

IAN RUTHERFORD

ET HOMINUM ET DEORUM . . . LAUDES (?):
A HYPOTHESIS ABOUT THE ORGANISATION OF PINDAR'S *PAEAN-*
BOOK

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 107 (1995) 44–52

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ET HOMINUM ET DEORUM . . . LAUDES (?)
A HYPOTHESIS ABOUT THE ORGANISATION OF PINDAR'S
PAEAN-BOOK

1

For the most part, “Paian” was a name for Apollo, and the paean was his genre.¹ The association of both the title and the genre with Apollo had probably established itself at least as early as the composition of the Pythian part of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, which describes the performance of the first Delphic paean (called the “ἱπαιηών” in line 517), and offers an aetiology in which the name is derived from that of the Cretan παιήονες (lines 518ff.).² This link is confirmed by numerous secondary sources, among them the opening of one of Pindar’s *Threnoi* (fr.128c, 1–2) where paeans are said to belong to the children of Leto. Two excellent examples of cult paeans dedicated to Apollo are the first and second Delphic *Paeans* dating from the last decades of the 2nd century B.C., which are exclusively concerned with the major episodes in the career of Apollo – his birth, his arrival at Delphi, his slaying of the Delphic dragon.³

This is not to say that paeans were not also addressed to other deities. The alternative addressee best attested is Asclepius – appropriately enough in view of his relationship to Apollo and in view of the fact that the name “Paian” can mean “healer”.⁴ The 4th century poet Philodamus of Scarpheia wrote a *Paeon* to Dionysus, but this is perhaps to be explained as a special phenomenon reflecting a syncretism between Apollo and Dionysus peculiar to Delphi.⁵ Another common group commonly addressed with paeans are heroes or (especially from the early Hellenistic period) deified mortals – in these cases the paean may have originally been a song of victory.⁶ However, all such cases represent only minor qua-

¹ On the paean-genre: A. Fairbanks, *A Study of the Greek Paeon* (Cornell 1900), L. Deubner, “Paian”, *NJKA* 22 (1919), 385ff., A. von Blumenthal, “Paian”, *RE* 36, 2340ff., G. A Privitera, “Il peana sacro ad Apollo”, *Cultura e scuola* 41 (1972), 41ff. = C. Calame ed., *Rito e Poesia Corale in Grecia: Guida Storica e Critica* (Rome, 1977), 17ff.; L. Käppel, *Paian* (Berlin, 1992).

² On this passage see G. Huxley, “Cretan Paiawones”, *GRBS* 15 (1975), 119ff.

³ J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), 141ff. and 149ff.; A. Bélis, *CID*.

⁴ Paeans addressed to Asclepius include that of Sophocles (*PMG* 737); the Erythraean Paeon (*PMG* 934 = Powell (above, n.3) 136); Isyllus’ Paeon (Powell, 33–4); the Paeon of Macedonicus (Powell, 138–9).

⁵ Powell (above, n.3) 165ff. See A. Stewart, “Dionysus at Delphi: The Pediments of the Sixth Temple of Apollo and Religious Reform in the Age of Alexander”, in *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, edd. Beryl Barr-Sharrar and Eugene N. Borza [*Studies in the History of Art*, 10] (Washington, 1982), 205ff.

⁶ Paeans in honour of heroes: to Agemon: Athenaeus, 15.696f.; at the Spartan *Gymnopaedia*, commemorating the dead who at fallen at the battle of Hysiai in 669 B.C. (Suda 1.547.12 Adler, *Anecdota Graeca* [I. Bekker (Berlin, 1814)] I,32.18ff.; paeans in honour of dead men: for Titus Flamininus after his death in 174 B.C. (Plutarch *Flam.* 16.6.2; Powell (above, n.3) 173); in honour of living potentates also: Athenaeus, 15.696f.;

fications to the general rule that in the classical period the cult-paeon was most closely associated with Apollo.

In view of this pattern, it is surprising that in the fragments of Pindar's *Paeans*, Apollo is rarely the focus of attention. True, almost all of the surviving fragments can be shown to come from poems that relate to festivals and cults of Apollo. But only in *Pa.* VIIb, which relates the myth of his birth, does Apollo himself provide the main theme.⁷ Apollo's main cult at Delphi provides the theme in *Pa.* VIII, which relates the myth of the four temples. But elsewhere the amount of mythological narrative relating directly to Apollo is surprisingly small. Thus, to take the better preserved poems, *Pa.* II, which begins with an address to the hero Abderus, narrates a military victory won by the Abderites over the Thracians; *Pa.* IV relates a Ceian myth which has no bearing on Apollo, the story of Euxantius' decision to turn down an offer to become ruler of Crete; *Pa.* V contained an account of the Athenian colonisation of Euboea; and *Pa.* VI narrates the careers of Achilles and Neoptolemus at Troy (which obliquely involved Apollo) and the birth of Aiakos (which does not).⁸ In all of these Apollo is less in evidence than one might have expected in poems belonging to the genre named after him. Apollo provides no more than the frame – either formally, through the paeon-refrain, or ritually, because the context of performance is a festival of Apollo.

It seems to me that this discrepancy should have bothered scholars more than it has. It would be possible to argue that the Pindaric *Paeans* must be regarded as our primary data for the genre in the 5th century, and that what they show is precisely that not all paeans were exclusively concerned with major episodes from the career of Apollo. While this position cannot be ruled out, I believe that resort should be made to it only after all other possibilities have been exhausted. In this spirit, the present paper suggests that there may after all be an explanation for the unexpectedly un-Apollonian character of most of the surviving *Paeans* in manner of organisation of the book of *Paeans* in the Hellenistic edition of Pindar. It is known that not all sections of the book are equally well represented in our fragments; and I want to raise the possibility the sections that contained *Paeans* with strongly Apollonian themes (which I define as themes relating episodes from the cycle of Apollonian myth or aetiologies relating to major cults of Apollo) may be those that were treated least kindly by the punishing process of transmission to which the book was subjected.

paeon to Seleucus from Erythrae: Powell, 140). In general see C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*² [= *Zetemata* 14 (Munich, 1970)] 148. The paeon which Duris of Samos reported was sung in honour of the Spartan general Lysander (*PMG* 867) was probably composed only after his death in 395 B.C. since there is no other evidence for the payment of heroic or divine honours to a living commander before Alexander; so E. Badian, "The Deification of Alexander the Great", in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki, 1981), 33–8.

⁷ The same myth is found in the fragment classed by Snell and Maehler as "*Pa.* XII", contributed by *P. Oxy.* 1792, but that is not necessarily from a *Paeon*.

⁸ On *Pa.* II and *Pa.* VI, the standard commentary remains that of S. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian*. On *Pa.* IV, see N. Hope, *A Commentary on the Fourth and Ninth Paeans of Pindar* (Thesis, Oxford, 1986).

2

The Hellenistic edition of Pindar, probably the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium,⁹ contained a single book-roll of *Paeans*.¹⁰ A number of papyri contribute to our knowledge of it, the most important being *P. Oxy.* 841. The text is written on the verso in columns of 15–17 lines, and there are two distinct hands: most of what survives is in plain capitals, but some fragments are in slightly more elaborate capitals. With the help of line numerical symbols written in the margin, it has been possible to reconstruct an almost continuous section comprising lines 870–1350 (representing about columns 60–90), and containing fragments of at least seven *Paeans* (“*Pa.* I–VII” in the enumeration of SM).¹¹ This is the section that Grenfell and Hunt called “A”, and it is all in the plain capitals. Other fragments written in the plain capitals have been shown with the help of other papyri to contribute to one more poem: *Pa.* VIIb (Grenfell and Hunt’s section B). This poem cannot be placed with respect to section A; the fragments are significantly dirtier than those of section A, but this factor provides no clear guidance.¹²

The fragments in the more elaborate capitals contribute to several more poems. With the help of other papyri it has been possible to reconstruct a sequence of three poems: *Pa.* VIId – *Pa.* VIII–VIIIa. The recto of the fragments of *P. Oxy.* 841 that come from this section – Grenfell and Hunt’s section C – is in the same hand as that of sections A and B;¹³ however, other fragments with the verso in elaborate capitals have a more rounded script on the recto. These contribute to *Pa.* IX–X(a)–X(b); Grenfell and Hunt called them “section D”, though there is no suggestion that the three fragments were contiguous. The differences in handwriting can be used as a basis for establishing possible orders for the various sections, assuming that sections in the same hand were contiguous. Clearly A and B belong together, C belongs with them, D comes next to C. The possible orders would therefore be: (AB)CD and DC(AB), where (AB) is short for “AB or BA”.

⁹ Earlier scholars, such as Callimachus (cf. the discussion of the genre and class of *Pyth.* 2 (Drachmann, *Scholia* 2.31.8ff.)) may have contributed to the edition. Scepticism with regard to the contribution of Aristophanes is shown by W. J. Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1986), 145–6 on fr. 381.

¹⁰ This is clear from the lists in *P. Oxy.* 2438 and *Vita Ambros.* (Drachmann, *Scholia in Pindarum*, (Leipzig, 1903–27) 1.3.6ff.; cf. Eustathius in Drachmann, *Scholia* 3.303.5ff.)). The list in *Suda* (4.133.6ff. Adler) does not specify the number of books. W. Croenert, in a review of vol. 5 of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (*Literarisches Zentralblatt* 59 [1908]) suggested that there were two books on the basis of Ammonius, *de diff. verb.* 231 Nickau (Pindar, fr.66 Snell – Maehler), but this seems to refer to two books of a commentary by Didymus. A. Meineke, *Stobaeus* (Leipzig 1860–), 2. cli–ii, suggested emending Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 2.1.8 (= Pindar, fr. 61) to imply that a reference to a fifth book of Pindaric *Paeans*. See J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare, Ét. et Com.* 13 (Paris, 1952), 67.

¹¹ For other cases of numerical symbols in the margin, see Irigoin (above, n. 10) 39 and add Stesichorus, *SLG* 133a, line 9 (= *P. Oxy.* 2803, fr. 1, col. ii, line 9)Ᾱ Geryoneis (*SLG* 27 col. ii, 6 = *P. Oxy.* 2617, fr. 7): Ν̄; “Thebaid” (*P. Lille* 76Cii+B): Γ̄.

¹² Thus, papyrus texture had misleading implications for arranging the fragments of the Lille Stesichorus: see J. M. Bremer, A. Maria van Erp Taalman Kip, S. R. Slings, *Some Recently Found Greek Poems* (= *Mnemosyne Supplement* 99), 128.

¹³ The recto, a census list, is *P. Oxy.* 984.

The numerical symbols in section A are most obviously taken as referring to lines of a book-roll containing the *Paeans* and nothing else. They might also refer to the lines of the *Paeans* even if these were divided between two rolls. Two other possibilities deserve to be mentioned. First, in principle the numerical symbols in section A might refer not to the lines of the *Paeon* book, but to lines of a book-roll. Thus, *P. Oxy.* 841 might represent an edition of the *Paeans* divided between two papyrus-rolls, and section A might come from the second.¹⁴ However, if there were as many as 3000 lines of *Paeans* (which is what this hypothesis would require), we would expect that two books would have been set aside for them in the edition. Alternatively, the numerical symbols might refer to a book-roll which included a few poems from some other genre and some or all of the *Paeans*, so that section A would represent *Paeans* grouped rather earlier in the *Paeon*-book; but that also seems a very long shot. These possibilities being eliminated, we are left with a probability that the numerical symbols probably refer to lines of a book-roll containing the *Paeans*.

If it is a reasonable hypothesis that the *Paeon*-book contained no more than 2000 lines, section A probably came in the latter section and perhaps near the end of the roll.¹⁵ This limits the possible orders to DC(AB). For the same reason section B probably precedes section A.¹⁶ Thus, the surviving *Paeans* were probably in the following order:

Section D	<i>Pa.</i> IX, X(a), X(b)
Section C	<i>Pa.</i> VIIId, VIII, VIIIa
Section B	<i>Pa.</i> VIIa–VIIb
Section A	<i>Pa.</i> I–VII

One of the main challenges presented by any attempt to reconstruct the ancient edition of the *Paeans* concerns the rationale governing their organisation within the book. Our information about the way ancient editions of the lyric poets were organised is far from complete, but what we have suggests that the poems were usually organised along a definite plan. The principles of division most familiar to us are by metre, as in the case of the first seven books of Sappho, or by genre, as in the case of Pindar, Bacchylides, Simonides and the eighth book of Sappho (*Epithalamia*). When there were enough examples of a particular

¹⁴ Radt (above, n.8), 5.

¹⁵ Compare the lengths of rolls of *Epinikia*: (cf. Irigoin (above, n.10) 40): *Olympians*: 1562; *Pythians*: 1983; *Nemeans*: 1273; *Isthmians*: more than 752. The first book of Sappho's poems had 1320 verses (cf. *PLF* 30); Bacchylides fr. 64 has the sign Ξ = 1400; Lycophron, *Alexandra*: 1474 lines; Aratus, *Phaenomena* + *Prognostica*: 1154 lines; Callimachus, *Hymns*: 1083 lines; the books of Apollonius' *Argonautica* range from 1248 (Bk. 2), to 1779 (Bk. 4); a fragment of *P. Oxy.* 2617, which contained Stesichorus, *Geryoneis*, has the symbol \bar{N} = 1300, and the roll may have been even longer; D. Page, "Stesichorus: The Geryoneis", *JHS* 93 (1973), 138ff., argues that the *Geryoneis* was over 1560 lines long.

¹⁶ Irigoin (above, n.10) 83, supposed that *Pa.* I is the end of *Pa.* VIIb. Against this is the lack of fit between the metre of the two fragments; and the fact that *Pa.* VIIb was performed in Delos (see title), whereas *Pa.* I seems to relate to a Theban festival. B. Snell, "Identifikationen von Pindarbruchstücken", *Hermes* 73 (1938), 425, says that a regular pattern of insect-holes, which he thinks get narrower as you move to the right, can be used to corroborate this arrangement, but I have been unable to confirm this.

genre to fill several books, it is reasonable to expect that a systematic subdivision will have been applied, as we can observe in the case of the *Epinikia* of Pindar.

Within the book, the arrangement seems to have generally followed one of two principles: 1) alphabetical order, whether by the first letters of the poems, as perhaps in the poems of Sappho,¹⁷ or of the titles given to them in the editions, as in the case of the *Dithyramboi* of Bacchylides, the alphabetical order extending no further than the first letter, as seems to be regularly the case in the Hellenistic period;¹⁸ 2) progression from more important subject to less important, as in the case of the *Epinikia* of Pindar, where the order seems to be determined for the most part a) by status of athletic event and after that b) or by status of the victor.¹⁹ Miscellaneous poems are put at the end of the books, for example the three “κεχωρισμένα” poems at the end of the Nemeans.²⁰ The arrangement of the single book of Bacchylides’ *Epinikia* was probably similar.²¹ The beginnings and ends of the books seem to have come in for special treatment, for just as miscellaneous poems tend to be placed last, so the first place seems to be reserved for poems that were regarded as of special importance.²² This is perhaps the only respect in which editors of the classical Greek lyric poets seem to have approached formal/aesthetic principles of organisation of the type we associate with Hellenistic poetry books.²³

¹⁷ See E. Lobel, *Σαπφούς Μέλη* (Oxford, 1925), p. xv. There are two sorts of evidence: a) in some cases consecutive poems in the papyri start with the same letter, and b) the lines that Hephaestion cites to illustrate the metres of the poems – which we imagine generally came from near the beginning of their respective books – always seem to start with letters near the beginning of the alphabet. An obstacle to this theory is posed by the first poem of Bk. 1: ποικιλόθρον . . . , but perhaps there were special reasons for putting this poem first. The organisation of the poems of Alcaeus within the book may also have been alphabetical: C. Gallavotti, “Nuovi carmi di Alceo da Ossirinco, 5 – Nuovi carmi da Ossirinco”, *RIFC* 70 (1942), 165, cited in L. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity* (Coll. Latomus 90 [1967]), 23, n.3.

¹⁸ Cf. L. Daly (above, n.17) 29; J. Rusten, “Dicaearchus and the Tales from Euripides”, *GRBS* 23 (1982), 363.

¹⁹ See Irigoien (above, n.10) 43–4.

²⁰ The κεχωρισμένα *Nemeans*: see *Nem.* 9 (Drachmann, *Scholia* 3.150.3). Similarly, an *Oschochorikon* may have come at the end of the *Isthmians*: I. C. Rutherford and J. A. D. Irvine, “The Race in the Athenian Oschochoria and an Oschochoricon in Pindar”, *ZPE* 72 (1988), 43ff.

²¹ H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides, Erster Teil, Die Siegeslieder, I.* [*Mnemosyne Supplement* 62] (Leiden, 1982) 36ff. It started with two poems dedicated to a Ceian victor, this arrangement presumably being preferred because Bacchylides was a Ceian poet. After that there is a sequence of three *Epinikia* dedicated to Hieron, then two for Lachon of Ceos for a victory at Olympia and a third for another Ceian victor, Liparion, then five for victories at the Isthmian, Pythian and Nemean games. It finished with two fairly obscure poems: an *Epinikion* for Cleoptolemus of Thessaly at the *Petraia* (it is presumably the obscurity of this festival which warranted the final position), and an installation poem for Aristoteles of Larissa, comparable to Pindar, *Nem.* 11 (see Maehler, 302ff.).

²² For example, Pindar *Ol.* 1, which being in honour of a victory in the horse-race, should have come after the *Ol.* 2-4, which are in honour of victories in the chariot race, but is placed first, presumably because it provides an aetiology of the Olympian games (surely not because of the qualities of the first five vowels, contra Slater (above, n.9), 146). Other examples might be the Ceian poems at the start of Bacchylides’ *Epinikia*, and the cletic hymn to Aphrodite at the start of the first book of Sappho.

²³ Aesthetic organisation of Hellenistic poetry books: J. van Sickle, “The Book-Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book”, *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 5ff. The arrangement of the first seven poems in the book of

On the basis of this, what conclusions are we led to with respect to the arrangement of the *Paean*-book? There are no signs of order by metre. Nor are there indications of alphabetical order: the poems are certainly not organised by alphabetical order of first letter; one might think that the alphabetical order might have been based on the information contained in the titles – the nationalities of the performers and the places of performance – but both seem to be ruled out.²⁴

In the absence of any obvious solution, I offer the following hypothesis. I begin with the observation that Apollo's lack of prominence is particularly noticeable in the poems from section A of the papyrus. None of the poems in this section can be shown to have related one of the standard Apollonian myths – his birth, his journey to the Hyperboreans, his taking over Delphi and his fight with the Delphic dragon. The nearest we come is that the introduction to *Pa.* III seems to have contained a description of an epiphany of Apollo. Since *Pa.* VI was written for the Delphic *Theoxenia*, one would expect Apollo to be prominent, but he has only a small role in the narration of the career of Achilles and Neoptolemus in the second triad. The poem also seems to have provided an aetiology of the Delphic *Theoxenia* (lines 62ff.), but this was brief and in no sense the focus of the poem. Apollo hardly seems to figure at all in narratives of *Pa.* II or *Pa.* IV. The surviving (or partially surviving) *Paeans* in which Apollonian mythology had a higher profile seem to have come earlier in the book. Thus *Pa.* VIIb, which relates the birth of Apollo came in section B; *Pa.* X, which has been plausibly connected with the Delphic *Septerion*,²⁵ comes from sections D; the narrative of the four Delphic temples related in *Pa.* VIII does not seem to stress Apollo's role to any degree, but in so far as it relates the origin of the Delphic oracle, it seems a very suitable theme for a paean.

Working from this data, I would suggest that the hypothesis which *prima facie* seems likeliest is the following. Aristophanes – or whoever the ancient editor was – proceeded by two stages. First, he made an initial selection of those poems by Pindar that he judged to belong to the paean genre. Second, he selected from these the paeans that he regarded as the best examples of the genre; since the paean was Apollo's genre, these will have been those in which the main themes were episodes from Apollo's career or the aetiologies of major Apollonian festivals. He will have placed these earlier in the book. The paeans that he grouped toward the end of the book – which happen to be much better preserved – are the ones that did not show the same degree of emphasis on Apollo or the aetiologies of his cults. (There is a certain similarity to the position of the *κεχωρισμένα* poems at the end of the

Bacchylides' *Epinikia* – two Ceian poems followed by three for Hieron, followed by two more Ceian poems – looks particularly "aesthetic" in character.

²⁴ Alphabetical order based on first letter is ruled out because *Pa.* V (beginning with ι) preceded *Pa.* VI (beginning with π); alphabetical order based on performers is ruled out because *Pa.* IV (Κεῖλοι) precedes *Pa.* VII (Θηβαῖοι), alphabetical order based on place is ruled out because *Pa.* IX (Thebes, from section D) will have preceded poems performed at Delos and Delphi in sections C, B and A. The poems in section A seem to be roughly in alphabetical order with respect to place of performance: *Pa.* II: Abdera; *Pa.* III–VI: Delos and Delphi; *Pa.* VII: Thebes; this data would be compatible with the hypothesis that the poems in section A constitute a separate group.

²⁵ Snell (above. n.16), 439; E. Simon, *Opfernde Götter* (Berlin, 1953) 33ff.

books they come in, or of the *κεχωρισμένα Partheneia* after the other two books of Partheneia.) The two hypothetical groups of *Paeans* can be represented thus:

<i>Paeans</i> with more Apollonian themes:	sections D, C and B of <i>P. Oxy.</i> 841 (<i>Pa.</i> X, VIII, VIIIb)
<i>Paeans</i> with less Apollonian themes:	section A of <i>P. Oxy.</i> 841 (<i>Pa.</i> II–VII)

Two possible counter-examples deserve to be mentioned. First, *Pa.* IX, from section D, seems to count against this hypothesis since the theme does not seem particularly Apollonian: the first triad is a prayer on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, requesting information about what it portends and asking that the worst effects should be averted; and the second triad seems to describe the birth of the Theban prophet Tenerus, the son of Apollo and Melia. This does not look strongly Apollonian, but we should perhaps bear in mind that from the 5th century there was a tendency to identify Apollo with the sun; and this view was perhaps held by the editor who placed *Pa.* IX early in the book.²⁶

The other text that could present a counter-example is *Pa.* VIIIa. We have only lines 10–25, which comprise a mythological narrative: someone, presumably Cassandra, reports that Hecabe had a dream in which she saw a hundred-handed monster, which is presumably meant to represent Paris. This does not look like an Apollonian paean, but if we had the opening nine lines or the section following line 25 (which may have been very large), we might get a completely different impression. For example, the poem might well have gone on to describe the relationship between Cassandra and Apollo; and perhaps a full specification of a cultic context was contained in the closing lines.²⁷

Sections D, C, B and A amount to 733 lines, which represents at most half the book.²⁸ If the average length of *Paeans* was 100 lines, there were probably between 15 and 20 of them in the whole book. This means that besides ten or so known from papyrological sources, there may have been a number of others. Some testimonial fragments of Pindar may come from these otherwise lost poems. For example: first, fr. *55: a scholion on Aeschylus tells us that according to Pindar Ge attempted to send Apollo to Tartarus because he tried to take over Delphi.²⁹ This is not said to be from a *Paeon*, but the theme would obviously suit a Delphic *Paeon* very well. Second, fr. *54: Strabo, 9.3.6, 419, and Pausanias, 10.16.3, attribute to Pindar the myth of how Delphi was founded at the meeting-point of two eagles, sent by Zeus, one from East and one from the West. Again we lack explicit testimony that this myth was related in a *Paeon*, but the myth, which is clearly meant as an aetiology for Delphi's claim that the *ὀμφαλός* is the center of the earth, seems very likely to come from a

²⁶ Euripides, *Phaethon* TGF 781.11–3 = lines 224–6 in J. Diggle, *Euripides' Phaethon* (Cambridge, 1970); and see Diggle 147–8; Aeschylus, *Bassarides* in TGrF 3.178–9 (= Ps. Eratosthenes *Catasterismi*, ed. Olivieri, in *Mythographi Graeci* (Leipzig, 1894–) 3.1.29.5).

²⁷ Contrastingly, D. A. Schmidt, “Bacchylides 17 – Paean or Dithyramb”, *Hermes* 118 (1990), 18ff. suggests that Apollo came in *via* the myth known to have been mentioned by Stesichorus (*PMG* 198 = Pausanias, 10.27.2), that Apollo transported Hecabe to Lycia after the sack of Troy.

²⁸ D: Paean IX–X: Di) 49 lines, Dii) 22 lines; C: Paeans VIII–VIIIa: 111 = 25 = 136 lines; B: Paean VIIa–VIIb: 63 lines; A: Paeans I–VI: 10+108+101+62+48+183 = 512. Total: 733.

²⁹ Schol. Aeschylus, *Eum.* 2.5b (= L. O. Smith, *Scholia in Aeschylum* (Leipzig 1976) 1.43.7).

poem written for performance at Delphi, and such a poem was probably a paean. And third, fr. 64: according to Ps. Plutarch, *De Musica*, Pindar said in one of his *Paeans* that the Lydian *harmonia* was first taught to men at the wedding of Niobe. This may well indicate that the story of Niobe and the destruction of the Niobids by Apollo and Artemis was the theme of one of the *Paeans* grouped earlier in the book.

3

In the preceding paragraphs I offered a *prima facie* hypothesis. A slightly more focussed interpretation about the organisation of the *Paeon*-book is suggested by the following observation by the Roman grammarian Servius.³⁰

conclamant socii laetum paeana secuti. paeon proprie Apollinis laus est, sed abusive etiam aliorum dicitur; unde Pindarus opus suum, quod et hominum et deorum continet laudes, paeanas vocavit.

(His comrades shouted the happy **παιάν** following him. The paean is properly praise of Apollo, but it is also used imprecisely of praise of others. Whence Pindar called a work of his, which contains the praises of both men and gods, *Paeans*.)

Servius comments on Virgil, *Aen.* 10.738, where Mezentius has just slain Orontes, and his comrades strike up a victory **παιάν** (Virgil is presumably thinking of Homer, *Iliad* 22.391). The comment is elucidated by a passage from Proclus' taxonomy of Greek lyric poetry in which a distinction is drawn between four major categories of poetry (*Chrest.*, 319b35–320a9): songs εἰς θεούς, songs εἰς ἄνθρώπους, songs that are both εἰς θεούς and εἰς ἄνθρώπους, and songs εἰς τὰς προσπιπτούσας περιστάσεις. For Proclus, the **παιάν** belongs in the first category εἰς θεούς. Servius, on the other hand, seems to attest an alternative classification, in which the **παιάν** belongs to the mixed category. This point emerges clearly if one compares the phraseology used by Proclus to describe the mixed category (*Chrest.*, 320a3–6)

εἰς θεοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄνθρώπους παρθένια, δαφν(ηφορικά, τριποδ)ηφορικά, ὠσχοφορικά, εὐκτικά· ταῦτα γὰρ εἰς θεοὺς γραφόμενα καὶ ἀνθρώπων περιείληφεν ἐπαίνους.

(Dedicated to gods and men: *Parthenia*, *Daphnephorika*, *Tripodephorika*, *Oskhophorika*, *Euktika*. These, while being dedicated to the gods, also contain praise of men.)

The phrase ἀνθρώπων περιείληφεν ἐπαίνους here corresponds exactly to Servius' *hominum . . . continet laudes*, and we can take it that Servius or his source has translated a similar Greek sketch of the genre. As a statement about the genre, Servius' testimony makes sense, since from the early Hellenistic period the traditional dedication of **παιῶνες** to deities

³⁰ Servius, on Virgil, *Aen.* 10.738 (Hagen/Thilo 2.464.1); surprisingly not included in the standard editions of Pindar.

such as Apollo and Asclepius was increasingly supplemented by the practice of dedicating παιῶνες to powerful men.

Servius' belief that Pindar applied the term *Paeans* to a certain group of songs which included praise of both men and gods, and that these songs were even grouped together as an *opus* in Pindar's time, seem to reflect ignorance about the role of Hellenistic scholarship in organising the songs.³¹ Nevertheless, the idea that Pindar's *Paeans* "contained the praises of both men and gods" need not itself be part of the error, and it may in fact reflect a doctrine of Hellenistic scholarship. This issue depends partly on what "contains the praises of men" means. If it implies dedication, it does not seem to describe the *Paeans* very well, because only one is dedicated to a hero or man – *Pa.* II. In that case, perhaps Servius, or his source, is mistaken, falsely attributing to Pindar the Hellenistic practice of dedicating παιῶνες to mortals. However, what we do find in the *Paeans* are narratives describing the exploits of heroes (*Pa.* IV, V, VI, VII), and it is possible that "containing the praises of men" refers to these. In this way, perhaps Servius does reflect knowledge of the *Paean*-book.

It is now possible to augment the hypothesis put forward in the preceding section. I would suggest that the book of Paeans was organised into "praises of gods" and "praises of men". The first section of the book will have consisted of paeans exclusively concerned with "gods", i.e. Apollo (at least mostly), while the second section will have consisted of paeans concerned with heroes and men, such as *Pa.* II (Abderus), *Pa.* IV (Euxantius), *Pa.* V (the Athenian colonisers of Delos), *Pa.* VI (Neoptolemus), *Pa.* VII (Tenerus). It remains possible that the *Paeans* in the first group would have been regarded as the purer instances of the genre, while those in the second group would have been regarded as less pure instances of it. Schematically:

<i>Paeans</i> concerned with gods (i.e. Apollo):	sections D, C and B of <i>P. Oxy.</i> 841 (<i>Pa.</i> X, VIII, VIIb)
<i>Paeans</i> concerned with heroes and men:	section A of <i>P. Oxy.</i> 841 (<i>Pa.</i> II–VII)

This remains a hypothesis only; I cannot pretend to have proved it. But my suggestion at least has the merit of accounting for two disconcerting features of the *Paeans* in section A of the papyrus: the paucity in them of narratives relating to Apollo, and the frequency of narratives relating to heroes and other mortals.

Harvard University

Ian Rutherford

³¹ As was noticed by Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1811–), 2.xxxi.