

## FORM AND MEANING IN BACCHYLIDES' FIFTH ODE

Douglas L. Cairns

School of Classics, University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

**Abstract.** Ring-composition dominates the structure of Ode 5 in ways which are subtle, complex, and crucial to the poem's interpretation. At all levels of the poem, ring-structure provides thematic links and contrasts as well as serving the formal articulation of the ode. The myth apparently eschews forms of ring-composition common in lyric narrative, but in fact manipulates the conventions even as it departs from them.

The impulse for this paper arose first from surprise that the secondary literature on Bacchylides' fifth Ode seems, as far as I can see, to ignore much that is obvious about the way the ode is constructed, and secondly from a conviction that study of the form and structure of archaic poetry, despite the current tendency to stigmatize such study as 'formalist' (i.e., deeply unfashionable) and 'ahistorical', is still worth undertaking.<sup>1</sup> Understanding of form will always be an indispensable part of the study of literature, and the form of epinician is a tangible aspect of the poem as a culturally embedded artefact. In studying the form of occasional poetry such as epinician one can legitimately claim to be investigating the poet's presentation of his material in relation to the expectations of his original audience, a fundamental aspect of the genre as the product of a particular society at a particular period.<sup>2</sup>

My aim here, however, is not to undertake a complete defence of the importance of literary form, but a more modest one, namely to concentrate on Bacchylides' use of ring-composition in his fifth Ode, and to show first that the technique dominates the form and structure of the poem to an extent greater than hitherto realized,<sup>3</sup> and secondly that Bacchylides' use of the technique in

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper was written at the Seminar für klassische Philologie, Göttingen, in the summer of 1995; I should like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (Bonn) for making my stay possible, and Prof. Dr C. J. Classen and Prof. Dr Hans Bernsdorff (Göttingen) for their assistance. I am also grateful to my colleague, Dr Roger Brock, for valuable comments and suggestions for improvement.

<sup>2</sup> See E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (repr. Berkeley 1986) 16, 27, 46; cf. R. Hamilton, *Epinikion* (The Hague 1974) 1.

<sup>3</sup> Maehler's discussion of the ode's form (*Die Lieder des Bakchylides* 1.2 [Leiden 1982] 82-84) is good, but there is more to be said. M. Lefkowitz, 'Bacchylides' Ode 5: Imitation and Originality', *HSCP* 73 (1969) 94 touches on ring-composition, but regards it as a simple technique operative at the level of the whole poem; H. Krieger, *Untersuchungen zu den*

this poem gives the lie to the view that ring-composition is necessarily a simple or naive feature of the archaic poet's craft.<sup>4</sup> But all this would be arid if it did not aid our understanding of the poem as a whole, and so I also suggest ways in which the form of the poem contributes to an appreciation of its meaning for an audience which knew how to be guided by the use of ring-composition.

The overall structure of the ode is straightforward enough; a beginning (proem plus initial praise, 1-55) and an end (second praise plus conclusion, 176-200) enclose a central mythical narrative (56-175);<sup>5</sup> in such a structure, an element of ring-composition is wellnigh inevitable, given the formal autonomy of the myth as a form of excursus.<sup>6</sup> In this case, however, application of the technique is more than just the echoing of the beginning in the end, or a return

---

*optischen und akustischen Daten der bacchylideischen Dichtung* (Vienna 1969) 223-53 argues that the structure of the poem is careful and considered, but does not go into detail. S. Goldhill, 'Narrative Structure in Bacchylides 5', *Eranos* 81 (1983) 65-81 ignores traditional forms; indeed (p. 66) he makes 'complicated' structure antithetical to ring-composition; and J. Pinsent, 'Pindar's Narrative Technique: *Pythian* 4 and Bacchylides 5', *LCM* 10 (1985) 2-8 is an unrevised public lecture which promises more than it delivers. Since the study of L. Illig (*Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung* [Borna/Leipzig 1931]), analysis of ring-composition in epinician has tended to concentrate on its deployment in mythical narrative (cf. n. 40 below); on ring-composition as the organizing principle of whole odes, see C. A. P. Ruck, 'Marginalia Pindarica I-II', *Hermes* 96 (1968) 128-42; C. A. P. Ruck, 'Marginalia Pindarica III', *Hermes* 96 (1968) 661-74; C. A. P. Ruck, 'Marginalia Pindarica IV-VI', *Hermes* 100 (1972) 143-69; C. Greengard, *The Structure of Pindar's Epinician Odes* (Amsterdam 1980) esp. 81-88; cf. the analyses of G. W. Most, *The Measures of Praise* (Göttingen 1985). The importance of ring-composition in Pindar is down-played by Hamilton [2] 8, 12 n. 33.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Illig [3] 56, 59f., W. A. A. van Otterlo, *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition* (Amsterdam 1944) 33-44; Hamilton [2] 2 n. 4; Pinsent [3] 7.

<sup>5</sup> That the traditional structure of a typical ('myth' as opposed to 'non-myth') epinician is tripartite is uncontroversial: Hamilton [2] 4-6, 8f. criticizes the 'traditional view' of an ABA pattern, but (26f.) reaffirms the basic tripartite structure (in Bacchylides as in Pindar, pp. 79, 81); among Bacchylides' myth-odes (1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 13) 11 is a partial exception, in that, despite its tripartite structure, its brief conclusion is more an appendage of the myth than a return to praise, and the structure of 13 is complicated by the insertion of a mythical element (Heracles and the lion) between the proem and first praise (cf. the brief myth of Archemorus in 9.10-20).

<sup>6</sup> On the formal autonomy of the myth, see Hamilton [2] 26, 56f.; this is even more pronounced in Bacchylides, whose myths generally form a more solid, self-contained, and unbroken narrative than Pindar's (cf. Hamilton [2] 82). For the basic association between ring-composition and digressions, etc. in archaic narrative style, see van Otterlo [4] 5-39; cf. B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 51-56 and K. Stanley, *The Shield of Homer* (Princeton 1993) 6-9 (with copious references).

to praise after a digression,<sup>7</sup> but rather the fundamental means by which the poem's thought is articulated.

The basic form is tripartite, but since beginning and end correspond, there is also a tendency towards bipolar resposion and antithesis; we shall see that this union of tripartition and bipolarity dominates the articulation of the poem. General correspondence of beginning and end is apparent in the fact that both the first and last sections begin with an invocation (of Hieron, 1-8; of the Muse Calliope, 176-78) which is followed by a reference to song (the poet has woven a song of praise [ῥῆμον], 9f.; the Muse is commanded to sing [ῥῆμῆσον], 179). More precisely, the central section is set within a chiastic frame in which the proem which begins the first section (1-36) is answered by the conclusion (187-200) which ends the last section, both of these being largely concerned with the poet's relationship with the victor and the interdependence of success and song. Following the proem (in 37-49) and preceding the conclusion (in 178-86) comes praise of the actual victory won for Hieron by Pherenicus; the first part is answered by the last and the second by the second-last. This chiastic correspondence in the poem's topical arrangement is underlined by verbal and conceptual echoes:<sup>8</sup> thus, in the proem, 'general' (στραταγῆ, 2), 'straight in its justice' (εὐθύδικον, 6), 'sends' (πέμπει, 12), 'servant of Urania' (Οὐρανίας . . . θεράπων, 13f.), and 'path' (κέλευθος, 31) are answered by 'peace' (εἰρήν[α], 200), 'not [outside] the path [of justice]' (κελεύθου . . . οὐκ ἐκτὸς δίκας, 196), 'to send' (πέμπειν, 197), 'attendant of the sweet Muses' (γλυκεῖαν . . . πρόπολος Μουσῶν, 191f.), and 'path' (κελεύθου, 196), while the wish for continued good fortune (36) which concludes the proem is answered by the similar wish which ends the entire

<sup>7</sup> Van Otterlo's ([4] 5; cf. Stanley [6] 7) 'inclusive' and 'resumptive' forms of ring-composition (respectively). (Van Otterlo has disappointingly little to say on the former, because he virtually ignores ring-composition in self-contained productions such as lyric poems in favour of its use in articulating the component parts of extended narrative [esp. Herodotus]; and only by down-playing integral ring-composition can he reach the astonishing conclusion that 'Die in dieser Stilart abgefasste Schriftwerke konnten also niemals einen wirklichen Abschluss haben' [p. 44].) For an excellent account of large-scale 'inclusive' ring-composition in Herodotus, see J. Herington, 'The Closure of Herodotus' *Histories*, *ICS* 16 (1991) 149-60, esp. for his demonstration that ring-composition can encompass not only verbal, but also conceptual and thematic patterns. For an extensive recent defence of the interdependence of form and meaning in a work employing elaborate and complex forms of ring-composition, see Stanley [6]; cf. N. J. Richardson (ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary* 6 (Cambridge 1993) 4-14.

<sup>8</sup> Greengard [3] 20 claims that verbal recurrence in Pindar is more typically used for formal or aesthetic effect than to underline thematic recurrence; if she is right, then, on our evidence, Bacchylides' methods in this ode are somewhat different.

poem (200). Likewise, the motifs of the poet's willingness and ability to praise which are prominent in the proem are rehearsed in similar terms in the conclusion: thus ἐθέλει γάρυν ἐκ στηθέων χέων αἰνεῖν Ἴερωνα ('He wishes to pour his voice from his chest and praise Hieron', 14-16) is taken up by πείθομαι εὐμαρέως εὐκλέα . . . γλώσσαν . . . πέμπειν Ἴερωσι ('I am easily persuaded to send my song of good fame to Hieron', 195-97), while the notion of lines 31-34 (that the prowess of the Deinomenids in the games and in war affords the poet endless opportunity to praise) is answered in the conviction expressed in lines 187-97 that achievement demands ἀλάθεια ('truth', i.e., faithful commemoration of the deeds of the past)<sup>9</sup> rather than φθόνος ('envy'), that the divine favour enjoyed by the successful should lead to renown among men, and that justice (δίκαια) demands that Hieron be praised. And, of course, all these reflections on Hieron's success, achieved with the help of the gods as it is, recall the very first word of the poem, the apostrophe of its addressee as εὐμοιρε ('well-destined', 1).

Similarly, the first and second praise of the victor, which form the inner elements of the chiasmic frame, correspond in their references to Pherenicus (37 and 184), to the river Alpheus (38 and 180f.), and to the glory brought to Hieron by his steed (νίκαν Ἴερωσι . . . τιτύσκων, 'fashioning a . . . victory for . . . Hieron' [49] answered by Ἴερωσι φέρων [εὐδαιμονίας πέταλον, 'bringing Hieron a leaf of prosperity' [185f.]). Both the first and the second praise, moreover, are rounded off by *gnomai* on what it is to be successful and favoured by the gods (50-55 and 187-94).

Perhaps the most interesting of the correspondences between the poem's beginning and its end, however, concerns the reference to Hesiod in the conclusion (191-94):

Βοιωτὸς ἀνήρ τᾶδε φώνησε, γλυκειᾶν  
 Ἥσιδος πρόπολος  
 Μουσαῖν, ὃν <ἄν> ἀθάνατοι τιμῶσι, τούτῳ  
 καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἐπιεσθαι.

<sup>9</sup> On this (typically epinician) sense of ἀλάθεια in Bacchylides, cf. 3.96, 8.20f., 13.204 (note φθόνος in 200), fr. 14, with L. Woodbury, 'Truth and the Song', *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 331-35; to the references in his n. 10, add A. M. Komornicka, 'Quelques remarques sur la notion d' ἀλάθεια et de ψευδος chez Pindare', *Eos* 60 (1972) 235-53; D. Bremer, *Licht und Dunkel in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Bonn 1976) 161, 296-314; Maehler [3] 61 ad 3.96; A. P. Burnett, *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, Mass. 1985) 44f., 57-59; T. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind* (Leiden 1985) 100-06; see also M. Detienne, *Les Maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1973).

A Boeotian man spoke thus, Hesiod, attendant of the sweet Muses, that whomever the immortals honour, him should the voice of mortals also accompany.

Opinions are divided as to whether this is a citation of a lost work of Hesiod (hence 'fr. 344'<sup>10</sup>),<sup>11</sup> or a summary allusion to *Theogony* 81-97,<sup>12</sup> but the latter is more plausible, for the *Theogony* passage has already been the subject of extensive allusion in the opening section of the poem. With his understanding of the work of the Muses and his justice (3-6), Hieron is like the Muse-blest king of *Theogony* 80-93, as Bacchylides is the Muse-blest poet who can distract a man from his troubles (7-14, cf. *Th.* 94-103).<sup>13</sup> That the *Theogony* passage is in Bacchylides' mind in the proem is confirmed by his use of the Hesiodic Οὐρανίας . . . θεράπων ('servant of Urania', 13f., cf. *Th.* 100); this allusion is then repeated in the ring-composition of 191-93 (γλυκειᾶν . . . πρόπολος Μουσῶν, 'attendant of the sweet Muses'); thus the explicit reference to Hesiod in the conclusion refers back to the implicit allusion in the poem's opening sections; the existence of the ring corroborates the allusion, suggests that the same Hesiodic passage is in play at both points, and indicates that Bacchylides expected his audience to perceive both the ring and the unsignposted allusion.<sup>14</sup> The poem is written for one who has the ability to 'recognize the sweet-gifted ornament of the violet-crowned Muses' (3f.), and this ability entails appreciation both of the ode's relationship to a range of epic forebears<sup>15</sup> and of its internal structure.

At the level of the whole poem, then, ring-structure is pronounced and pervasive, apparent both in the topical arrangement of the poem's themes and in numerous verbal and conceptual echoes, and even encompassing one of the ode's many debts to earlier poetry. The contribution of such a thorough-going deployment of ring-composition to the effect of closure and the sense of formal unity is readily apparent, but already in the case of the Hesiodic allusions we have seen that it is impossible to separate consideration of the poem's form from that of its meaning as a literary artefact. And in fact the contribution of the

<sup>10</sup> R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967).

<sup>11</sup> So R. C. Jebb, *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge 1905) 293; D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* 4 (Cambridge, Mass. 1992) 153; D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup> (Bristol 1982) 433; Maehler [3] 122 (all *ad loc.*).

<sup>12</sup> So Lefkowitz [3] 90f. (cf. M. Lefkowitz, *The Victory Ode* [Park Ridge 1976] 73; cf. Merkelbach and West [10] on fr. 344).

<sup>13</sup> On the Hesiodic allusion, cf. Lefkowitz [3] 50f., [12] 45; Goldhill [3] 67.

<sup>14</sup> Contrast Goldhill [3] 67 n. 11.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Maehler [3] 117f.

overall ring-structure to the ode's meaning is considerable. We have seen how the process of respension between post- and pre-myth sections begins with a second invocation to balance the first and continues with second praise of the victor in chiasmic opposition to the first. The invocation in itself indicates that the lines which begin the process of completing the ring and forming the poem's conclusion can also be considered a new beginning; and despite the verbal and conceptual correspondence which marks this new beginning as similar to the opening invocation, it is their difference which makes the greater impression upon the hearer. Thus the invocation of a Muse (a regular way of beginning a Bacchylidean epinician)<sup>16</sup> contrasts with the opening invocation, unique in extant epinician, of the mortal Hieron.<sup>17</sup> Equally, while 1-55 concentrate on Hieron's achievement and Bacchylides' ability to celebrate it, and conventional elements of praise appear sporadically (the victor's city, 1; his name, 16; his family, 35f.; the name of the winning horse, 37; periphrasis for place of victory, 38; previous victory, 41),<sup>18</sup> the invocation which introduces the second praise is followed by an injunction to praise the patron deity of the games (178f.) and a positive profusion of typical elements—two periphrases for the place of victory (181f.), patron hero (181), Phoenician (184), victor's city (184f.), victor's name (185).<sup>19</sup> In many ways, the ode's second beginning is a more typical epinician opening than its actual beginning. The density of conventional elements in the second praise emphasizes the anomaly of the initial concentration on Hieron and his success; and, as Goldhill points out,<sup>20</sup> the stress on the Muse and on Zeus gains in effect from the fact that we have just heard and understood a myth which illustrates the mutability of human fortune and the dependence of human happiness on fate and divine favour.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Odes 1, 3, 12, 13; cf. the Graces in 9 and Hestia in 14B, and the personifications invoked in 2, 7, 10, 11.

<sup>17</sup> The uniqueness of the opening address is noted by W. Steffen, 'Bacchylides' Fifth Ode', *Eos* 51 (1961) 11; Krieger [3] 223; and P. T. Brannan, 'Hieron and Bacchylides: An Analysis of Bacchylides' Fifth Ode', *CF* 26 (1972) 201-03; but only W. H. Race, *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta 1990) 184 has observed that the anomaly extends to the provision of a full-scale hymnic invocation of Hieron. 1-8 bristle with the conventional elements of a cultic hymn (see Race [above, this note] 85f.): Hieron is given an epithet and a title (1f.); his *sedes* is given (1); his powers are extolled (3-6); and finally there is a summons and request (8).

<sup>18</sup> Hamilton [2] 82 notes that the two constant elements of the 'naming complex' (victor's name, place of victory) are unusually far apart.

<sup>19</sup> 'Sechs Programmpunkte hat Bakchylides in diesen wenigen Versen (in einem einzigen Satz!) zusammengefaßt', Krieger [3] 247.

<sup>20</sup> Goldhill [3] 79.

Despite the ring-composition which makes the end echo the beginning, the intervening myth has changed everything, and hymnic invocation of the victor alone, together with praise of the poet's own skill, has perforce given way to a proper emphasis on the role of the divine which is all the more striking for being postponed. The (apparently) purely formal technique of ring-composition brings the first and second invocations together and prompts the reflection which reinforces the connection between the mythical section and the argument of the poem as a whole.<sup>21</sup>

An audience, of course, can only perceive a ring when it is complete; thus the effects just described can be appreciated only when the performance is at or nearing its end. But this is not to say that they may not also be anticipated; for the structural principles which govern the poem as a whole are also to be found in the architecture of its parts—indeed, it is ring-composition which makes the greatest contribution to the articulation and formal distinctness of the parts.<sup>22</sup> Thus in the first section the opening apostrophe of Hieron as εὖμοιρε ('well-destined') is answered by the *makarismos* in 50-55, including μοῖραν in 51 and εὐδαίμων, a synonym of εὖμοιρος, at the very end of the entire first section in 55; likewise the phrase 'if any mortal on earth' (αἴ τις ἐπιχθονίων, 5), used in the initial invocation to magnify Hieron's εὐδαιμονία, is answered by 'for no mortal on earth' (οὐ γὰρ τις ἐπιχθονίων, 53f.) in the *makarismos* which concludes the first section, prepares for the myth, and begins to set Hieron's εὐδαιμονία in something like its proper context.<sup>23</sup> Once again, a technique which relies on the perception of similarity is used also to suggest difference, as the apparently unqualified εὐδαιμονία of Hieron in the invocation is set against the circumspection of the *makarismos* and *gnomai*, which in turn prepare for the dark foil of the myth which so colours our impression of the contrast between the poem's opening and closing sections.<sup>24</sup>

Within the first section (1-55), the status of 9-36 as a sub-section distinct from the preceding invocation and dealing with the poet's task and the

---

<sup>21</sup> That Bacchylides uses the ring to apply the lesson of the myth to Hieron's achievement offers no purchase to those who would emphasize Bacchylides' 'pessimism' here (e.g., J. Stern, 'The Imagery of Bacchylides' Ode 5', *GRBS* 8 [1967] 35-43); the reflections on the instability of good fortune in the myth and elsewhere are 'dark foil' (Bundy [2] 47-53, 74f.) for the magnitude of Hieron's success in achieving so much, given the odds against which human beings struggle. See now D. Arson Svarlien, 'Reversal of Imagery and Values in Bacchylides 3 and 5', *QUCC* 50 (1995) 35-45.

<sup>22</sup> On this function of ring-composition in Pindar, cf. Greengard [3] 20.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Goldhill [3] 71.

<sup>24</sup> The opening section also exhibits an inner ring in ξένοσ ('guest-friend', 11) and φιλοξείνω ('hospitable', 49).

interdependence of poet and victor (Schadewaldt's *Sieg-Lied-Motiv*<sup>25</sup>) is confirmed by the ring created by ὕμνον ('song [of praise]', 10) and ὕμνεῖν ('to sing in praise', 33), while that of 1-36 as a slightly larger structural unit (the proem) is confirmed by the way in which the reference to agonistic success and martial prowess in 33f. (κυανοπλοκάμου θ' ἕκατι Νίκας χαλκεοστέρνου τ' Ἄρηος, 'by the will of dark-tressed Victory and bronze-breasted Ares') answers that in 1f., εὖμοιρε [Σ]υρακ[οσίων] ἱπποδινῆτων στρατα[γ]ῆ ('well-destined general of the horse-whirled Syracusans').<sup>26</sup> Ring-composition is also pronounced in the poem's final section (176-200), which exhibits the following chiasmic sequence:<sup>27</sup> sing Zeus (178f.); Pherenicus brings prosperity to Hieron (184-86); *gnome* 1 (187-90); *gnome* 2 (191-94); the poet sends his 'song of good fame' to Hieron (195-97); prayer to Zeus (200).<sup>28</sup> Thus a section which forms a chiasmus with 1-55 is itself chiasmic; and the section as a whole is contained within the emphatic references to the pre-eminence of Zeus, thus reinforcing the emphasis on human dependence on divine favour which we saw to be a by-product of the ring linking beginning and end of the poem.

So far we have looked at simple ring-patterns (ABA', ABCB'A', and ABCC'B'A') and have seen that these have a major role to play in the articulation of the poem and its argument. There is nothing naive or primitive about these patterns, but they are certainly perspicuous, and this might suggest that Bacchylides' application of the principles of ring-composition is quite straightforward. But there is more: while the first section of the ode (1-55) can be divided into two distinct parts (proem, 1-36, and first praise, 37-49, followed by gnomic link, 50-55) answered chiasmically by a bipartite final section (second praise, 176-86, followed by conclusion, 187-200), there is also evidence within that section of creative adaptation of the basic principle of ring-composition. The bones of this structure consist of a chiasmic pattern in which the initial invocation (1-8) is answered by the final *makarismos* and *gnome* (50-55); the invocation, in turn, leads seamlessly into the second section of the proem (9-16), in which the poet introduces himself as the victor's ξένος

<sup>25</sup> W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* (Halle 1928) 277f., 294, 298-306.

<sup>26</sup> On the way in which multi-correspondence in elements of ring-structure prevents the impression of mechanical joining of discrete elements, cf. Greengard [3] 25, 38.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ode 1.159-84 with Maehler [3] 9.

<sup>28</sup> The *gnomai* in 187-90 and 191-94 form the fulcrum on which the chiasmus balances, but in terms of their content they belong rather to the second of the two concluding sections (187-200), on the interdependence of poet and victor, success and song. Gnomical cluster and reflections on the poet's task are typical elements in the conclusions to Bacchylides' mythodes; see Hamilton [3] 81-83.



('guest-friend') and as worthy to praise his fame, and declares his willingness to praise (the *Bereitwilligkeitsmotiv*, 14-16).<sup>29</sup> This concern with the poet's credentials and the relationship between song and success is taken up by the lines (31-36) which conclude the proem, in which the typical notion of the poet's willingness to praise is answered by the equally typical idea that the victor's excellence provides the poet with an abundance of material for praise (the εὐμηχανία motif/*Leichtigkeitsmotiv*).<sup>30</sup> Thus 1-8 (A) and 9-16 (B) form a recognizable chiasmus with 31-36 (B') and 50-55 (A'). A clear ring-pattern might have been created had Bacchylides chosen to site the first praise of the victor (which actually occurs at 37-49) in the centre of this frame; but instead he does something more interesting. Maehler has pointed out how the inclusion of the simile of the eagle extends the proem to an unusual degree.<sup>31</sup> This simile (which, in spite of its multivalence, has as its basic point of comparison [31] the poet's εὐμηχανία)<sup>32</sup> comes at the point at which one might have expected the first praise of the victor's achievement. Thus the simile separates the *Bereitwilligkeitsmotiv* (B) from the *Leichtigkeitsmotiv* (B'), and forms the heart of what we saw to be a distinct sub-section (9-36), dominated by reflections on the poet's task and his abilities.

Several details of the eagle-simile indicate that not only does the eagle represent the poet, but his majestic and unimpeded progress matches that of Pherenicus in the Olympic horse race;<sup>33</sup> the suggestion that the eagle represents

<sup>29</sup> Maehler [3] 85, 92 (and often).

<sup>30</sup> See Maehler [3] 92, 97, 165 and cf. Bundy [2] 61f., 64; E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte* (Heidelberg 1968-69) 2.26, 46. On poetic εὐμηχανία, see A. M. Miller, 'Pindar, Archilochus, and Hieron', *TAPA* 111 (1981) 135-43.

<sup>31</sup> Maehler [3] 83.

<sup>32</sup> For the image of the poet as eagle, cf. Pi. *O.* 2.87f., *N.* 3.80-82, *N.* 5.20f. For R. Stoneman, 'The "Theban Eagle"', *CQ* 26 (1976) 188-97, none of these refers to the poet, all extol the victor, while for P. A. Bernardini, 'L' "aquila tebana" vola ancora', *QUCC* 26 (1977) 121-26 all refer to the poet; Hubbard [9] 149-52 and D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song* (London 1986) 104-06 argue for multivalence in every case, while I. L. Pfeijffer, 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CP* 89 (1994) 305-17 rightly insists that we must judge each case on its own terms. Here, not only does the explicit connection, 'Even so I, too' (31), make the comparison between the sublime ease of the eagle's progress (16-19, 24-30) and the poet's εὐμηχανία (31-36) certain, but the analogy of eagle and poet is reinforced by the designation 'messenger of Zeus' (19f.; Lefkowitz [12] 47; Pfeijffer [above, this note] 308) and the contrast with the *voices* of lesser birds (22f.). This is not to deny that the image also has an application to Hieron (as protégé of Zeus, as confident in his own power [21f.], or as conspicuous for men to see [29f.]; cf. Brannan [17] 222; Goldhill [3] 68f.; Pfeijffer [above, this note] 316); on the application to Pherenicus, see below.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Brannan [17] 227f.; Lefkowitz [12] 48, 51; Goldhill [3] 70.

the horse is already there in the reference to the former's 'fine-haired coat' (λεπτότριχα . . . ἔθειραν, 28f.), for both 'hair' and 'coat' are properly used of mammals, not birds (indeed, ἔθειραι—always in the plural—is in Homer exclusively used of horses' mane or horse-hair crests).<sup>34</sup> The parallel becomes apparent when we find that the description of Pherenicus' success at Olympia is made to mirror the eagle's flight. So the incomparable superiority of the eagle over other birds (21-23) is balanced by that of Pherenicus over other horses (43-45); the description of the eagle's plumage as 'fine-haired' in 28 is answered by the metrically equivalent ξανθότριχα ('yellow-haired') of Pherenicus at 37; where the eagle flies σὺν ζεφύρου πνοαῖσιν ('with the blasts of the West Wind', 28f.), Pherenicus is ῥίπᾶ . . . ἴσος βορέα ('like the blast of the North Wind', 46; cf. ἀελλοδρόμαν, 'storm-running', 39); and as the eagle was ἀρίγνωτος ἀνθρώποις ἰδεῖν ('conspicuous for men to see', 29f.),<sup>35</sup> so 'Dawn saw Pherenicus winning' (Φερένικον . . . εἶδε νικάσαντα χρυσόπαχυς Ἄως, 37-40). The effect of balance between the simile and the account of Pherenicus' victory is reinforced by the near-exact correspondence in length (14:13 cola). Thus the eagle simile can be seen as both an element sandwiched between two passages on the poet's task and as the first of two parallel exaltations of pre-eminence separated by reflections on the poet's task; instead of the basic pattern, ABCB'A', we have ABCB'C'A', in which the central elements can be seen at once as alternating pairs and as two overlapping rings, BCB' and CB'C'. Bacchylides has used the basic tripartite structural principle of ring-composition to create a structure which is more complicated, subtle, and fluid than he is generally given credit for.

Let us turn now to the myth. Maehler, noting the eagle-simile's contribution to the unusual length of the poem, adds the observation that the poem stands in the same proportion (18 per cent) to the poem as a whole as the introduction to the myth (56-77) does to the mythical section as a whole (56-

<sup>34</sup> This fact led A. Bonnafé, 'L'Aigle dans Bacchylide V. 26-30', *ZPE* 9 (1972) 37f., to argue that ἔθειρα must refer not to the eagle's plumage but to its crest; but what we have here is a case of 'intrusion', in which a detail appropriate to the tenor of the simile/allegory (Pherenicus) has been attached to the vehicle (M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* [Cambridge 1974] does not discuss this example, but for similar cases of intrusion in allegorical contexts, see his pp. 144-49).

<sup>35</sup> The papyrus' μετ' (30), deleted by R. J. Walker, 'Bacchylides', *The Atheneum* (18 December 1897) 856, would imply that the eagle is a man among men; the objection of Maehler [3] 96 *ad loc.* ('Der Adler jedoch mischt sich nicht unter die Menschen'; cf. Walker [above, this note]) fails to take account of the possibility of 'intrusion' (so Silk [34] 143; cf. W. J. Verdenius, 'Two Notes on Bacchylides V', *Mnem.* 28 [1975] 63), but his text is none the less preferable on metrical grounds (see p. 91 for his note on 11f.).

175).<sup>36</sup> This is only one of several ways in which the structure of the mythical section follows that of the whole poem. After the lengthy introduction that is Heracles' descent (56-77), the poem's central section falls into three subsections—the first-person narrative of Meleager's sufferings (93-154) enclosed within two shorter sections in which Meleager and Heracles converse (78-92 and 155-75). These, moreover, conform to the same chiasmic arrangement which we saw in the structure of the poem as a whole—Meleager speaks first (78-84) and Heracles replies (84-92), while after Meleager's tale it is Heracles who speaks first (159-69) and Meleager who replies (170-75). The effect of this chiasmus in highlighting Meleager's narrative as the ode's central element is reinforced by the stress at its beginning and its end on the tears of the heroes: Heracles' musings on the purposes of Hera and Athena provoke tears in Meleager (94), as he remembers the effects of divine purpose in his own case, and these are recalled first in his own description of his weeping as his life ebbs away (153f.) and then in Heracles' tears of sympathy (155-58); these details, serving as virtual quotation marks round Meleager's speech, in themselves contribute to the pathos which is the myth's (intended) effect; the fact that tears of resignation and melancholy at one's own loss are answered by and evoke tears in recognition of shared humanity is presumably no less significant.

Chiasmic focus on the ode's central 'event' is thus evident,<sup>37</sup> but the appearance of mechanical formalism is avoided by the preservation of a natural sequence of statement and counter-statement. Though Meleager's narrative takes centre stage, it is introduced as a response to Heracles' remarks (93f.) and itself elicits Heracles' reply (159); thus something of the alternating rhythm which we noticed in the ode's opening section is detectable. This is yet more evident in Meleager's speech itself. Though one might discern an external conceptual ring enclosing the speech (in so far as it is an answer to Heracles' question, 'Who killed you?' [89], and so its climax in Meleager's death completes the frame), the narrative itself falls into two distinct phases (the first, 104-20, describing the struggle against the boar, and the second, 124-54, continuing the tale with the war against the Curetes and the circumstances of Meleager's death), each preceded by a reference to the cause of all the trouble, the anger of Artemis (94-104, 121-24). Thus Artemis' anger rings the first phase of the narrative, but the last element of this ring becomes the prelude to a second phase of the narrative which balances the first. These two phases, however, are still linked by ring-composition: the initiation of the train of

<sup>36</sup> Maehler [3] 83f.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. the focus on Croesus' speech (37-46) in Ode 3, with Maehler [3] 39.

events is recalled in its climax as the hostile action of the κούρα ('maiden') Artemis in 104 is recalled by that of Althaea, Θεστίου κούρα ('daughter of Thestius') in 137. These details, making an outer ring round the entire tale, also participate in inner rings surrounding each of its two phases, for Artemis the κούρα of 104 is recalled in the Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ ('daughter of Leto') of 124, and Althaea the κούρα δαΐφρων ('fiery-minded daughter', 137) answers δαΐφρων . . . Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ (122-24).<sup>38</sup> Verbal repetition thus (a) frames Meleager's tale and (b) frames and links its two phases,<sup>39</sup> though there is no direct correspondence between the tale's beginning in the offence of Oeneus and its end in the death of Meleager.

Ring-composition, then, permeates the central mythical section, both in its overall (chiastic) form and in the conceptual fabric of its central element, the speech of Meleager. Yet this pattern is not allowed to impose itself too prominently or mechanically, so that the myth as a whole is presented as a linear narrative in which the chiastic form of the dialogue co-exists with its natural forward motion; similarly, Meleager's speech is bounded by rings which link Artemis and Althaea (and look forward to the climactic naming of Deianeira), but still takes the form of a sequential narrative in two distinct

<sup>38</sup> The adj. δαΐφρων is common in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, both in contexts in which it seems to convey a notion of hostility (cf. δαΐω, 'kindle', and so 'destroy', δάτιος, 'hostile') and in contexts in which it suggests skill or intelligence (from δαῖνα, 'learn'; see P. Buttman (tr. J. R. Fishlake), *Lexilogus*<sup>5</sup> [London 1861] 209-12); here, the culmination of the story in Althaea's burning of the brand (and its analogue in the shirt of Nessus' effect on Heracles' flesh, the prelude to his immolation on Mt. Oeta) makes it virtually certain that an etymology from δαΐς, 'torch', is active; this will not be clearly distinct from the senses 'hostile' or 'destructive', which are foremost in the etymology of the name, *Daianeira* (173).

<sup>39</sup> There is more to the repetition of the root, δαΐ-: repetition of δαΐφρων (122, 137) clearly indicates thematic significance, a significance which reaches its climax in the reference to Deianeira (173; like Artemis and Althaea, she too is a 'daughter'—104, 124, 137; cf. Lefkowitz [3] 86, [12] 68; J. Péron, 'Les Mythes de Crésus et de Méléagre dans les odes III et V de Bacchylide', *REG* 91 [1978] 323). The syllable is also repeated in the name (Daipylos) given to the father of Meleager's victim in 145 (cf. Burnett [9] 144), and Brannan [17] 245 also sees a play on δαΐφρων in δαΐμων in 135 and δαιδαλέας in 140; given that the first of these three is surely a deliberate way of making the crucial sound ring in the audience's ears, the case for the latter pair as echoes is not as far-fetched as might at first appear; cf. the way in which Aeschylus repeats the sound βου- even in words which have no etymological connection with 'cows' in *Supp.* 570, 586, 599 (context of Io's transformation; cf. more remotely 118, 129, 776). But however that may be, the certain thematic significance of the repetition of δαΐφρων and its connection with Deianeira establishes that, in principle, to pay attention to verbal repetition in epinician poetry is not necessarily to perpetuate outmoded practices of New Criticism. See in general W. J. Slater, 'Doubts about Pindaric Interpretation', *CJ* 72 (1976-77) 193-208, esp. 199f.

phases. Thus, while Bacchylides has not abandoned ring-composition in the myth, it is clear that he has also striven to give this part of the ode a particular character of its own, for the form of his narrative is closer to the epic or Stesichorean than to the typical epinician narrative style. The narrative unfolds in a straightforward chronological sequence; its use of ring-composition is purely formal, aesthetic, and thematic; in particular, Bacchylides seems to eschew the familiar epinician narrative technique by which the myth opens with its main point (the *kephalaion*) before proceeding first backwards, then forwards in time until it returns to (and sometimes advances beyond) the point at which it began.<sup>40</sup> Equally, though the speeches of the myth are arranged in chiasitic order, there is no explicit conceptual link between its beginning and its end; nor is there any sign of an exterior ring to frame the myth as a whole.

Now, narrative structure of the above type (external ring, *kephalaion* ring with flashback, linkage of beginning and end of myth) is not a prescriptive norm; but it is very frequent, whereas the narrative structure of the myth of Ode 5 is unique in Bacchylides and without close parallel in Pindar.<sup>41</sup> In an ode, moreover, which is thoroughly permeated by ring-composition it is at least mildly surprising that the central myth appears so determinedly to avoid typical narrative structures in which ring-composition is crucial. This must be deliberate: Bacchylides clearly wants to present his narrative, highly indebted to epic forebears as it is,<sup>42</sup> in quasi-epic style; but he also wishes to use the

---

<sup>40</sup> See Illig [3] 56-67, 88, 97, 102, followed (with varying degrees of modification) by H. and A. Thornton, *Time and Style* (London 1962) 27-35; Ruck [3] (1968) 129-32; Hamilton [2] 57, 61-65; Greengard [3] 23-26, 51-53; W. J. Slater, 'Pindar's Myths', in G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M. C. J. Putnam (edd.), *Arktouros* (Berlin 1979) 63-70; W. J. Slater, 'Lyric Narrative: Structure and Principle', *Cl. Ant.* 2 (1983) 117-32; A. Hurst, 'Temps du récit chez Pindare (Pyth. 4) et Bacchylide (11)', *MH* 40 (1983) 154-68. The basic pattern (*kephalaion* ring, 'flashback', one or more inner rings) is discernible in Bacchylides 3 (heavily chiasitic), 11 (see Hurst [above, this note] 161-64; cf. Maehler [3] 203f.) and 13 (main myth, 100-67), but not in 9, while in 1 the text is too fragmentary to tell (although Maehler [3] 8f. guesses at *kephalaion* ring).

<sup>41</sup> In Slater's terminology ([40 (1979)] 64f.) it exhibits not 'simple' or 'complex' lyric, but 'epic' narrative style; this type may be discerned in several odes of Pindar (*O.* 9, 13, *P.* 5, *N.* 1; Slater [40 (1979)] 65), but in none of these does the straightforward linear narrative co-exist with elaborate use of chiasitic structure and verbal ring-composition; and the other examples of 'epic narrative' myths cited by Slater are all from Aeginetan odes, in which the treatment of myth differs markedly from that in odes for non-Aeginetan victors (see Hamilton [2] 57-60).

<sup>42</sup> See in general Lefkowitz [3]; also Maehler [3] 103 *ad* 60-62, 104 *ad* 56-67, 105 *ad* 73, 108 *ad* 94-96 and 97ff., 115f. *ad* 151-54, 117f. *ad* 162-64; cf. H. Buß, *De Bacchylide Homeri imitatore* (Gießen 1913) 45 *et passim*.

opportunities for dramatic irony offered by extensive dialogue in the Stesichorean mode.<sup>43</sup> What I want to suggest, however, is that this epic/Stesichorean presentation, with its apparent departure from the norm, actually conceals the considerable extent to which Bacchylides exploits and accommodates the more regular epinician form.

First, we saw that Bacchylides does not extract the *kephalaion* from his narrative and present it as the opening detail of his myth; yet despite the linear progression with which the myth unfolds (Heracles descends, meets Meleager, they converse, Meleager tells his story, they converse again), the narrative does exhibit the temporal flashback associated with the *kephalaion* ring, in so far as the meeting of Heracles and Meleager encloses the tale of how the latter met his death. We have seen, too, how (apart from lines 56-77 which introduce the myth) the frame in which Meleager's tale is set is chiasmic in form. In retaining the backward-forward temporal sequence and the not infrequent chiasmus in the structure of the narrative, Bacchylides is thus employing elements of the narrative style which his audience will most readily associate with the genre. Will this lead them to look further for implicit or suppressed elements of the traditional form? I think it will. For is it really the case that there is no trace of ring-composition linking beginning and end of the myth? Heracles is first introduced as 'the gate-crashing, unconquerable son of Zeus' (ἐρείψιπύλον [παῖδ' ἀνίκητον . . . Διός, 56-58). Both epithets stress Heracles' previous success; but this detail comes immediately after the *gnome* of 53-55, that no mortal is fortunate in all respects, and thus an audience may be prepared to suspect that the epithets are used in preparation for the reversal that will confirm the *gnome*. (Ἀνίκητος, of course, is ambiguous between 'unconquerable' and 'unconquered', and the latter may imply 'hitherto unconquered'.) Accordingly, when we look to the culmination of the myth as a whole in Meleager's reference to the youthful Deianeira, still ignorant of the ways of Aphrodite, the enchantress of mortals (172-75), we find clear allusion

<sup>43</sup> This is not to endorse the view that Bacchylides is following a Stesichorean version of the death of Meleager, as suggested by M. Croiset, 'Sur les origines du récit relatif à Méléagre de Bacchylide', *Mélanges H. Weil* (Paris 1898) 77-80 and J. March, *The Creative Poet* (London 1987) 44-46. There is no evidence for this (cf. L. H. Galiart, *Beiträge zur Mythologie bei Bakchylides* [PhD diss. Freiburg/Schweiz 1910] 42), and indeed every reason to believe that Bacchylides' version is an old one (see Buß [42] 10-13; J. T. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* [Lund 1949] 13-16; B. Gentili, *Bacchilide: Studi* [Urbino 1958] 45; cf. A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus: Choephoroi* [Oxford 1986] 209 [ad 603-12]; S. C. R. Swain, 'A Note on *Iliad* 9.524-99: The Story of Meleager', *CQ* 38 [1988] 271-76; J. B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary* 3 [Cambridge 1993] 131f. [ad 9.524-605]). For another perspective, see J. Bremmer, 'La Plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique', in C. Calame (ed.), *Métamorphoses de la mythe en Grèce antique* (Geneva 1988) 37-56.

to Heracles' ultimate defeat at the hands of a woman and by means of a charm designed to restore his love. The detail which ends the myth points to the ironic reversal of that which began it, all the more so given Heracles' enquiry regarding 'an untamed daughter' (ἀδμήτα θυγάτρων, 167); in this myth in which women conquer men, in a chain of events going back to the 'unconquerable [ἀνίκητον] anger' of a virgin goddess (103f.), it is the breaking of the untamed virgin that will lead to the defeat of the unconquered hero. As often in epinician, ostentatious refusal to relate an event (176-78) serves as an emphatic way of alluding to that event; and just as the abrupt ending and *Abbruchformel* serve to emphasize the reversal of the positive details of the myth's beginning and thus complete the internal conceptual ring (the conquering of the unconquered Heracles), so they also complete the external ring, for the emphasis thrown on Heracles' ultimate downfall vividly exemplifies the lessons of the *makarismos* and *gnome* which introduce the myth; and these lessons remain with us as the poem's concluding lines seek to place Hieron's particular success and his general εὐδαιμονία in the proper context of the right relationship between man and god. The apparent suppression of detail and refusal of formal and narrative closure in the myth's abrupt ending in fact supply the crucial thematic link back both to the external frame of the myth and to its opening detail; this is perhaps the most remarkable of all of Bacchylides' creative adaptations of traditional form in this ode.

The above article has explored some of the crucial patterns of verbal and conceptual correspondence in the poem. It has not exhausted these (for there are many which do not perform the structural role with which we have been concerned); nor would a comprehensive study of such features, or even of all the formal conventions (and departures therefrom) that there may be in the poem, exhaust the possibilities for interpretation. But this is formalist poetry, and appreciation of the formal conventions of the genre is an absolute prerequisite for a proper understanding of the poet's presentation of his material to his original audience.