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The paean-cry is a short prayer to Apollo consisting of an interjection ἰή followed by the vocative of the Apollonian epithet παίαν (παίαν and παίανος are dialectical alternatives). According to an aetiology well attested from the 4th century B.C., the paean-cry and the associated Apollonian epithet ἰήνος were supposed to have had their origin during Apollo's fight with the Delphic dragon, when someone encouraged him by saying ἰεῖ or ἰε (“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 παι (it is presupposed that Apollo was still a child when he shot the dragon), so that the complete etymon is ἰεῖ, παι (“shoot, child”) or, less commonly, ἰε, παι, ἰόν (shoot an arrow, child).² Accounts vary as to who uttered the words: in one version it was Leto, which suits the παι element in (II), in others it was the citizens of Delphi or some local nymphs.³ Schematically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary terms</th>
<th>ἰή, ἰεῖ, Παίαν, ἰήνος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aetiological back-formation (I)</td>
<td>ἰε, παίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetiological back-formation (II)</td>
<td>ἰε παι (ἰόν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that this Pythoctonia-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 ἰε is a rare imperative form of ἰήμι, 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 ἀδίκε) 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; Basilius, Homilia de virginitate (Rivue Bénédiction 63 [1953], 39), 2, 21.

² No full survey exists. See in general, T. Schreiber, Apollo Pythoktonos, Leipzig 1879; K. Strunk, "Friehe 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 (FGrHist7F31 = Strabo 9, p.422, discussed below), also Macrobius, Sat. I, 17, 17; for version (II), Cleftarchus of Soli Peri Paroimion A', fr.64Wehrli (= Athenaeus 701d); Duris' Samion Horoi (FGH76F79 = Et. M. s. ἱήνος); Apollonius Rhodius 2, 701-13; Callimachus, Hymn 2, 97-104 (only the last certainly includes the ἱόν element). For the purpose of this paper I ignore the alternative ancient etymologies for the paean-cry, for example those from ἱαοθαῖ and παίανο, 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 Cleftarchus; 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 paean at Delphi (the paean being only an elaborated and extended form of the the paean-cry) is traced back to the Cretans who sang after the manner of the Cretan παινόνες or "paean-singers" (516-9). Set against this, the significance of the Pythoctonia-aetiology would seem to be that it claims the origin of the paean-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. Around the same time Sacadas of Argos composed his Πίθος νόμος, a musical composition designed to imitate the conflict between Apollo and the Delphic dragon in several stages. 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 Πίθος νόμος bore the name κατακελευσμός, a word which suggests the idea of bystanders encouraging Apollo to shoot the dragon. In that case the Pythoctonia-aetiology may have already been around, although it cannot itself have been part of the Πίθος 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 Α', while version (I) is attested in a fragment of the Histories of Ephorus. Ephorus mentioned the Pythoctonia in the course of an euhemerising interpretation of the god Apollo: 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, συμμείζωντας αὐτὸς, καὶ ἄλλοιν μηνύσαι χαλέποιν ἄνδρα,
Πόθωνα τούτου, ἐπίκλησαν Δράκοντα, κατατοξεύουσας δὲ ἐπικλέεσθαι ἦν παιαίν, ἀφ' οὖν
τὸν παιασμὸν οὕτως ἐξ θοὺς παραδόθημα 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 παινόνες is found first in W. Ppape, 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 παραπάνες (Homer Od. 22. 348). On etymology in the Homeric Hymn, see also D. Kolk, Der pythische Apollohymnus als aitiologische Dichtung (Meisenheim a. Glan, 1963). Note that the Homeric Hymn associates a different aetiology with the Pythoctonia - that of Πυθών (i.e. Delphi) from the rotting (πῦθομαι) of the dragon's corpse (Hy. Hom. Ap., 363).


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

7 Strabo 9, 3, 10 (assigning the Πίθος νόμος to a Hellenistic general Timotheus, presumably wrongly); Pollux 4, 77; cf. Kolk (above, n.4), 42-3. I would compare the use of ἐπικλέεσθαι and ἐγκέλεῳ in the accounts of the paean-cry in Ephorus (below) and Duris (below, appendix). The word κατακελευσμός is otherwise used of a boatswain commanding rowers (Aristophanes, Ran.207 and Av.1273; cf. the association between paean-cry and the κέλεμα 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 Πίθος νόμος in the only other source - the hypothesis to Pindar's Pythians (Drachmann, Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina [Leipzig, 1910] II, 2, 10ff.).

For references, see n. 2 above

8 On euhemerising elements in Ephorus, see A. Henrichs, "The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of Isis Aretalogies", HSCP 88 (1984), 146.
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 (σκηνή), 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 Pythoctonia-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 _I.T._ 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 presuppposes 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 Pythoctonia-aetiology from the 5th century, I turn to Pindar. There is no evidence that Pindar anywhere dealt explicitly with the Pythoctonia 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 Pythoctonia-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 Pythoctonia 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. Apollo, 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 βιον κρατήσαε Πυθόες τῶν Ἀπόλλωνα, διὸ καὶ ταρτασσάει ἐξήτει αὐτῶν ἢ γῇ) Πυθόες 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.
First, assuming the physical appearance of Paris, Apollo kills Achilles to prevent him from sacking Troy (77-91). Second, when Zeus eventually yields to fate and allows that Troy be sacked (92-98), Achilles’ son Neoptolemus sacks Troy. However, Apollo swears that Neoptolemus will never make it home, because he has killed Priam at the altar of Zeus Herkeius (105-117). Third, Neoptolemus comes to Delphi and gets into a fight with the priests μυριάν περί τιμάν, and Apollo kills him there (117-120). The death of Neoptolemus is described in these lines:

```
120 ἄμφιπόλοις δὲ
μυριάν περί τιμάν
δηρασσόμενον κτάνεν

ὅπερ τεμένει φίλων γὰς παρ’ ὀμφαλὸν εὐρύτ.

ὅπερ ἴητε, νῦν, μέτρα παιρό
νόμων ἴητε, νέοις.
```

The narrative ends with a two-line coda addressed to young men (νέοι). This coda begins with the puzzling expression ὅπερ ἴητε, the second word repeated in l.122, which may represent the ἴητε part of the paean-cry and then a pluralised form of it (I set out the various interpretations of this that have been put forward below). The other major component in the coda is μέτρα παιρόνων, which looks as if it might be the object of ὅπερ ἴητε. Taken together the expression ὅπερ ἴητε μέτρα παιρόνων can be thought of as an expansion of the simple paean-cry, and this is perhaps a reason for interpreting παιρόνων in the sense of "paean-cries" rather than "paeans." The position of the coda strongly suggests a paean-refrain, the most common position for which is at the end of a section of a poem, and which perhaps arose from a paean-cry uttered at the end of a ritual or prayer. And though Pa. VI has no regular refrain, the coda at Pa. VI, 121-2 resembles and is perhaps meant to suggest a paean-refrain in so far as it concludes a triad, and we can perhaps think of it as a quasi-refrain. One reason that Pindar may had for including such a quasi-refrain here is that he felt that a reference to paean-cries would provide a satisfying formal conclusion to the long narrative in the second triad. This interpretation seems to me to be reinforced by the choice of the expression μέτρα παιρόνων in l.121. One might read this as a simple periphrasis (perhaps comparing the transparent παιρόνων / ἀνθεία at Bacchylides 16, 8-9), but I suspect that it is also

---

14 It seems to me that the noun may fairly often have this sense, although this has not generally been recognised. Among passages where this could be the sense are Aeschylus fr.350, 3-4: ξύμπαιντ᾽ τ᾽ εἰπόν θεοφιλεῖς ἐμάς τύχας παιάν ἐπηφήμηκεν, εὐθυμίων ἐμέ ( . . . made the sacred utterance ἰὴ παιάν afterwards [ἐπ᾽-]); Pers.392-3: οὔ γὰρ ὠς φυγῇ παιάν᾽ ἐφόμοιν σεμνῶν Ἐλλήνες τότε . . . Th. 635: ἀλώσιον παιάν᾽ ἐπεξιακχάσας; 869–70: Ἀλίκα τ᾽ ἐχθρὸν παιάν᾽ ἐπιμέλειν, E. IT. 1403-4: οὐδέτερον ἐπηφήμησαν εὐχαίσιν κόρης παιάνα.

15 For the closural force of the paean, I would compare this entry in Hesychius: τελεσίερον παίαν τῶν ἐπιτελεστικῶν τῶν τοῖς θείοις ἐπιτελουμένων λερών. The paean-refrain, when it occurs, generally comes at the end of formal units or at the end of whole works, though there are some exceptions, such as Pindar Pa.V (the refrain comes at the start of the strophe).

16 Cf. also Pa. XVII(b), -3 to -2 ἵτε παιρόνων / ἰὸραν πεταλ. This sense seems to be implied in Grenfell and Hunt’s translation (“paeans in full measure”: The Oxyrhynchus Papyri V [1908], 96), but see S. L. Radt, Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian, Text, Scholien und Kommentar (Amsterdam 1958), 171.
meant to imply that the paean-cries are a sort of measure which marks off the preceding section of the poem. The whole expression would then be an effective transition to the following section of the poem.

The form ἰῆτε is unparalleled and it has provoked a certain amount of discussion. 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 αἰλαζεῖν from αἰλαί. Wackernagel argued against this, on the grounds that the natural verbal derivative from the root ἰά would be ἰάζω. The position was revived by Radt in his commentary on Pa. VI.

B) Wackernagel suggested that ἰῆτε should be interpreted as a pluralised interjection, analogous to τῆτε or δέοτε from δέο. He did not explain how he understood μέτρα παινόφρων. We could perhaps take it as in apposition to the interjections, defining them as "the measures of paens". More likely, we could see it as an accusative governed by the interjection ἰή, 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". Compare the use of the interjection αἰαί governing an accusative at Aristophanes Lysistrata, 393:

\[ \text{ἡ γινῇ δι᾽ ὄρχομενη} \]
\[ \text{αἰαί 'Ἀδωνι' φοριν.} \]

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):

\[ \text{ἡ ἰῆτε παῖνομεν τῆτε παῖνομεν} \]

This is not dissimilar in spirit to the interpretation of Radt (above, n.16) 171, who however took παινόμενων as an objective-genitive, so that μέτρα παινόμενων are "measures for paens" rather than "measures consisting in paean-cries". 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 δὲ ἱεράτειαι, ἢ ἑγώσκοις ἔρμας ἡ Ἱροῦστος πέτοραν ὃ τοις, ἄφωρετα τροχών μέτρον ἐχων | ἡμος. Here the mevtron 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.

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

17 This is not dissimilar in spirit to the interpretation of Radt (above, n.16) 171, who however took παινόμενων as an objective-genitive, so that μέτρα παινόμενων are "measures for paens" 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 δὲ ἱεράτειαι, ἢ ἑγώσκοις ἔρμας ἡ Ἱροῦστος πέτοραν ὃ τοις, ἄφωρετα τροχών μέτρον ἐχων | ἡμος. Here the mevtron 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 (1923), 538.


22 Radt (above, n.16) 171.


24 For the accusative absolute, see R. Kühner and E. Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 1, 329-31; E. Schwzyzer, 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.
In the first stanzas, 'Ἀσκληπιόν' | δαιμόνια κλεινότατα, ἵη Παιάν

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 paean or the paean-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 ἵητε might have been meant to suggest a form of the verb ἴημι - either the 2nd plural present imperative ἵετε or the 2nd pl. present optative ἵετε (the latter being easier from the point of view of quantity) - which would take μέτρα παινόμων as its object and mean "utter." Support for this was found in the fact that the Pythoctonia aetiology made use of an approximate equivalence between ἵη 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 ει and η were perceived as identical as early as the 5th century, and even earlier. For Strunk εἰρυφαφέτραν ἐκαβόλον (111) was additional support in so far as it suggested a parallel between Apollo the shooter of arrows and the chorus' shooting paean-cries.

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 Ἀσκληπιέ, δαιμονιον κλεινοτατε. The Erythraean version is clearly to be preferred on this point, being the lectio difficilior.


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

30 Strunk (above, n.2) has five examples for the equivalence of η ~ ει: 1) Hesiod Theog. 200 (φιλομειρείά derived from μήρα; 2) Callimachus Hymn 2, 97-104 (ειέν ~ ἵη); 3) Pindar Pa.VI, 121–2; 4) the spelling ηιλασών for ειλάσων 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: ειέλη ~ ἡλάσει ~ ἡλευν. 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. It may be felt to be a point against position C) that the difference between the transmitted form \( \eta \tau e \) and the forms of \( \eta \mu i \) that it is supposed to evoke is too great to allow that it was understood as a form of the verb. But even if \( \eta \tau e \) is primarily a pluralised interjection (perhaps an ad hoc formation), it might nevertheless be meant to suggest a form of the verb \( \eta \mu i \) (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 Pythoctonia-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 Pythoctonia when Pindar wrote, and we have already seem that this could be so (it does not matter for this purpose whether version (I) or version (II) was better known).

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.

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 Pythoctonia. 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). 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 \( \Delta \alpha \lambda o\zeta \) (fr.33c, 6; Pa.VIb, 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 \( \nu \varepsilon o\iota \) might be a resonance of \( \pi \alpha \iota \) in the etymology.


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 Pyrros at Delphi", UCPA 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). 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 that Neoptolemus is represented simultaneously slaying Priam and holding Astyanax: see O. Touchefeu, "Astyanax", LIMC II, 931-7.

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, "Mhde;n "Agan 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, SLG 478 (= 196aWest), 30.

40 μέτρα μέν γνώμαι διώκων, μέτρα δέ καὶ κατέχων. Almost immediately before this line (ll.66-8) there is an explicit allusion to Hesiod, Op. 412: μελέτη δέ τε έργων οφέλει, 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 kaiqo's in the Epinikia where both moral and technical generic senses seem quite often to be present. J. A. Wilson, "Kaiqo's 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 (τo πρέπουσ: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes [NGG I 16 (1933), 67]). One might also compare Íρμονια at P. 8, 68, which seems to have the primary meaning of "harmony", but also the overtone of "appropriateness": see J. Taillerdet, "Sur deux passages de la VIIIe Pythique", REG 99 (1986), 225-31; T. K. Hubbard, "Pindar's Harmony: Pythian 8, 67-9", Mn. 36 (1983), 286-92. For the paean as a symbol of Apollonian moral authority in general, see Plutarch, Mor. 389b (where the paean is described as τεταγμένην καὶ σώφρωνα μοῖσαν).
Appendix: Pindar Pa.VII(c)

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

υλ. λιαγι
ου βαθωθι
ηεε παι μει
δαμον 'Αθηνα

2 vel e | βαθιοδε Εγρένφελ and Ηαντ || 3 vel ιε ει, μεγιστου vel μεγαλοθεονος Διος vel sim. Σν. || 4 vel οθιαται Εγρένφελ and Ηαντ

The words ιεε (or ιε ει) παι 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 ιεειοιν ιε ει).43 Snell and Maehler suggest in their apparatus that the rest of the line would have perhaps specified whose son Apollo was (e.g. παι μεγιστου Διος).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 ιεε παι could contain a resonance of a paean-cry. I would argue that it also reflects the aetiological back-formation ιεε, παι (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) is fr.28 of P.Oxy.841.

43 ιεε (vocative of ιεειοιν) or ιε ει? 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 ιεειοιν and even the interjection ιε are sometimes written with a rough breathing in Hellenistic sources, perhaps influenced by the supposed derivation from ιεειμι.

44 For the form of the syntax, cf. e.g. Simonides PMG 70, 1: σειετε παι δολομηδεος Άφροδιτας, Pindar, Ol.2, 12: ω Κρόνικε παι Πεας, Aristophanes, Eq.561: ω Γεραιστιε παι Κρόνου, id. Thes.129: δαξε παι Λατως.

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 Παιαν 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 Museknoten (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 Pythoctonia - there is no indication of that. Rather, I suggest that Pindar was familiar with the derivation of the paean-cry from ἵε παῖ, and here uses a form of address that is half way between the paean-cry and the aetiological back-formation. Schematically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary terms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iη ιε Παιάν, ιηιος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iηε ιειμεγίστου Διός</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pindaric adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Aetiological back-formation (II) | ιε | παι |
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