

IAN RUTHERFORD

NEOPTOLEMUS AND THE PAEAN-CRY:
AN ECHO OF A SACRED AETIOLOGY IN PINDAR

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 88 (1991) 1–10

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Neoptolemus and the Paean-Cry:

An Echo of a Sacred Aetiology in Pindar

The paean-cry is a short prayer to Apollo consisting of an interjection ἦ followed by the vocative of the Apollonian epithet παιάν (παιών and παιῆον are dialectical alternatives). According to an aetiology well attested from the 4th century B.C., the paean-cry and the associated Apollonian epithet ἰήσιος were supposed to have had their origin during Apollo's fight with the Delphic dragon, when someone encouraged him by saying ἕει or ἕε ("shoot").¹ Two versions of the etymology can be distinguished, according to how the second word of the paean-cry is dealt with: in one version (I), attested for Ephorus, the second word is not etymologised at all, but interpreted in the sense "healer"; in the other (II), which is the more common of the two, the second word is derived from παῖ (it is presupposed that Apollo was still a child when he shot the dragon), so that the complete etymon is ἕε, παῖ ("shoot, child") or, less commonly, ἕε, παῖ, ἰόν (shoot an arrow, child).² Accounts vary as to who uttered the words: in one version it was Leto, which suits the παῖ element in (II), in others it was the citizens of Delphi or some local nymphs.³ Schematically:

Primary terms	ἦ ἰὲ Παιάν, ἰήσιος
Aetiological back-formation (I)	ἕε, παιάν
Aetiological back-formation (II)	ἕε παῖ (ἰόν)

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that this Pythoetia-aetiology of the paean-cry is probably at least as old as the 5th century, and in particular to show that it may be presupposed in Pindar's *Sixth Paean*.

¹ ἕε is a rare imperative form of ἕημι, which seems to be preferred for the purpose of the aetiology because it is closer to the derivative. It is found only in accounts of the aetiology (e.g. in Athenaeus 701d) and (in the compound ἄφιε) in some very late sources: *Hippiatrica Berolinensia* (E. Oder and K. Hoppe, *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum*), 15, 9.4; Athanasius, *De Virginitate* (ed. E. F. von der Goltz), 23, 5; Basilus, *Homilia de virginitate (Révue Bénédictine* 63 [1953], 39), 2, 21.

² No full survey exists. See in general, T. Schreiber, *Apollo Pythoktonos*, Leipzig 1879; K. Strunk, "Frühe Vokalveränderungen in der griechischen Literatur", *Glotta* 38 (1960), 79-82, F. Williams, *Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1978), 85 (on 1.103). The source for version (I) is Ephorus (FGrHist70F31 = Strabo 9, p.422, discussed below), also Macrobius, *Sat.I*, 17, 17; for version (II), Clearchus of Soli *Peri Paroimion A'*, fr.64Wehrli (= Athenaeus 701d); Duris' *Samion Horoi* (FGH76F79 = Et. M. s. ἰήσιος); Apollonius Rhodius 2, 701-13; Callimachus, *Hymn 2*, 97-104 (only the last certainly includes the ἰόν element). For the purpose of this paper I ignore the alternative ancient etymologies for the paean-cry, for example those from ἰᾶσθαι and παύω, of which the fullest ancient discussion is in Macrobius at *Sat.I*, 17, 16-20 (derived in part from Apollodorus of Athens, *Peri Theon* 14 = FGrHist244F90).

³ The speaker is Leto the accounts of Duris and Clearchus; the Delphians in Ephorus and Callimachus; and local nymphs in Apollonius of Rhodes.

A *terminus post quem* for this aetiology may be provided by the fact that it is not mentioned in the Pythian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. The *Homeric Hymn* in fact advances a different aetiology in which the use of the paeon at Delphi (the paeon being only an elaborated and extended form of the the paeon-cry) is traced back to the Cretans who sang after the manner of the Cretan παῖηόνες or "paeon-singers" (516-9).⁴ Set against this, the significance of the Pythoetonia-aetiology would seem to be that it claims the origin of the paeon-cry for Delphi and overrides the hypothesis that it was imported from Crete. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* takes us back to perhaps the early 6th century B.C.⁵ Around the same time Sacadas of Argos composed his Πύθιος νόμος, a musical composition designed to imitate the conflict between Apollo and the Delphic dragon in several stages.⁶ The composition of Sacadas may provide our first evidence of interest in the episode in which the bystanders call on Apollo to shoot: one of the sections of the Πύθιος νόμος bore the name κατακελευσμός, a word which suggests the idea of bystanders encouraging Apollo to shoot the dragon.⁷ In that case the Pythoetonia-aetiology may have already been around, although it cannot itself have been part of the Πύθιος νόμος, since this lacked the verbal articulation that would have been required to spell out such an aetiology.

A *terminus ante quem* for the aetiology is provided by the 4th century prose sources. Version (I) of the etymology is attested slightly earlier than version (II): the earliest attestation for version (II) is a fragment of Clearchus of Soli *Peri Paroimion A'*, while version (I) is attested in a fragment of the *Histories* of Ephorus.⁸ Ephorus mentioned the Pythoetonia in the course of an euhemerising interpretation of the god Apollo:⁹ Apollo is represented as a culture hero who introduces agriculture in the area of Parnassus and eliminates two local brigands, first Tityus and second Python, alias Dracon. This is the account of the killing of the latter:

. . . τοὺς δὲ Παρνασσίους, συμμίζαντας αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλον μνηῦσαι χαλεπὸν ἄνδρα, Πύθωνα τοῦνομα, ἐπὶ κλησὶν Δράκοντα, κατατοξεύοντος δ' ἐπικελεύειν ἵε παιάν, ἀφ' οὗ τὸν παιανισμὸν οὕτως ἐξ ἔθους παραδοθῆναι τοῖς μέλλουσι συμπίπτειν εἰς παράταξιν.

⁴ G. Huxley, "Cretan Paiawones", *GRBS* 15 (1975), 119-124, followed also by H.G. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns and Homeric* (London/Cambridge 1950), 361. This interpretation of παῖηόνες is found first in W. Pape, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*³ (Brunswick, 18880) 2. 438; A. von Blümenthal, "Paian" *RE* 36, 2341* endorses the hypothesis, though suggesting also that the true reading might be παραηδόνες (Homer *Od.* 22. 348). On aetiology in the *Homeric Hymn*, see also D. Kolk, *Der pythische Apollhymnus als aitiologische Dichtung* (Meisenheim a. Glan, 1963). Note that the *Homeric Hymn* associates a different aetiology with the Pythoetonia - that of Πυθώ (i.e. Delphi) from the rotting (πύθομαι) of the dragon's corpse (hy. Hom. Ap., 363).

⁵ See most recently R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge, 1982), 132, 200.

⁶ On Sacadas, see H. Abert, *RE* s. v.

⁷ Strabo 9, 3, 10 (assigning the Πύθιος νόμος to a Hellenistic general Timosthenes, presumably wrongly); Pollux 4, 77; cf. Kolk (above, n.4), 42-3. I would compare the use of ἐπικελεύω and ἐγκελεύω in the accounts of the paeon-cry in Ephorus (below) and Duris (below, appendix). The word κατακελεύω is otherwise used of a boatswain commanding rowers (Aristophanes, *Ran.* 207 and *Av.* 1273; cf. the association between paeon-cry and the κέλευμα of a boatswain at E. *IT.* 1406). Other explanations for the κατακελευσμός are offered by ancient sources: Strabo says it was the ἀγών and Pollux says that it was the section which Apollo challenges the dragon; neither is necessarily right. The κατακελευσμός is not one of the sections of the Πύθιος νόμος in the only other source - the hypothesis to Pindar's Pythians (Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* [Leipzig, 1910] II, 2, 10ff.).

⁸ For references, see n. 2 above

⁹ On euhemerising elements in Ephorus, see A. Henrichs, "The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of Isis Aretologies", *HSCP* 88 (1984), 146.

ἐμπρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ σκηπὴν τότε τοῦ Πύθωνος ὑπὸ τῶν Δελφῶν, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν ἔτι καὶ αἰεὶ ὑπόμνημα ποιουμένους τῶν τότε γενομένων.

Two details are mentioned: the first is the aetiology of the paean-cry (version (I) of the etymology); the second is the burning of Python's tent (σκηπή), which was part of the Delphic Septerion. In interpreting each of these we must keep Ephorus' euhemerising objective in mind: the reason he singles out the detail of the burning of the hut is perhaps that he believes that it supports his hypothesis that Python was man, since one would expect a tent to be the abode of a man;¹⁰ similarly, with respect to the aetiology of the paean-cry, the fact that Ephorus, who is our earliest source for it, uses version (I) should not be taken to indicate that version (I) is necessarily earlier than version (II): if he had known both versions, Ephorus would have preferred (I) to (II) because the idea implied in (II) that Apollo was a child did not suit his euhemerising version of the myth.

On this interpretation, FGrHist70F31 is certainly not to be taken as evidence that Ephorus himself invented the Pythoetia-aetiology of the paean-cry.¹¹ The aetiology will probably have been at least as old as the 5th century, and grounded in Delphic tradition. It must be conceded that there is no direct attestation of the aetiology from the 5th century. Indirect evidence is perhaps provided by the fact that the *motif* of Apollo killing the dragon while still a child is older than the 4th century: it is attested for the 5th century in a literary source (Euripides *IT*.1239-51), and for 5th and even the late 6th century in iconographic sources (Apollo accompanied sometimes by Artemis is represented as shooting from the safety of Leto's arms).¹² Version (II) of the etymology presupposes and is closely linked to this *motif*, and if the *motif* is older than the 4th century, the etymology may be also.

In search of resonances of the Pythoetia-aetiology from the 5th century, I turn to Pindar. There is no evidence that Pindar anywhere dealt explicitly with the Pythoetia or the associated aetiology of the paean-cry, though some lost Paean may well have contained such an account.¹³ However, I would suggest that there is a resonance of the Pythoetia-aetiology at the end of the second triad of *Pa*.VI, 121-2. This passage follows a myth which is built around the motif of Apollo's antagonism for first Achilles and then Neoptolemus. There are three stages in its

¹⁰ Interpreters disagree on whether the Septerion was linked to the Pythoetia before Ephorus: W. R. Halliday, *Plutarch's Greek Questions* (Oxford, 1928), 70-1, on *Plut.Qu.Gr*.12, proposed that the ritual of the Septerion, though old, had no connection at all with the story of Apollo and the snake until about the 4th Century, "when the rationalistic version was applied for the purposes of explanation"; W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (tr. P. Bing, San Francisco 1983), 129, seems to side with Halliday. For the other side, see E. Simon, *Opfernde Götter* (Berlin, 1953), 21, 29.

¹¹ As had been suggested by Halliday (above, n.10).

¹² For iconographical evidence, see *LIMC* s. Apollon, 993 (lecythos from the second quarter of the 5th century = Roscher, *ML* 3, 3407, fig.4), 988 (lecythos from the second quarter of the 5th century: Apollo shoots from his mother's arms, though Python is not depicted), also s. Apollo/Aplu, 10 (fragment of an Etruscan terracotta group from the late 6th century) and 11 (Etruscan Bronze mirror from the second quarter of the 5th century). See also J. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley, 1959), 16-17, and Appendix 7 (550).

¹³ I exclude the possibility that he might have invented it himself, for which there is no evidence. We know that Pindar mentioned conflicts between Apollo and other monstrous adversaries: see A. Stéfos, *Apollon dans Pindare* (Athens, 1975), 86. In fr.55 (πρὸς βίαν κρατῆσαι Πυθοῦς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, διὸ καὶ ταρταῶσαι ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἢ γῆ) Πυθοῦς is the place, not the dragon, despite what Snell-Maehler imply in their index. It is quite possible that Apollo's triumph over the Delphic dragon was mentioned in another paean.

meant to imply that the paean-cries are a sort of measure which marks off the preceding section of the poem.¹⁷ The whole expression would then be an effective transition to the following section of the poem.¹⁸

The form ἰῆτε is unparalleled and it has provoked a certain amount of discussion.¹⁹ Three interpretations have been put forward:

A) Schroeder argued that it might be from a hypothetical verb ἰῆναι formed on the basis of ἰή, along the lines of ἀλάζειν from ἀλαῖ.²⁰ Wackernagel argued against this, on the grounds that the natural verbal derivative from the root ἰά would be ἰάζω.²¹ The position was revived by Radt in his commentary on *Pa. VI*.²²

B) Wackernagel suggested that ἰῆτε should be interpreted as a pluralised interjection, analogous to τῆτε from τῆ or δεῦτε from δεῦρο.²³ He did not explain how he understood μέτρα παιηόνων. We could perhaps take it as in apposition to the interjections, defining them as "the measures of paeans". More likely, we could see it as an accusative governed by the interjection ἰή ἰῆτε, which would be felt to have a quasi-verbal force; equally we might call it an accusative absolute, not directly dependent on the interjections and perhaps implying a verb with the sense "we utter".²⁴ Compare the use of the interjection ἀλαῖ governing an accusative at Aristophanes *Lysistrata*, 393:²⁵

ἡ γυνὴ δ' ὀρχουμένη
'ἀλαῖ Ἄδωνιν' φησίν.

A relevant parallel involving the interjection ἰή which has not been adduced in this context comes in the refrain in Erythraean Paean to Asclepius (*PMG* 934):

¹⁷ This is not dissimilar in spirit to the interpretation of Radt (above, n.16) 171, who however took παιηόνων as an objective-genitive, so that μέτρα παιηόνων are "measures for paeans" rather than "measures consisting in paean-cries".

¹⁸ This would be in line with Pindar's well-known practice of ending narratives by self-consciously talking about the limits of the narrative or the appropriate measure: see for example E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* II, 73. Compare Pindar's use of the word μέτρον in the context of poetry at *Isth.* 1, 61-4: πάντα δ' ἐξειπεῖν, ὅσ' ἀγώνιος Ἑρμῆς | Ἡροδότῳ πέπορεν | ἵπποις, ἀφαιρεῖται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων | ὕμνος. Here the μέτρον is equivalent to the length of the poem, which, being short, does not allow for a full narration of Herodotus' victories. The idea is different from *Pa. VI*, 121-2, where the μέτρα are the limit which the utterance of the paean cries is imagined as imposing on the narrative and the triad, but the general force of the two passages seems to me to be similar.

¹⁹ Note, however, that Maehler has identified a possible parallel at *Pa. XXII*(k), 18 (see apparatus).

²⁰ O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina*⁵ (1923), 538.

²¹ "Graeca", *Philologus* 95 (1943), p.184 (= *Kl.Schr.* 2, 833).

²² Radt (above, n.16) 171.

²³ Above, n. 21. Cf. also Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* I (Basel, 1920), 71ff.; E. Fränkel, "Umdeutungen von Flexionsformen usw.", *IF* 59 (1948), 163ff. τῆτε comes from Sophron, fr.156K.

²⁴ For the accusative absolute, see R. Kühner and E. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* 1, 329-31; E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich, 1950), 2, 2, 87-8; A. C. Moorhouse, "The Syntax of Sophocles", *Mnemosyne Supplement* 75 (1982), 46-7. I avoid the term "accusative of exclamation", which may not exist in classical Greek; discussion has centred around Aeschylus, Ag.1146, on which see E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950), 2, 523 (arguing that it does exist, at least in the context of dirge), and J. P. Denniston and D. L. Page, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1957), 174 (arguing that there are no examples until the Hellenistic period, and only a few them).

²⁵ Bion uses the same construction in the *Lament for Adonis* at lines 28, 37, 63, 87, 93.

ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἄσκληπιὸν
 δαιμόνα κλεινότατον, ἰὲ Παιάν

In the first stanzas, Ἄσκληπιὸν | δαιμόνα κλεινότατον can be construed as the object of the verb ἐγένετο in the immediately preceding section of the first stanza, but in the second and third stanzas it can only be an accusative dependent on the composite interjection: ἰὴ παιάν.²⁶ There may be another example of this construction with ἰὴ in the refrain from a fragmentary cult poem by Pindar known as *Pa.XXI*, perhaps in honour of Hera:²⁷

ἰὴ ἰὲ βασιλειαν Ὀλυμπίων
 νύμφαν ἀριστόποσιν

In theory one could supply a verb of speaking at the end of the line here (either in the first person or an imperative), but the generally short line length observable in other parts of the fragment would seem to be against it. In the examples cited the accusative accompanying the interjection specifies the deity praised, whereas in *Pa.VI*, 121-2 it would be a sort of internal accusative and would refer to what is being sung (whether this is the paeon or the paeon-refrain), and that there is no exact parallel for this, but I do not see this as a major stumbling block: if an interjection can govern one form of accusative, it would probably be able to govern another the other form also.

C) Wilamowitz suggested that the abnormal form ἰῆτε might have been meant to suggest a form of the verb ἴημι - either the 2nd plural present imperative ἴετε or the 2nd pl. present optative ἰέλτε (the latter being easier from the point of view of quantity)²⁸ - which would take μέτρα παιηόνων as its object and mean "utter".²⁹ Support for this was found in the fact that the Pythoetonia aetiology made use of an approximate equivalence between ἰὴ and the imperative singular of ἴημι. Position C) was reasserted a few years later by Klaus Strunk, who used it as evidence supporting a thesis that the vowel sounds εἰ and η were perceived as identical as early as the 5th century, and even earlier.³⁰ For Strunk ἐῤρυφαρέτραν ἑκαβόλον (111) was additional support in so far as it suggested a parallel between Apollo the shooter of arrows and the chorus' shooting paeon-cries.³¹

Deciding between these positions is not easy. I would suggest that we can rule out at least position A) for the reason I mentioned, but either B) or C) could be right. Radt argues against C)

²⁶ Note that we find this reading only in the earliest Erythraean version of the Paeon; in the Macedonian and Egyptian versions the seconds and third instances of the refrain have Ἄσκληπιέ, δαιμον κλεινότατε. The Erythraean version is clearly to be preferred on this point, being the lectio difficilior.

²⁷ *P.Oxy.2442*, fr.32, col.2. See Lobel in *Ox.Pap.26*. The refrain occurs in ll.3-4 = 11-2 = 19-20.

²⁸ U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, "Pindars siebentes nemeische Gedicht", *SB Berlin* 1908, 348, n.2.

²⁹ Parallels for ἴημι in the sense "utter": LSJ I, 2.

³⁰ Strunk (above, n.2) has five examples for the equivalence of η ~ εἰ: 1) Hesiod *Theog.*200 (φιλομμειδέα derived from μήδεα; 2) Callimachus *Hymn* 2, 97-104 (ἰεἰ ~ ἰή); 3) Pindar *Pa.VI*, 121-2; 4) the spelling ηλίσσων for εἰλίσσων in a citation of Euripides *Phoenissae* 3 (=1) in a hymn preserved on a late Ptolemaic ostrakon (see M. Haslam, "The Authenticity of Euripides *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles *Electra* 1", *GRBS* 16 [1975], 158-9); and 5) Ar *Vesp.*771-2: εἴλη ~ ἡλιάσει ~ ἡλιον. None of the examples proves more than that these vowels were felt to be close enough to be used as a source for paronomasia.

³¹ (above n.2) 86: "das Ausstossen der Paianrufe ist nun in Vs.121 gewissermassen als ein ritueller Nachvollzug des göttlichen Verschiessens der Pfeile aufgefasst."

that such paronomasia would have been out of keeping with the spirit of Greek religion, but on the contrary paronomasia of this sort is very often found in literary accounts of religion.³² It may be felt to be a point against position C) that the difference between the transmitted form ἰῆτε and the forms of ἰημι that it is supposed to evoke is too great to allow that it was understood as a form of the verb. But even if ἰῆτε is primarily a pluralised interjection (perhaps an *ad hoc* formation), it might nevertheless be meant to suggest a form of the verb ἰημι (in that case B and C are not incompatible). What follows is in a sense an additional factor in favour of interpretation C), or at least in favour of some interpretation in which C) plays a part.

It was a weakness in earlier formulations of C) that no reason was adduced for why Pindar should suggest the Pythoetonia-aetiology at this point in the poem. I would point to the context: the narrative that leads up to it focusses round conflict between Apollo and the Aiakidai, and it culminates in Neoptolemus' unsuccessful challenge to Apollo's possession of the shrine at Delphi. The reference to paean-cries in ll.121-2 makes sense in any case as a cry of triumph, but it gains special point if it is meant to recall the first paean-cry was sung at Delphi when Apollo was fighting the Delphic dragon - the Delphic myth *par excellence*. The success of such an allusion requires only that there should have already been a strong association between the paean-cry and the Pythoetonia when Pindar wrote, and we have already seen that this could be so (it does not matter for this purpose whether version (I) or version (II) was better known).³³ I would add that the position of this supposed allusion - at the end of the myth and of the triad - is in line with a conclusion of Richard Garner's recent study of poetic allusion in Greek tragedy, which is that the beginnings and ends of strophes, antistrophes or lyric sections are particularly common places for allusions.³⁴

The point of the allusion would be to suggest that as an opponent of Apollo Neoptolemus is a sort of second Delphic dragon. There is an interesting parallel for this analogy in the two Hellenistic Paeans preserved on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi in which Apollo's presumed defeat of the Gallic invasion of 279/8 B.C. is explicitly compared to the Pythoetonia.³⁵ I should make it clear that Pindar is not suggesting that Neoptolemus tried to take over Delphi (I take it that *Pa.* VI implies essentially the same version of the story that Pindar advanced in *Nem.* 7, namely that Neoptolemus came to Delphi bringing "first-fruits of war" from Troy and died in a fight over sacrificial meat).³⁶ Apollo punished Neoptolemus for impieties that were committed in another time and another place: he cut down the defenceless Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeius (cf. *Pa.* VI, 113-7; also the *Iliou Persis* of Arctinus), and in general he showed himself to be the most brutal of all Greek warriors at Troy, fighting on long after the other Greeks had stopped (according to Pausanias Polygnotus portrayed this scene in his *Iliou Persis*, housed in the Cnidian Lesche at

³² Radt (above, n.16) 171. The etymological adaptation of Δᾶλος (fr.33c, 6; *Pa.* VIIb, 47) would be another counter-example.

³³ It is worth noting, however, that if version (II) had been in Pindar's mind, the address to the νεοί might be a resonance of παῖ in the etymology.

³⁴ R. Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy: the Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London, 1990), 181; appendix B, 188-9.

³⁵ Anonymous Paean 18-21 ; Limenius Paean 26-35 (citations from J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, 141 and 149).

³⁶ This is version 3 in J. Fontenrose's convenient survey, "The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi", *UCPCA* 4.3 (1960), 212. In other versions Neoptolemus came to Delphi to demand satisfaction for Apollo's killing of Achilles (version 1 in Fontenrose's survey) or simply to plunder the sanctuary (Fontenrose's version 2).

Delphi above the shrine of Neoptolemus).³⁷ It is interesting that Neoptolemus' violent nature is symbolised in later literature by the idea that he is snake: we find this in Virgil *Aen.*2, 471-5. at a point when he is about to kill Priam. This could just be a reminiscence of Hector in Homer, *Il.* 22, 93-5, but it might also reflect understanding of Pindar's point on Vergil's part. Livrea has recently suggested that the δράκων at Lycophron, *Alexandra* 327 might stand for Neoptolemus the sacrificer of Polyxena (as well as Agamemnon the sacrificer of Iphigeneia), and that that passage and Virgil, *Aen.*2, 471-5 might go back to a common source.³⁸

In view of this one wonders whether one of the factors that may have led Pindar to choose the expression μέτρα παιηόνων in *Pa.*VI, 121 is that, although its primary meaning is that of a structural "measure" with respect to the end of the second triad and the transition to the third, the expression also gestures toward a broader moral measure symbolised by Apollo. The moral sense is commoner in the case of the singular of μέτρον, though we find it in the plural also, first at Hesiod, *Op.*694.³⁹ And Pindar, although he too uses the "moderation" sense most commonly in the singular, uses it once in this sense in the plural at *Isth.*6, 71.⁴⁰ Similarly, at *Pa.*VI, 121, the expression μέτρα παιηόνων suggests that the paeon-cries are not merely measures in the semi-literal sense that they form a conclusion to this section of the poem, but also constitute a sort of moral measure in so far as they remind one of Apollonian moral authority and in particular the Pythoetonia.⁴¹

³⁷ Pausanias 10.26.4. The position of the painting - in the Cnidian Lesche behind the temple of Apollo at Delphi - may indicate that this detail in the painting was meant to comment on the role of Neoptolemus at Delphi. Robert B. Kebric, *The Paintings in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi and their Historical Context* (= *Mnemosyne Supplement* 80 [1983]) 22-3, is sceptical about this interpretation; see also L. Woodbury, "Neoptolemus and Delphi: Pindar *Nem.*7.30ff.", *Phoenix* 33 (1979), 96-7. On vases Neoptolemus is represented simultaneously slaying Priam and holding Astyanax: see O. Touchefeu, "Astyanax", *LIMC* II, 931-7.

³⁸ E. Livrea, "P.Oxy.2463: Lycophron and Callimachus", *CQ* 39 (1989), 142, n.9: "perhaps the Virgilian simile depends on the same lost material that suggested the serpent image to Lycophron". For the influence of the description of Neoptolemus' killing of Priam in *Pa.*VI, 121-2 on Vergil see A. König, *Die Aeneas und die Griechische Tragödie [Studien zur Imitations-Technik Vergils]* (Berlin 1970), 74.

³⁹ See E. G. Wilkins, "Μηδέν ἄγαν in Greek and Latin Literature", *CPh.* 21 (1926), 132-148, who lists interesting parallels, from, for example, Theognis. Two examples that have not yet made it to the lexica are Stesichorus' SLG 89, 8 and Archilochus, SLG478 (= 196aWest), 30.

⁴⁰ μέτρα μὲν γνώμα διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων. Almost immediately before this line (*Il.*66-8) there is an explicit allusion to Hesiod, *Op.*412: μελέτη δὲ τε ἔργον ὀφέλλει, and I suppose it is possible that the plural μέτρα which is unique in this sense in Pindar could be seen as a reminiscence of *Op.*694; the sense "moderation" in the singular occurs at *Ol.*13, 48; *Pyth.*2, 34; *Pyth.*8, 78; *Nem.*11, 47 (cf. W. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), 332 (s. a)).

⁴¹ It is encouraging that we have a parallel for this particular type of double meaning in which moral and poetic senses are simultaneously conveyed by the same word in Pindar's use of the word καιρός in the Epinikia where both moral and technical generic senses seem quite often to be present. J. A. Wilson, "Καιρός as 'Due Measure'" *Glotta* 58 (1980), 180-7, referring to *Pyth.*9, 78; *Ol.*13, 48, *Nem.*1, 18; *Pyth.*1, 81. Precisely this point is made by M. Pohlenz (τὸ πρέπον: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes [NGG I 16 (1933), 67]). One might also compare ἁρμονία at *P.*8, 68, which seems to have the primary meaning of "harmony", but also the overtone of "appropriateness": see J. Taillerdat, "Sur deux passages de la VIIIe Pythique", *REG* 99 (1986), 225-31; T. K. Hubbard, "Pindar's Harmonia: Pythian 8, 67-9", *Mn.*36 (1983), 286-92. For the paeon as a symbol of Apollonian moral authority in general, see Plutarch, *Mor.* 389b (where the paeon is described as τεταγμένην καὶ σῶφρονα μῦσσαν).

Appendix: Pindar *Pa.* VIIc(c)

There may be another resonance of the Pythoctonia-aetiology in a tiny fragment known as *Pa.* VIIc(c):⁴²

υἱ . λεσῖ
 ὦ βαθυδί
 ἰήϊε παῖ μεῖ
 δᾶμον Ἴθαίνα

2 θ vel ε | βαθύδοξε Grenfell and Hunt || 3 vel ἰή ἰέ, μεγίστου vel μεγα(λο)σθενέος Διὸς vel sim. Sn. || 4 vel ἰθαίνατ Grenfell and Hunt

The words ἰήϊε (or ἰή ἰέ) παῖ in line 3 are most likely an invocation to Apollo (the fact that the fragment is from a Paean itself strongly suggests that, not to mention the Apollonian associations of ἰήϊος/ἰή ἰέ).⁴³ Snell and Maehler suggest in their apparatus that the rest of the line would have perhaps specified whose son Apollo was (e.g. παῖ μεγίστου Διός).⁴⁴ The only clue as to context is l. 4 which probably contains a reference to the people of Athens. The likeliest scenario, perhaps, is that the chorus are calling on Apollo to look after Athens (which makes most sense if it is an Athenian chorus, perhaps visiting Delphi), though there are many other possibilities.⁴⁵

It is easy to see that the expression ἰήϊε παῖ could contain a resonance of a paean-cry. I would argue that it also reflects the aetiological back-formation ἴε, παῖ (version (II)). The claim is

⁴² All texts of Pindar are cited from the edition of B. Snell - H. Maehler, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* II (Leipzig, 1989). *Pa.* VII(c)c is fr.28 of *P.Oxy.* 841.

⁴³ ἰήϊε (vocative of ἰήϊος) or ἰή ἰέ? The adjectival form is attractive if, as seems likely, ll.2-3 make up one long vocative phrase, but we cannot entirely rule out the possibility of analysis into two interjections. If the adjectival form is right, this goes against the statement of Radt (above, n.16), 44, to the effect that the adjective never occurs in "kultischen" paeans (a category which covers Pindar's Paeans), but only in literary works. The adjective ἰήϊος and even the interjection ἰή are sometimes written with a rough breathing in Hellenistic sources, perhaps influenced by the supposed derivation from ἴημι.

⁴⁴ For the form of the syntax, cf. e.g. Simonides PMG 70, 1: σχέτλιε παῖ δολομήδεος Ἄφροδίτας, Pindar, *Ol.* 2, 12: ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Πέας, Aristophanes, *Eq.* 561: ὦ Γεραίστιε παῖ Κρόνου, id. *Thes.* 129: ὄλβιε παῖ Λατοῦς.

⁴⁵ A couple of other possible Athenian scenarios are worth mentioning: first, according to an aetiology mentioned only in a Hellenistic paean attributed to Limenius Apollo was hailed as Παιάν when he passed through Attica on his way from Delos to Delphi (Powell [above, n.35] 149, 11-15). This could be seen as an alternative Athenian aetiology, designed to anticipate and override the Pythoctonia-aetiology, appropriating the origin of the paean-cry for Athens, and the myth need not be as late as Limenius, since the idea that Apollo passed through Attica on his way from Delos to Delphi after his birth was ancient when Limenius wrote in the 2nd century B.C. (cf. Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, 9-11). Second, Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.17.8) gives a variant aetiology of the paean-cry in which it was encouragement given by the Delphic oracle to Theseus (i.e. "shoot, healer") when he was about to go to war with the Amazons (cf. Callimachus, *Hecale* fr.260, 10). On these aetiologies, see P. W. Moens, *De Twee Delphische Hymnen Met Museknoden* (Utrecht, 1930), 77ff. I would like to thank Christina Kraus and Christiana Sourvinou-Inwood for advice on this paper.

not that *Pa.VIIc(c)* comes from a narration of the Pythoetonia - there is no indication of that. Rather, I suggest that Pindar was familiar with the derivation of the paeon-cry from ἴε παῖ, and here uses a form of address that is half way between the paeon-cry and the aetiological back-formation. Schematically:

Primary terms	ἴη ἴε Παιάν, ἴήϊος	
	ἴήϊε παῖ μεγίστου Διός	Pindaric adaptation
Aetiological back-formation (II)	ἴε παῖ	

Harvard University

Ian Rutherford