, Alcman 14a1, 28.1.1 (adverb λίγ'), cf. also fr. 30.1 PMG, Pind. Pai. 14.32, Stes. 63.1, 101.1 PMG; it is also a likely supplement for a lacuna in Sappho 44.22 LP.

Pindar. For these poets, moreover, the prooimial Muse was more closely associated with recited epic than with early choral lyricists, as the rhapsodes' success placed hexameter poetry — first and foremost, the Homeric corpus — at the center of the late Archaic literary system. This renders the task of disentangling the influences of choral and hexametrical conventions in Bacchylides and Pindar particularly challenging. Nevertheless, it is precisely the prooimial Muse — the Muse whose involvement was thought to be essential to any exercise in *mousikē* and who is therefore so often invoked in the beginning of the text — that forms the basis for the emergence of the Muse as a goddess of poetic inspiration. Bacchylides and Pindar both testify to the crucial early phase of this development.

Bacchylides twice begins an epinikion with an appeal to Kleiō, whose general association in Archaic Greece must have been with κλέος 'fame' (in later allegoresis, she became the Muse of History). While the idea of poetic praise bestowing κλέος goes back to a shared Indo-European tradition,[22] Bacchylides's reference point may be more specific. He prefers the Ionic form Κλειώ (Pindar has Κλεώ), attested in *Theogony* 77, which in itself is not surprising in light of Bacchylides's Ionizing dialect. Yet it is significant that Bacchylides seems to reserve Kleiō for opening apostrophes, whereas Ourania never stands in the vocative, even where she seems to stand in for the prooimial Muse as a diegetic framing device: in 16.3 the speaker claims that "Ourania sent for me from Pieria a cargo ship loaded with hymns" (ὁλκ]άδ' ἔπεμψεν ἐμοὶ χρυσέαν [Πιερ]ίαθεν ἐ[ύθ]ρονος [Ο]ὐρανία) and in 6.10–14 we are told that "the hymn of Ourania is honoring" the son of Aristomenos "on account of his victory" (Οὐρανίας ὕμνος ἕκατι Νίκα[ς] … γεραίρει). In the latter example "the hymn of Ourania" should be construed as a periphrasis for 'Bacchylides's poem', given the poet's use of this Muse as a branding device.

It is thus conceivable that the key association of Kleiō was with κλέα ἀνδρῶν, lit. 'fames of men' celebrated by epic poetry. This would explain why Bacchylides employs Kleiō as an analogue of the prooimial Muse (placed in the vocative) of poetry written in dactylic hexameter. Whereas in the case of Ourania what is emphasized is the notion of εὐπορία, Kleiō has a more restricted, conventional role. In *Epinikion* 3, commissioned by Hieron of Syracuse, she is addressed in a characteristically hymnic fashion, except that Bacchylides mixes immortal and mortal objects of praise: "Kleiō of sweet gifts, hymn Demeter who reigns in Sicily of the best grain, and the violet-crowned Kore [Persephone] and the swift Olympian-running horses of Hieron" (Ἀριστο[κ]άρπου Σικελίας κρέουσαν Δ[ά]ματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε Κούραν ὕμνει, γλυκύδωρε Κλεοῖ, θοάς τ' Ὀ[λυμ]πιοδρόμους Ἱέρωνος ἵππ[ο]υς 3.1–4). In the opening of another epinikion, Kleiō "who lords over hymns" (ὑμνοάνασσ') is asked to guide straight "our minds" (φρένας ἀμετέρας) as a wise steersman would, "if ever she did that before" (εἰ δή ποτε καὶ πάρος 12.2). From the viewpoint of the function of the diegetic device, this address is equivalent to the prayer "to begin a hymn," but the addition of a *da-quia-dedisti* formula signals that Kleiō and the poet have a long-standing personal relationship. Finally, Kleiō's name can be discerned in the beginning of another epinikion (13.9), but the papyrus provides no context for it; Bacchylides took up the opening address in the closure of the poem: "if it was indeed the bloom-giving Kleiō who has dipped it [χάρις 'grace' of the poet's relationship with the victor's father] in my mind, songs that have words of delight will herald him to all the people"

[22] Schmitt 1967, 61–102, West 2007, 396–410; with a bibliography on κλέος ἄφθιτον on p. 408, n. 103.

(τὰν εἰκ ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλειὼ πανθαλὴς ἐμαῖς ἐνέσταξ[εν φρασίν,] τερψιεπεῖς νιν ἀ[ο]ιδαὶ παντὶ καρύξοντι λα[ῶ]ι).

Another modification of the prooimial Muse, familiar from Pindar, is uniquely represented in Bacchylides in 5.176. The myth is interrupted by an appeal to Kalliopa: "White-armed Kalliopa, stop your well-made chariot here" (λευκώλενε Καλλιόπα, στᾶσον εὐποίητον ἅρμα αὐτοῦ). Yet what appeared to be a break-off motif is immediately converted into a prooimial device, for the text continues, as if it is only starting, with an imperative: "Hymn Zeus, son of Kronos, the Olympian chief of the gods, Alpheus of untiring flow, the strength of Pelops, and Pisa, where the famous Pherenikos [Victory-Bringer, name of Hieron's horse] has won bringing to well-towered Syracuse to Hieron a leaf of good fortune" (Δία τε Κρονίδαν ὕμνησον Ὀλύμπιον ἀρχαγὸν θεῶν, τόν τ' ἀκαμαντορόαν Ἀλφεόν, Πέλοπός τε βίαν, καὶ Πίσαν, ἔνθ' ὁ κλεεννὸς [πο]σσὶ νικάσας δρόμωι [ἦλθ]εν Φερένικος <ἐς> εὐπύργους Συρακόσσας Ἱέρωνι φέρων [εὐδ]αιμονίας πέταλον). Bacchylides is here using the same strategy of sneaking in a mortal addressee (a tyrant with the ambition of receiving posthumous cult-honors) into the list of deities.

To sum up, Bacchylides put the mythology of the Muse(s) to a very particular use: the conceptualization of a specialist in *mousikē* as someone who enjoys a personal partnership with the divine. The Muses — and particularly, the solitary Muse (or individual, named Muses) — proved particularly serviceable figures for the somewhat paradoxical project of developing individuated *choral* poetics. Although they have Homer as testimony for their claim to be Olympian deities and are broadly associated with χορεία, they are only marginally significant to Greek cult and therefore are more readily available for (meta) poetic appropriation.

In the post-Simonidean age, which saw the rise of an inter-polis market of *mousikē* linked to Pan-Hellenic centers and such institutions as athletic games and polis-sponsored collective θεωρίαι, poets found themselves competing over commissions. Self-promotion became an essential element of their metapoetics, which called for a distinct notion of poet-composer (as opposed to performer) that had to be signaled in a choral medium. The major strategy used by Bacchylides and Pindar to solve this task was to redeploy the Muses, minor deities originally associated with folk collective song-and-dance, which they sought to tie to their highly individual poetic programs.

### Pindar and the invention of the poet's Muse

As in the case of Bacchylides, the exercise in diachronic stratification will prove indispensable for understanding both Pindar's general metapoetic strategies and formal choices made in particular texts. Out of the total of 71 references to the Muse(s) in the Pindaric corpus, 25 are to the singular Muse, 42 to the Muses in the plural, and only 4 to single Muses provided with an appellative.[23] The data is summarized in Table 2.

To facilitate comparison with the evidence of Bacchylides, I also present a comparative chart with the most important figures (for each of the two poets, the total number of instances of each type is coupled with percent out of total number of uses in the corpus):

[23] Excluded: O. 2.27a (later addition, del. *metri causa* by Aristophanes of Byzantium); Dub.334.3 (no context; unclear whether singular or plural); P. 1.12/P. 1.14, I. 8.57/I. 8.60, and Pai. 7b.15/Pai. 7b.19 counted each as one instance.

*Table 2:* **The Muses in the corpora of Bacchylides and Pindar: a synopsis**

| Word count | | Bacchylides<br>Epin. 4000<br>Dith. 1348<br>Dith. frag. 3590<br>Alia 2233<br><br>TOTAL 11171 | | Pindar<br>Epin. 21946<br>Olymp. 6102<br>Pyth. 7719<br>Nem. 5119<br>Isthm. 3006<br>Frag. 9106<br>TOTAL 31052 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| freq. of Muses (relative to total word count) | | 0.268 % | | 0.228 % | |
| Muses (instances / %) | | 30 | **100 %** | 71 | **100 %** |
| SING. | total | 4 | **13.3 %** | 25 | **35.2 %** |
| | generic | 3 | **10 %** | 11 | **15.5 %** |
| | non-gen. | 1 | **3.3 %** | 14 | **19.7 %** |
| PLUR. | total | 16 | **53.3 %** | 42 | **59.1 %** |
| | choral | 5 | **16.6 %** | 16 | **22.5 %** |
| | meton. | 11 | **36.6 %** | 26 | **36.6 %** |
| NAMED | | 10 | **33.3 %** | 4 | **5.6 %** |

First of all, it should be noted that the difference in overall frequency of references to the Muses in Bacchylides and Pindar (0.268 % vs. 0.228 %) is not statistically significant,[24] which suggests that their usage, at a very basic level, reflects a common feature of choral lyric at the time: on average, every 500 words one expects an encounter with a Muse. Turning to specific kinds of such encounters, the most obvious difference concerns Bacchylides's fondness for individually named Muses (33.3 % vs. 5.6 % in Pindar), which is balanced by a striking expansion of non-generic uses of the solitary Muse in Pindar (19.7 % vs. 3.3 % in Bacchylides). Whereas the single instance of the non-generic Muse in Bacchylides (15.47) is entirely derivative from the conventions of catalogue poetry (DF 1), in Pindar the Muse is repeatedly referred to as an agent who shares the poet's effort in the composition of the text. It is thus very likely that "the Muse" construed as a goddess intimately involved in the poet's work — a figure of paramount importance for later European literature — is a Pindaric invention. Although careful observation of this figure in Pindar reveals older patterns of behavior, particularly that of the prooimial Muse, her ubiquity in the corpus projects an image that is quite different from that found in Alcman or in the Homeric prooimia.

On the other hand, there are no discernible quantitative differences between Pindar and Bacchylides in their references to the Muses in the plural. The metonymic employment — this category subsumes the numerous attributive uses which approximate the use of the adjective Μουσαῖος in Pindar — was clearly an inherited element of the poetic language, shared by Bacchylides and Pindar (note the identical percentage of total occurrences: 36.6 %). Yet a closer look at the evidence reveals a curious divergence. Whereas Bacchylides repeatedly describes the specialist in poetic craft (and principally, himself) by using set collocations of the type "servant of the Muses" (4.8, 5.13, 5.193, 9.3, 63.1), Pindar tends both to vary such expressions and to apply them more broadly. In particular, he is

[24] The probability that the difference is determined by chance is in this case 46 % (for a difference to be considered statistically significant one expects this probability to be below 5 %).

clearly reluctant to describe himself in this way, particularly in the epinikia. In *Olympian* 6.91, Aineas, the chorus master (and Pindar's representative) in Syracuse, is described by a unique expression "message stick of the Muses of lovely hair" (ἠϋκόμων σκυτάλα Μοισᾶν) and in *Isthmian* 9.8 the Aiginetans are praised as "wise stewards of the Muses and agonistic contests" (ταμίαι τε σοφοὶ Μοισᾶν ἀγωνίων τ᾽ ἀεθλων). A generalized reference to poets as "ploughmen of the Pieridai" (Πιερίδων ἀρόταις) is found in *Nemean* 6.32.[25] The declaration in *Pai*. 6.6 — where the speaker deems himself "a spokesman of the Pieridai" (ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν) — is therefore quite exceptional.[26]

I believe that Pindar's avoidance of the traditional means of designating a specialist in poetic craft in the epinikia is in part due to his cultivation of a malleable, inclusive speaking persona, which very often encompasses the singing chorus (cf. Maslov 2015, 105–115). In this respect, *Paian* 6.6 presents an exception, which probably has to be explained by the more conventional shaping of the ἐγώ in the Paians and in non-epinician genres more broadly.[27]

Pindar is also far less likely than Bacchylides to use traditional appellatives of the Muses. Compared to Bacchylides's rather idiosyncratic employment of the figures of Kleiō and Ourania, Pindaric usage is occasional and easy to explain. The mention of Kalliopa in the list of the traditional virtues of the Epizephyrian Lokrians, where one would expect the generic Muse,[28] is not that surprising, seeing that Kalliopa is interchangeable with the generic singular in the earlier poetic tradition.[29] The appearance of Terpsikhora in *Isthmian* 2.7 in the description of "songs with silvered faces" exploits the etymological connection of her name and χορός 'chorus'. As for the appearance of Kleō in the ending of *Nemean* 3, where her willingness is the condition for further propagation of the "light" issuing from Aristokleidas's victory, she both evokes the victor's name (Aristokleidas 'offspring of the

[25] An expression "nurslings of the Muses" (θρέμματα Μουσῶν) is listed among poeticisms in Aristides *Or*. 45.3 and, based on context, is attributed to Pindar as a *dubium* by Snell-Maehler (fr. 352). This attribution is indeed very uncertain.

[26] Cf. Bowra 1964, 3: "Normally, when he speaks of his own function, it is in image or metaphor, but it is noteworthy that he avoids the vaguer forms of periphrasis, such as calling himself the θεράπων of the Muses (Hes. *Theog.* 100; Bacch. 5.14), or their ὀπηδός (Hom. Hymn. 4. 450) or πρόπολος (Bacch. 5.192)."

[27] Most famous is Pindar's fr. 150: μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ᾽ ἐγώ, cited by as a parallel to *Il*. 1.1 by a Homeric scholiast and by Eustathius (van der Valk 1971: 16). Another Pindaric fragment of three words (fr. 151) — Μοῖσ᾽ ἀνέηκέ με — is quoted by Eustathius (1971, 16 and 275). It is not clear if anything is to be made out of the epic form of the verb (noted in Slater 1969, s.v. ἀνίημι), but Eusthatius' interest in these fragments may imply their quasi-prooimial function. Note that Eustathius uses the Ionic form Μοῦσα in both fr. 150 and 151. Further discussion of these two fragments can be found in Maslov 2015, 200. I point to two more examples of self-designation of the speaker in Pindaric fragments: Μοισᾶν / ἐπαβολέοντ[α] πολλάκι, Παιάν, δέ / ξ᾽] ἐννόμων θ[υσι]ᾶν "O Paian, receive the one who frequently has a share of the lawful/[tuneful?] sacrifices of the Muses" (Pai. 6.181; I follow the interpretation of Kurke 2005, 122–4, taking this line as a reference to the involvement of the Aeginetan chorus in the "sacrifices of the Muses"). An example of more traditional type of diction is presented in *Dith*. fr. 70b.25: ἐμὲ δ᾽ ἐξαίρετο[ν / κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων / Μοῖσ᾽ ἀνέστασ᾽ Ἑλλάδι κα[λ]λ[ιχόρῳ "The Muse set me up as a chosen herald of wise words for Hellas of beautiful dancing places" (reference probably to the poet, but possibly to the Theban choreuts).

[28] Kalliopa is probably introduced for the sake of *variatio* (cf. the prooimial Muse in l.3 — note Pindar's preference for keeping apart generically and functionally distinct types of Muses). This praise of the inhabitants of a polis for their cultivation of *mousikē* is a Pindaric topos (Bundy 1986 [1962], 24–6).

[29] Passages where Kalliopa stands for the generic "Muse": Hom. Hymn. Hel. 2; Alcman 27.1 PMG; Sappho 124.1 LP, S260.11; Stesichorus 63.1 PMG.

One-of-Great-Fame') and poses as an embodiment of subsequent κλέος (note the significant positioning at the end of the poem).[30]

Pindar's achievement lies elsewhere: he was able to transform the non-distinct Muse of the late epic prooimia into a companion of the poet-composer (and thus a means of signaling his unique authorship) as well as render her continuously present in the jolting, uneven movement of the Pindaric epinikion. The task of the following analysis is to show that, contrary to the received view, for Pindar the Muse was not a pre-defined figure, a staple of the poetic tradition. Instead, Pindar confronted different kinds of Muses, shaped by generic contexts that determined their semantic associations and diegetic functions. Yet whereas in Bacchylides these diachronic patterns are easy to tell apart, and the locus of experimentation is the domain of individual μυθοποίησις (as in the furthering of the idea of the poet as Ourania's servant), Pindaric usage is more syncretic in that it repeatedly demands that we see several motivations at once in a given reference to the Muse (in Table 3, those are presented in brackets). In at least five cases, where the Muse is mentioned

*Table 3:* **Muse(s) in Pindar (71 total)**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SINGULAR (Μοῖσα) **25** | **11** | 7 nom. 4 acc. | (generic) 'musical performance, song' | O. 13.22, P. 4.279, P. 10.37, N. 1.12 [prooimial], I. 2.6, Pai.14.32 ["clear-voiced"], fr.199.3; P. 5.65 [epaoidic], N. 3.28 [break-off], I. 8.6 [prooimial], Pai.4.24. |
| | **5** | 4 nom., 1 voc. | the poet's Muse | O. 1.112, O. 3.4 [prooimial], Dith. 70b.25, fr.151 [Odyss.]; fr.150 [prooimial?] |
| | **3** | voc. | DF 2 prooimial — opening | O. 10.3, P. 4.3, N. 3.1 |
| | **6** | 5 voc., 1 nom. | prooimial — transitional | P. 1.58, P. 11.41, N. 6.28, I. 6.57, fr. Isth.6a.e; N. 7.77 |
| PLURAL (Μοῖσαι, Πιερίδες, Ἑλικωνιάδες) **42** | **2** | voc. | DF 1 | Pai.6.54, Pai.8.102 |
| | **4** | 1 nom., 3 gen. | chorus (in myth) | I. 8.57–60; P. 1.12–4 [epaoidic], P. 3.90, N. 5.24 |
| | **10** | voc., nom., gen., dat. | deities of *mousikē* | O. 11.17, N. 9.1 [prooimial], Dith.70a.14 [prooimial]; O. 6.21, O. 10.96, fr. 287; Pai.7.15–9 [DF 1]; O. 13.96, Pai.12.2 [prooimial], fr.215b.8 |
| | **6** | 1 gen.; 5 dat. | = (met.) *mousikē* | fr.198a.2; P. 4.67, P. 5.114, N. 10.26, I. 7.23, fr. 155.2 |
| | **20** | gen. | (met.) attributive; ref. to people (5) | O. 7.7, O. 9.5 [prooimial], O. 9.81, P. 1.2, P. 6.49, P. 10.65, N. 4.3, N. 7.12, N. 9.55, I. 1.65, I. 2.2, I. 2.34, Pai.6.181, Pai.7b.14, fr.215a.6; O. 6.91, N. 6.32, I. 9.8, Pai.6.6, fr.352 |
| ADJ. *Μουσαῖος* | **4** | | = above | N. 8.47 [epaoidic], I. 6.2, I. 8.61, Pai.9.39 |
| NAMED **4** (*Kleō* 2, *Terpsikhora* 1, *Kalliopa* 1) | **1** | nom. | generic — *Kalliopa* | O. 10.14 |
| | **1** | gen. | attrib. — *Terpsikhora* | I. 2.7 |
| | **2** | gen. | end of the poem — *Kleō* | N. 3.83, Pai.7a.7 |

[30] Kleō makes a second appearance at the end of a fragmentary Paian: Κλεὸς ἕκατι 'for the sake of Kleō' (*Pai.* 7a.7). On the abnormal short genitive ending, see Rutherford 2001, 242–3, with bibliography.

in close association with the *ego*, I have assigned them to a separate category "the poet's Muse," even though these instances can be derived from the prooimial Muse (except in fragmentary poems, where the context is insufficient).

In only two of Pindar's surviving epinikia, a plain vocative addressed to a singular Muse is placed conspicuously at the beginning.[31] The more straightforward example is the opening of *Pythian* 4 — Pindar's longest preserved poem, whose self-conscious reliance on the model of epic narrative is unmistakable:[32] "it is necessary that today you stand by the dear man … in order that you increase the owed breeze of hymns for the Latoidai and for Pytho" (Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ᾽ ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῆι Κυράνας, ὄφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεσίλᾳ, Μοῖσα, Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυθῶνί τ᾽ αὔξῃς οὖρον ὕμνων). Here the appeal to a single Muse may be taken as an allusion to the openings of hexameter epics, although this is not borne out by Pindar's phrasing; one might also think of the conventional address to the generic ("clear-voiced") Muse in Alcman and Stesichorus.

The same is true of the opening of *Nemean* 3, where the speaker beseeches the Muse to come to Aigina, where "young men, the craftsmen of sweet-speaking revels, wait by the Asopian water, seeking after your voice (ὕδατι γὰρ μένοντ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Ἀσωπίῳ μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων σέθεν ὄπα μαιόμενοι)." The Muse (Kalliopa) here is a figure for the voice of the chorus; she has nothing to do with the composition of the text. Yet Pindar continues, and by a slight shift of emphasis, converts the Muse into a confidante of the poet-composer:

> τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἁμᾶς ἄπο·
> ἄρχε δ᾽ οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ,
> δόκιμον ὕμνον· ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὀάροις
> λύρᾳ τε κοινάσομαι. (N. 3.9–12)

Yield an abundance (ἀφθονίαν) of song from my mind. Begin an acceptable hymn for the one ruling over the much-clouded skies, [Zeus's] daughter, and I will make it a common possession of both their voices and the lyre.

The topos of ἀφθονία is the first signal of the ensuing forceful splintering of the persona of the poet and the singing chorus, yet the two are bridged by a reminiscence of the prooimial Muse — the diegetic device whose function is limited to making the performance "begin." But why begin a hymn to Zeus? This is not to say that such a move is

[31] In *Olympian* 10, the Muse is coupled with "Alatheia, daughter of Zeus" (θυγάτηρ Ἀλάθεια Διός), and both are asked "with straight hand to restrain the blame of falsities that harm guest-friends" (ὀρθᾷ χερὶ ἐρύκετον ψευδέων ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον). This request (and the coupling) are quite unparalleled, pointing to the liberty with which Pindar had come to treat this figure. The larger context clarifies the logic of this address: "Read aloud to me the Olympian victor, son of Arkhestratos, where he is written in my mind: I have forgotten that I owe him a sweet song: Muse! but you and Alatheia, daughter of Zeus …" (Τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ μοι Ἀρχεστράτου παῖδα, πόθι φρενὸς ἐμᾶς γέγραπται· γλυκὺ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέλος ὀφείλων ἐπιλέλαθ᾽· ὦ Μοῖσ᾽, ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἀλάθεια Διός) The Muse is clearly invoked in her prooimial function — as suggested by *alla* 'but' following the imperative, *Moisa* is to be taken closely with the preceding clause (a song is owed, hence it must be urgently begun, note similar reference to debt of song next to the mention of the Muse in the beginning of *O.* 3 and *P.* 4). The following request to correct the wrong is primarily motivated by the introduction of Alatheia. Another possible example of a vocative addressed to the singular Muse in the opening of the poem is fr. 150.

[32] I am referring both to its dialect features (Maslov 2013, 14) and to the choice of a heavily dactylic version of the dactylo-epitrite.

unexpected: an epinikion for a Nemean victor can be framed as a hymn to the Nemean Zeus (who is addressed again in line 65). Nevertheless, the idea that the poem represents, or includes, a hymn to Zeus is not taken further, nor is it motivated by the preceding context. The opening of *Nemean* 3 thus seems to represent a sequence of generically distinct moves, whose ultimate telos is the conversion of the prooimial Muse into an entirely different figure, more closely involved in the process of composition rather than performance.[33]

The same pattern informs the opening of *Olympian* 3, where the reference to the Muse could be doubly classified (as "the prooimial" or "the poet's Muse"). Notably, this poem is both an epinikion and a cult song for the festival of theoxenia in Akragas.[34] Here the opening reference to the visiting gods (Helen and the Tyndaridai) is followed by a metapoetic reflection, again serving to foreground the persona of the poet speaking through the choral medium:

> … Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπον
> Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ
> ἀγλαόκωμον· ἐπεὶ χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι
> πράσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος,
> φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν
> Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, ἅ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν… (O. 3.4–9)

> The Muse thus somehow has taken a stand next to me as I devised a new, still glossy way of fitting the sound of glorious celebration to the Dorian sandal. For garlands yoked to hair exact from me a divinely-founded debt, to mix together in a fitting fashion for the son of Ainesidamos the many-voiced φόρμιγξ, the shout of the αὐλοί, and the arrangement of words — and Pisa [demands] that I cry out…

Several essential elements of Pindar's metapoetics are on display in this passage: poetic presence figured through divine presence,[35] the discourse of εὕρησις 'invention', the posture of the poet as a mastermind "mixing" together different elements of the performance (dance, music, text), and the notion of poetic commission as a χρέος 'debt', imposed on the poet by the victor's glorious achievement. In the context of the present discussion, however, this passage is of interest because it showcases the metamorphosis of the generic singular Muse, via the prooimial Muse, into the Muse who oversees the poet's preparation for the performance. We are witnessing the birth of a new diegetic frame (and one that will have a long afterlife): the appeal to the Muse as an aide in the *composition* of the text. In contrast to the Homeric Muse, Pindar's Muse does not dictate the contents of the poem based on her knowledge of the past or merely incite the singer to perform (as in *Od*. 8.73),

[33] Note also the use of the language of kinship in this passage: the Muse is deemed "our mother" in l. 2 and then "daughter" (supply: of Zeus), a juxtaposition that makes the poet into Zeus's progeny. Kinship metaphors are in general characteristic of the construction of the Pindaric ἐγώ: in *Pai*. 6.12 the speaker compares himself to "a child obeying his dear mother in his heart" (with apparent reference to Pytho); cf. also I. 1.1. There are some other curious parallels between the beginning of *N*. 3 and *Pai*. 6: λίσσομαι 'beseech' and the phrase containing the motivation for the address (ὕδατι γὰρ), which emphatically localizes the choral performance "by the water" (following the mention of the Muses — possibly due to the association of the Muses with springs, for which see Otto 1955, 30).

[34] For a detailed discussion of the theoxenic context of this poem, see Krummen 1990, 217–66.

[35] Maslov 2015, 201–212.The same verb, παρίστημι 'stand by', is used in P. 4.1.

but helps the poet in his labor of putting it together. The Muses' tie to Mnemosyne is being severed.

Whereas in *Olympian* 3 Pindar's starting point is the prooimial Muse, in *Olympian* 1.111–112 a similar transformation occurs in the case of the plain generic use. In *Nemean* 1.12 the Muse is said to "be fond of calling to mind great contests" (μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ). The same notion is expressed in Bacchylides 3.92, where the Muse — in this case, referring to remembrance through musical performance — is said "to nourish the light of achievement" (ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ῶμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ Μοῦσά νιν τρέφει). Moreover, in Pindar's *Olympian* 10.95–96, this idea is conveyed by the use of the same verb, yet the Muses are referred to in the plural as "the Pierian daughters of Zeus": they "nourish broad fame" (τρέφοντι δ' εὐρὺ κλέος κόραι Πιερίδες Διός). (It should be noted in passing that this reference to the Muses in the plural supports the view that in Bacch. 3.92 and *N.* 1.12 the Muse is in the generic singular.) The objective description of the function of the Muse(s) is transformed into a subjective statement of the poet's competence in *O.* 1.112, where the poet declares: "for me then the Muse is nourishing a missile most powerful in valor" (ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει).[36] As the Muse's responsibility shifts from the propagation of the memory of the past (and actual musical performance) to the preparation for future acts of praise (and thus to the individual poet's εὐπορία), a generic Muse takes on the traits of Pindar's poetic Muse.

Perhaps the most significant locus of formal innovation in Pindar is the juncture between segments of epinikia — often signaled by "break-off" formulas.[37] These seemingly unmotivated leaps of narrative are to a large extent responsible for Pindar's later reputation as a poet of sublime, irrational genius. Within the poetics of epinikion, a form that sutures together different preexistent primary and secondary genres, these junctures stand as a reminder of its hybridity. Yet Pindar's metapoetic choice to focus attention on the disunited, multifarious nature of his texts demands an explanation. Pindar's break-offs — which tend to include an explicit dismissal of the previous (mythical) segment of the poem as irrelevant to the given occasion — appear to be a perfect example of what Viktor Shklovsky called "the baring of the device," referring to the self-conscious display of the formal construction of a literary text. For Shklovsky, the baring of the device was endemic to literature.[38] I would look for a more specific motivation behind Pindar's formal experiments in the changing nature of poetic authorship. Genre mutation puts additional pressure on the author function, forcing it to do the extra work of authentication, which would be unnecessary in a text that follows a well-established genre. The hypertrophy of the Pindaric *ego* is thus directly related to the innovative nature of Pindaric epinikion.

Pindar is exploiting moments of juncture as occasions for self-presentation and self-promotion. A comparison with Bacchylides is particularly suggestive here: the only voca-

[36] The syntax and semantics of ἀλκᾷ in this passage is disputed; see (Gerber 1982, 170–172) for alternative translations. The shifting between objective (referring to the victor, victor's city, etc.) and subjective (referring to the *ego*) statements is a notable feature of Pindaric poetics (the distinction was introduced in Bundy 1986).

[37] The English term is Bundy's calque of *Abbruchsformel* (cf. Schadewaldt 1928, e.g. 268). On Pindar break-offs see Race 1989; on the history of this device, cf. (Carey 1981, 6–7).

[38] A classic discussion of the "baring of the device" is Shklovsky's analysis of *Tristram Shandy* (Shklovskii 1965, translation of Шкловский, В. *«Тристрам Шанди» Стерна и теория романа*. Петроград: ОПОЯЗ, 1921).

tive appeal to the Muse in the middle of the poem (following the myth) at 5.176 is neither used as an occasion to foreground the poet's presence, nor is it left unmotivated structurally, as it is directly followed by a request to hymn Zeus. While in other respects distinct from Pindaric usage, this Bacchylidean passage serves as a reminder of the prooimial provenance of those Muses that are addressed in the middle of Pindar's epinikia.

If the Muse is seen as an agent whose intervention is crucial to the beginning of the text/performance, her transposition to the other significant node of the text — as it is suddenly diverted from its previous course and set on a new beginning — need not strike us as particularly surprising. It is remarkable (again, in contradistinction to Bacch. 5.176) that this transposed prooimial Muse in Pindar is generally asked to hymn not Zeus or other gods, but the victor. In some cases, as in *Pythian* 1.58–60, a reminiscence of the earlier pattern persists: "Muse, I bid you sing (κελαδῆσαι) also at the side of Deinomenes — for the victory of a father is not an alien joy — come then let us devise a hymn friendly to the king of Aetna" (Μοῖσα, καὶ πὰρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι πίθεό μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων· χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος. ἄγ' ἔπειτ᾽ Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον). This, in essence, is a request to the Muse to perform at Aetna (which Hieron passed on to his son Deinomenes). There ensues a catalogue of Dorian settlements (lines 61–66), which in the following prayer are revealed as indications of Zeus's long-standing grace: "Zeus the Accomplisher, ordain such a lot to the citizens and kings near the water of Amenas, as a truthful account of men" (Ζεῦ τέλει᾽, αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν Ἀμένα παρ᾽ ὕδωρ αἶσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων 67–68). It is thus possible to regard the hymn that is "friendly to the king of Aetna" as a hymn of praise addressed to Zeus.[39]

A similar moment occurs in *Nemean* 7.75–84, where the speaker interrupts (ἔα με) a supposedly all-too-lengthy digression to utter a metapoetic reflection, which characteristically converts the hymnic Muse into the Muse of the epinikian poet:

> νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθείς
> ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχύς εἰμι καταθέμεν.
> εἴρειν στεφάνους ἐλαφρόν, ἀναβάλεο· Μοῖσά τοι
> κολλᾷ χρυσὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ᾽ ἁμᾶ
> καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας ὑφελοῖσ᾽ ἐέρσας.
> Διὸς δὲ μεμναμένος ἀμφὶ Νεμέᾳ
> πολύφατον θρόον ὕμνων δόνει
> ἡσυχᾷ. βασιλῆα δὲ θεῶν πρέπει
> δάπεδον ἄν τόδε γαρυέμεν ἡμέρᾳ
> ὀπί·

I am not stubborn — [even] if, lifted up, I cry out something overmuch — [when it comes to] paying down a favor, to the victor at any rate. It is easy to weave crowns — strike up [on the lyre]! The Muse, indeed, binds together gold and white ivory and, having fetched it from below, a lily-like flower of coral.[40] And, having remembered [masc. sing.] Zeus around Nemea, stir up a renowned [speaking in many voices?] murmur of hymns quietly: it is fitting in this plain to sing of the king of the gods in soft voice.

[39] It should be noted that, even beyond this context, Zeus is a very prominent figure in *Pythian* 1. Several lines below the speaker again prays to Zeus (ll. 71–72); another prayer to Zeus is found at line 29.

[40] For an alternative translation, "rosemary," see (Egan 2005, 54–7), who compares the *hapax* πόντια ἔερσα to Lat. *ros maris* (explained as a calque from Greek) and cites evidence for the use of rosemary in crowns.

In this passage, the mention of the Muse (in the nominative case) as the agent responsible for the intricate work of composition — compared to the weaving of a crown — is preceded by an unmistakable marker of a proem, the middle voice of the verb ἀναβάλλομαι 'to strike up on the lyre'.[41] The sense that, near the end of the poem, Pindar is only getting started is reinforced by the reference to ritual remembrance of the god, a common feature of cultic poetry (including the Homeric Hymns). The imperative — self-reflective, rather than addressed to the Muse (the participle μεμναμένος is masculine) — that enjoins the chorus to hymn Zeus, the king of the gods, again belongs firmly in a prooimial section. Yet, as in *Pythian* 1.58–60, the whole apparatus of the hymnic prooimion is put at the service of the commission at hand. In the process, the prooimial Muse assumes new, distinctively Pindaric traits.

In several other epinikia, the Muse is addressed in the moment of transition from the myth to the enkomiastic segment of the poem. In *Isthmian* 6.58–59, Pindar interrupts the myth, and invokes the Muse before launching into the victory catalogue. Exactly the same pattern is found in *Pythian* 11.41, where the Muse is reminded that given that "she contracted to furnish her voice silvered for pay" (εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθευ παρέχειν φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον), she is to sing the achievements of the father Pythonikos and the son Thrasudaos, not the — supposedly irrelevant — myth of Orestes's rescue and revenge. What follows is a victory catalogue.[42] In itself, the narration of a myth is not irrelevant to the enkomiastic purpose of the poem, inasmuch as the inclusion of a mythical section assimilates the epinikion to songs performed as part of cult ritual, thus giving more symbolic weight to the praise of the victor.[43] Moreover, an address to the Muse introducing a victory catalogue suggests another generic affiliation: that of hymns to the gods which contain their aretology (the narrative of their deeds), and often include catalogues of places of cult worship.[44]

Finally, note that in *Pythian* 11.41 the voice of the Muse is described as "silvered." It is conceivable that the singular Muse stands as a figure for the performing chorus, in the tradition of earlier choral lyric. This is confirmed by a parallel from *Isthmian* 2.6–8 — a passage in which the speaker reminisces about the times when "the Muse was not yet a lover of profit, nor one who works for hire" (ἁ Μοῖσα [Μοῦσα] γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις): for at that time "the sweet soft-voiced songs of Terpsikhora, their faces silvered, were not being bought and sold" (οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί). The combined reference to Terpsikhora and "silvered faces" suggests a (costumed?)

[41] The original technical meaning of the verb was probably 'deliver a prelude on a stringed instrument' (cf. P. 1.3; see West 1981, 122, Rocconi 2003, 48–9). On its use as a term referring to the "kitharodic" prooimion, see Koller 1956, 170.

[42] The victory catalogue also follows the transitional invocation of the Muse in fr. Isthm. 6a, but there is little context to say more about the function of the Muse in this fragment.

[43] On intimations of hero cult for athletic victors in Pindar's epinikia, see Currie 2005 whose conclusions, however, are too far-reaching.

[44] In N. 6.28–29 the structure is different, as there is strictly speaking no break-off in the text: the address to the Muse — "come, Muse, direct the glorious breeze of words onto this [household]" — is embedded in the lengthy praise of the victor's clan, the Bassidae (and a catalogue of their athletic victories). Praise through genealogy suggests hymn as a generic precedent. Note, however, that here we may be dealing with a postponed prooimial invocation of the Muse as the opening of N. 6 is occupied by gnomic material.

chorus in performance.[45] Yet both these passages can also be assigned to the rubric of "the poet's Muse."

It bears emphasizing that this particular, arguably most distinctively Pindaric, function of the Muse as the poet's aide is restricted to the epinikia. As I suggested above, this is due to particular pressure on the composition of the epinikion as a compound genre and the correspondingly hypertrophied authorial presence. By contrast, the diegetic device that is distinctive of the *Iliad* and *Theogony* (DF 1), and which occurs once in a dithyramb of Bacchylides (15.47), in Pindar only occurs in the cultic genre of paian. Notably, in both cases where he employs this device Pindar (in contrast to Bacchylides) preserves the plural number of the Muses addressed. In Pai. 6.54–60 the speaker addresses the Muses: "But maidens, for you know everything, Muses, you hold this ordinance [or adornment] along with your father of dark clouds and Mnemosyne, attend to me now: for I arrived at the broad assembly for Loxias in the [time] of the gods' xenia and my tongue desires to [pour down?] honey's choicest part" (ἀλλὰ παρθένοι γάρ, ἴσθ' ὅτ[ι], Μοῖσαι, πάντα, κε[λαι]νεφεῖ σὺν πατρὶ Μναμοσ[ύν]ᾳ τε τοῦτον ἔσχετ[ε τεθ]μόν, κλῦτε νῦν· ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄφτον γλυκὺν … ἀγῶνα Λοξία{ι} καταβάντ' εὐρὺν ἐν θεῶν ξενίᾳ). The identity of the speaker is moot: it is possible that this uncertainty serves to ease the transition from the posturing of the poet as a "spokesman of the Pieridai" in the opening of the poem to a more diffuse choral subjectivity operative in the body of the poem (since most of the first triad is missing, this can only be a hypothesis).

The address to the Muses in *Paian* 6.54–60 is prompted by the preceding gnome "as to whence [the strife?[46]] of the immortals took its beginning, it is possible for the gods to persuade the wise (σοφοὺς = the poets), but impossible for mortals to find out" (καὶ πόθεν ἀθαν[άτων ἔρις ἄ]ρξατο. ταῦτα θεοῖσι [μ]ὲν πιθεῖν σοφοὺ[ς] δυνατόν, βροτοῖσιν δ' ἀμάχανο[ν εὑ]ρέμεν). The whole passage may be taken as a reminiscence of *Iliad* 2.484–492, but note a difference between the Iliadic and Pindaric metapoetics: whereas the speaker of *Iliad* 2.484ff says that, in contrast to the Muse, "we/I know nothing" (οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν), thus aligning himself with the mortals of *Paian* 6.52, Pindar confidently claims privileged access to divine knowledge. This conceptualization of poetic σοφία, which is particularly characteristic of Pindar (although not narrowly Pindaric, cf. Theognis 1.769–772), recurs in *Paian* 7b.15–20, where the speaker prays to the Muses, "for minds of men are blind, whoever without the Helikoniades seeks for the deep road of σοφία" (τ]υφλα[ὶ γὰ[ρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες, [ὁ]στις ἄνευθ' Ἑλικωνιάδων βαθεῖαν … ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν).

The second example of the Iliadic diegetic frame (DF 1) is *Paian* 8.102–4, where the Muses are confronted with a question regarding the appearance of the third Delphic temple: "What was the shape of that temple [wrought] through the artful skills of Hephaistos and Athena?" (ὦ Μοῖσαι· το<ῦ> δὲ παντέχ[νοις / Ἁφαίστου παλάμαις καὶ Ἀθά[νας / τίς ὁ ῥυθμὸς ἐφαίνετο;). As one would expect with this diegetic frame, the Muses immediately oblige, and the text continues with the description of the temple made of bronze and gold.

[45] For the (meager) evidence for the use of masks in choral non-dramatic performance in Archaic Greece, see Ferrari 2008, 16–7. In case, the description of the songs' faces as silvered evokes both embellishment and remuneration (Bury 1892, 40–41); see Maslov 2015, 260–262 for further discussion of secondary literature on this passage). Note the use of a definite article with Μοῖσα in I. 2.6, is unique in all of the Archaic corpus and appears to be due to a greater degree of personalization in the description of the Muse, unmatched elsewhere in Pindar.

[46] There is a lacuna in the papyrus; possible supplements are discussed in Rutherford 2001, 309.

Pindar's use of this traditional device in the paians, but not in the epinikia, is an important piece of evidence for genre differentiation within the Pindaric corpus. The contrast between the usage in the paians and the epinikia is particularly striking in light of the fact that Pindar thrice uses rhetorical questions closely related to those that appear in DF 1, but never calls on the Muse(s) in these contexts.[47] It appears that Pindar not only uses an older metapoetics in the paians, but that he also consistently *avoids* certain devices in the epinikia.[48] I would suggest that Pindar is not interested in employing a highly traditional device in a genre that allows, and perhaps demands, a more innovative poetics and, correspondingly, a more aggressive and individuated metapoetics. Conversely, the concept of the poet's Muse is restricted, in the surviving corpus, to the epinikia,[49] where Pindar's general strategy was to promote his own poetic mythology of the singular Muse, only referring to the plural Muses in marked contexts.

In fact, if we omit the attributive use of the genitive plural and metonymic expressions, there remain only nine occurrences of plural Muses in the epinikia, and none of them appears to permit the substitution of the singular for the plural. In several poems, the Muses appear as a group of divinities attending, with their choral song and dance, well-known mythical events: the marriages of Kadmos and Harmonia, Peleus and Thetis (*P.* 3.90,[50] *N.* 5.24), and the funeral of Achilles (*I.* 8.57–8).[51] The Muses also perform at Zeus's side on Olympus, enchanting the thoughts of the Olympian gods (κῆλα δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων θέλγει φρένας[52]), but filling with terror "all that Zeus does not approve of" (ὅσσα δὲ μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεύς *P.* 1.12–14). This is not the only possible allusion to what may be regarded as an epaoidic substratum in Pindar's representation of the Muses in Pindar.[53] In the opening

[47] O. 10.60–63: τίς δὴ ποταίνιον ἔλαχε στέφανον (cf. the same topos in a fragment of Simonides's epinikion [506 ]); *P.* 4.70–71: τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας; I. 5.39–42: λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἕκτορα πέφνον (here the answer — Aiakidai — is proleptically provided in the preceding sentence). Christopher Carey describes this topos as "the epic question to the Muse" (1981, 4), but does not remark on the fact that Pindar does not address the question to the Muse(s). In the case of *P.* 4.70–71, scholia contain remarks on the similarity of the phrasing to the Homeric device (Drachmann 2.116; for discussion see Phillips 2016, 178).

[48] It is not possible to interpret this genre restriction along the lines of J. M. Bremer's explanation for the avoidance of the use of the term χορός 'chorus' for the performers of the epinikia (namely that an all too close association with cult poetry was seen as inappropriate in a "secular" genre [1990.55]): the diegetic frame that involves a request for information, although very old, does not seem to have a specific association with cult poetry.

[49] There may be two exceptions: fr. 150 and fr. 151 for which we have no context. These fragments could also belong to lost epinikia, as has been suggested for fr. 150 (Snell and Maehler 1989, 128).

[50] In P. 3.90 the Muses' performance dedicated to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis takes place "on a/the mountain" (χρυσαμπύκων μελπομενᾶν ἐν ὄρει Μοισᾶν), which remains unnamed (it is generally assumed to be Pelion; cf., e.g., Gildersleeve 1885 ad loc.). Perhaps this unusual lack of specificity reflects the idea that mountains are the proper locus for the Muses' activity (Maslov 2016, 416–417).

[51] In two further poems, the Muses are invited to join the Pindaric κῶμος 'revel' (Pindar's unmarked term for the chorus of the epinikia) as choral divinities: in *Nemean* 9.1, the Muses are invited to undertake a "festive procession", presumably across the Ionian sea, from Sikyon to Aetna, and in *Olympian* 11.17, the imperative "there join in the revel" appears to include the Muses.

[52] κῆλα is usually rendered as 'shafts' (of song), see (Slater 1969, 278) following (West 1966 ad *Theog* 708), but, next to θέλγει, a (folk-etymological? purely contextual?) association with κηλέω 'to bewitch' is very likely (cf. Maehler 1963, 82). For this verb and its derivates in (meta)poetic contexts, see (Maslov 2009, 29, n. 64).

[53] For a hypothetical reconstruction of the underlying conception of the Muses as ambiguous, healing/harm-bringing divinities see Toporov 1977; further discussion in: Maslov 2016, 438–441. In his unpublished dissertation (1954), Elroy Bundy discusses this paradoxical quality of music in *Pythian* 1.12–14 in

of *Nemean* 4 “wise songs, daughters of the Muses” (σοφαὶ Μοισᾶν θύγατρες) are said (in a gnomic aorist) “to enchant toils by touch: not even warm water makes limbs as soft as praise singing along with a *phorminx*” (θέλξαν νιν ἁπτόμεναι. οὐδὲ θερμὸν ὕδωρ τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τεύχει γυῖα, τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος).[54]

There remain only two examples where Pindar uses the plural form without an obvious motivation. Yet closer analysis shows that such a motivation does exist. In *O.* 6.21, the Muses are said to “entrust” (ἐπιτρέψοντι) the oath-taking to the speaker, and in *O.* 13.96, the speaker declares that he has come as an ἐπίκουρος ‘ally’ “to the brilliantly-throned Muses and the [clan of] Oligaithidai” (Μοῖσαις γὰρ ἀγλαοθρόνοις ἑκὼν Ὀλιγαιθίδαισίν τ’ ἔβαν ἐπίκουρος). A notable literalism in Pindar’s use of juridical categories (Maslov 2015, 223–224) may rule out the use of the (originally) generic singular in the first passage, and the plurality of the Muses in *O.* 13.96 aids in the construction of the image of a militant collective comprising the divinities and the victor’s clan.

The evidence thus bears out the hypothesis that Pindar’s singular Muse is not only restricted to the epinikia, but also strongly preferred in this genre. This is an important indication that the Pindaric epinikion, in addition to embedding older layers of metapoetics, also includes highly innovative elements. In particular, the following two Pindaric developments are worth emphasizing: the employment of the (originally) prooimial Muse in transitions between different segments of a poem, and the concomitant transformation of the generic Muse into the poet’s confidante. Whereas Bacchylides creates a personalized mythology of named Muses, Pindar remolds the figure of the Muse into a structural element inextricable from the workings of his poetic form.

## References


Bowra C. M. *Pindar*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964.

Bremer J. M. Pindar’s Paradoxical ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy about the Performance of his Epinicia, in: S. R. Slings (ed.), *The Poet’s I in Archaic Greek Poetry: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*. Amsterdam, VU University Press, 1990, 41–58.

Bundy E. L. *Hesykhia in Pindar*. Ph.D. diss., UC Berkeley, 1954.

Bundy E. L. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1986. Revised Digital Version posted in 2006 at http://repositories.cdlib.org/ucbclassics/bundy. [Orig. publ. 1962]

Bury J. B. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*. London and New York: MacMillan, 1892.

Campbell D. A. *Greek Lyric*. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982–1993.

Carey C. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*. New York, Arno Press, 1981.


conjunction with a similarly violent aspect of ἡσυχία in the prooimion to *Pythian* 8. He concludes that both reflect the duality at the heart of Pindar’s *Weltanschauung*, which is embodied in the principle of helping one’s friends and harming one’s enemies. More specifically, this principle has a social dimension: ἡσυχία stands for the fellow citizens’ acquiescence to the success of the victor (1954, 161). Bundy does not consider the fact that it is the Muses’ voice (rather than the sound of the φόρμιγξ) that is harmful to Zeus’s enemies. In my view, Bundy’s explanation, perhaps especially adapted to *Pythian* 8, does not necessarily exclude the presence of an epaoidic subtext in *Pythian* 1.

[54] In this passage, I take the pronoun νιν to refer to the toils (plural) as the most likely antecedent. Another Pindaric locus where the Muse may have epaoidic connotations (but here this possibility is rather remote) is *Pythian* 5.65: in a hymnic aretology of Apollo, his bestowal of “remedies for heavy diseases for men and women” is mentioned first, and immediately afterwards he is said “to give the Muse [generic use] to whomever he wishes.” The passage can also be read as a list of traditional forms of σοφία (Solon fr. 13.51–60 W), but the direct juxtaposition of healing and *mousikē* is, at the very least, suggestive.

Currie B. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
Curtius E. R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, translation by W. R. Trask. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1953. [Orig. German ed.: 1948]
Egan R. B. Πόντια ἔερσα: a Botanical Hapax in Pindar (N. 7.79), *Glotta* 2005, 81, 54–57.
Drachmann A. B. (ed.) *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. 3 vols. Leipzig, Teubner, 1903–1927.
Faraone C. A. Hipponax Fragment 128W: Epic Parody or Expulsive Incantation?, *CA* 2004, 23 (2), 209–45.
Fearn D. *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.
Ferrari G. *Alcman and the Cosmos of Sparta*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008.
Ford A. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2002.
Gerber D. E. *Pindar's* Olympian One: *A Commentary*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1982.
Gildersleeve B. L. (ed.) *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York, Harper & Bros., 1885.
Hexter J. H. *The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation: More, Machiavelli, and Seyssel*. New York, Basic Books, 1973.
Irigoin J. (ed.) *Bacchylides. Dithyrambes, Epinicies, Fragments*. Paris, Belles Lettres, 1993.
Koller H. Das kitharodische Prooimion. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung, *Philologus* 1956, 100, 159–206.
Koller H. ΘΕΣΠΙΣ ΑΟΙΔΟΣ, *Glotta* 1965, 43, 277–85.
Krummen E. *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 1990.
Kurke L. V. The Poet's Pentathlon: Genre in Pindar's First *Isthmian*, *GRBS* 1988, 29 (2), 97–113.
Kurke L. V. Choral Lyric as 'Ritualization': Poetic Sacrifice and Poetic Ego in Pindar's Sixth Paian, *CA* 2005, 24 (1), 81–130.
Maehler H. *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentums bis zur Zeit Pindars*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
Maslov B. The Semantics of ἀοιδός and Related Compounds: Towards a Historical Poetics of Solo Performance in Archaic Greece, *CA* 2009, 28 (1), 1–38.
Maslov B. The Dialect Basis of Choral Lyric and the History of Poetic Languages in Archaic Greece, *Symbolae Osloenses* 2013, 87, 1–29.
Maslov B. *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Maslov B. The Genealogy of the Muses: an Internal Reconstruction of Archaic Greek metapoetics, *AJP* 2016, 137 (3), 411–447.
Miller A. M. 'Address to the Delian Maidens' in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo: Epilogue or Transition? *TAPA* 1979, 109, 173–186.
Otto W. F. *Die Musen und die göttliche Ursprung des Singens und Sagens*. Düsseldorf: E. Diederichs, 1955.
Phillips T. *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
Race W. H. Elements of Style in Pindaric Break-Offs, *AJP* 1989, 110 (2), 189–209.
Rocconi E. *Le parole delle Muse. La formazione del lessico tecnico musicale nella Grecia antica*. Rome, Quasar, 2003.
Rutherford I. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001.
Schadewaldt W. *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*. Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1928.
Shklovskii V. Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*: Stylistic Commentary, translated by L. T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, in: *Russian Formalist Criticism*, Lincoln 1965, 25–57.
Schmitt R. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden, Harassowitz, 1967.
Slater W. J. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1969.
Snell B. and H. Maehler (eds.) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*. Pars I: Epinicia. Stuttgart, Teubner, 1987.
Snell B. and H. Maehler (eds.) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*. Pars II: Fragmenta. Indices. Leipzig, Teubner, 1989.
Stark R. Res Publica, reprinted with the author's supplements in H. Oppermann (ed.), *Römische Wertbegriffe*. Wege der Forschung. Band 34. Darmstadt 1967, 42–119.
Steiner D. Nautical Matters: Hesiod's Nautilia and Ibycus Fragment 282 *PMG*, *CP* 2005, 100 (4), 347–355.
Toporov V. N. ΜΟΥΣΑΙ 'Muzy': soobrazheniia ob imeni i predystorii obraza (k otsenke frakiiskogo vklada), in: *Slavianskoe i baltiiskoe iazykoznanie: antichnaia balkanistika i sravnitel'naia grammatika*, Moscow 1977, 28–86. [Toporov, V. N. ΜΟΥΣΑΙ 'Muses': Observations on the name and prehistory of the image

(toward an assessment of the Thracian contribution), in: *Slavic and Baltic linguistics: Ancient Balkan Studies and Comparative Grammar*. Moscow 1997, 28–86] (In Russian)
van der Valk, M. (ed.) *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
Verdier Chr. *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft; 7. Innsbruck, Institut für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1972.
West M. L. (ed., comm.) *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1966.
West M. L. The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music, *JHS* 1981, 101, 113–29.
West M. L. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.

**For citation:** Maslov B. The Children of Mnemosyne: a Contrastive Metapoetics of Pindar and Bacchylides. *Philologia Classica* 2016, 11(2), 223–243. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2016.202

**ДЕТИ МНЕМОСИНЫ:**
**К СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНОЙ МЕТАПОЭТИКЕ ПИНДАРА И ВАККХИЛИДА**

*Борис Маслов*

В статье рассматривается вопрос о разных типах использования Муз(ы) в поэтике Пиндара и Вакхилида и их преемственности по отношению к элегической и ранней мелической поэзии. На основании детального обзора словоупотребления выдвигается гипотеза о различии в метапоэтических стратегиях упомянутых поэтов: в то время как Вакхилид разрабатывает индивидуальную мифологию поименованных Муз (прежде всего, Урании), Пиндар переосмысляет безымянную Музу эпической и ранней хоровой лирики как сотрудницу поэта, вовлеченную в сам творческий процесс. Таким образом, именно у Пиндара Муза приобретает — в дополнение к мнемонической и побудительной функциям, которые она имела в гекзаметрической поэзии, — тот характер помощницы поэта в составлении оригинальных поэтических произведений, который отличает ее в позднейшей литературной традиции.

*Ключевые слова*: греческая лирика, эпиникий, метапоэтика, авторство, Музы, Пиндар, становление литературы.

Received: 01.08.2016
Final version received: 05.11.2016