

The main, and positive, intention here is to demonstrate that an important thematic and structural ingredient in Nemean 7, and one that is sustained throughout the ode, is an emulative critique of Homer's *Odyssey*. A secondary, and negative, effect is to add to the accumulation of argument and evidence against the notion that the ode contains Pindar's apology for an earlier treatment of Neoptolemos in a paeon. This persists as a lively critical issue as is apparent from recent discussions by A.P. Burnett, *AJP* 119 (1998) 493-520; and I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeon*, (Oxford 2001) 322-323, but virtually all the internal 'evidence' for it is explained here as anti-Homeric polemic.

Some anti-Odyssean elements in the ode are explicit, well-recognized and previously the subject of detailed analytic description, notably by A. Köhnken in *Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971). Köhnken's analysis is pretty much restricted to what he calls the 'first myth' (20-30) and the 'second myth' (34-47). He effectively demonstrates that here Pindar turns Homer's own words against him, while favoring the achievements of Neoptolemos against those of Odysseus. While the present essay augments Köhnken's identification of anti-Homeric content within the 'myths' themselves, it also demonstrates the extension of Pindar's anti-Odyssean program into the remainder of the poem. This effect is particularly to be discerned in several instances where the encomiast is either subject or object of negative 'assertions': — — — — — ' (64), — π — — — — π — — — — (70-71), — — — — — (76), — — — — — π — — — — — (102). All of these have, on occasion, been seen as self-exculpating comments on Pindar's putative anti-Neoptolemos comments in the paeon. Here, by contrast, they are seen as criticisms of the *Odyssey* and its hero who is also often the narrator. Each negative statement about the encomiast reflects in its context an Odyssean antithesis which is elicited through allusion. Sometimes the connection with the Odyssean counter-exemplum involves a cue in the form of 'quotation' of a singular striking Odyssean locution such as — — — — π — — — — (71; *Od.* 24.523) which sets up an implicit contrast between two contest-ending, spear-throwing incidents, or — — — — — (76; *Od.* 14.467, and nowhere else) whereby an accommodating encomiast is contrasted with the obdurate braggart. In another case it is through what I see as an allusion to Ithaca — — — — — π — — — — —. In a final instance the encomiast, after owning, in a negative way, to the use of manipulated words in his treatment of Neoptolemos, issues a stricture against repeating the same thing three or four times. This is a reminder that in referring to Neoptolemos' sack of Troy — — — — π — — — — π — — — — π — — — — π — — — — (35), Pindar has adapted Odyssean words. In contrast, though, to Homeric references to Odysseus' sack of Troy, he has not said the same thing three or four times: — — — — π — — — — π — — — — π — — — — (Od. 3.130; 11.533; 13.316); — — — — π — — — — π — — — — (Od. 1.2).